

FILE NO. 260609

Petitions and Communications received from June 4, 2026, through June 11, 2026, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 16, 2026.

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

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

- Reappointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.113, to the Recreation and Park Commission:
 - o Larry Mazolla Jr. - term ending June 27, 2030
- Renomination pursuant to Charter, Section 4.106, to the Board of Appeals:
 - o John Trasvina - term ending July 1, 2030
- Renomination pursuant to Charter, Section 4.121, to the Building Inspection Commission:
 - o Lindsey Maclise - term ending July 1, 2028
- Renomination pursuant to Charter, Section 4.117, to the Entertainment Commission:
 - o Leonard Poggio - term ending July 1, 2030
- Renomination pursuant to Charter, Section 4.112, to the Public Utilities Commission:
 - o Joshua Arce - term ending August 1, 2030
 - o Kate Hermann - term ending August 1, 2030
- Renomination pursuant to Charter, Section 4.139, to the Public Works Commission:
 - o Paul Woodford - term ending July 2, 2030
 - o Elenor Blume - term ending July 2, 2030
- Renomination pursuant to Charter, Section 4.139, to the Sanitation and Streets Commission:
 - o Azalina Eusope - term ending July 1, 2030

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting three Police Commission Resolution Nos. 26-25, 26-24, and 26-28. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), submitting the 2026 Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of Board President Rafael Mandelman, submitting an excusal notice for meetings of the Budget and Appropriations Committee on June 10, June 11 and June 12, 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), submitting a response to Recommendation #6 from the Office of the Controller's (CON) October 2025 audit of San Francisco's Chapter 19B Surveillance Technology Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting a notice of delay for the First Quarter 2026 Report - Chapter 96A (Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements) and Chapter 96E (Domestic Violence Data Reporting). Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), submitting Controller's Discussion of the Mayor's proposed Budget for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2026-2027 and 2027-2028. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), submitting the San Francisco Fire Commission's Amended Rules of Order. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting an agenda for the June 15, 2026, meeting of the Civic Design Review Committee. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the California Department of Parks and Recreation, submitting a notice of nomination of Bellaire Tower to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a notice of proposed changes in regulations related to Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine). Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), submitting a notice of PG&E's rate change request for its 2027 Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) forecast application to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Alexandra Pickolick, regarding public parking in Golden Gate Park. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Barklee Sanders, regarding right-of-way maintenance in District 10. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Raphael Mauro, regarding San Francisco's Legacy Business Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Stephen Torres, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; eliminate exceptions allowing indoor smoking in bars with no employees, bars with historically compliant semi-enclosed smoking rooms, and hotel rooms, to conform to provisions of California law; and repeal suspended and superseded provisions regulating smoking in certain locations. File No. 260361. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From a member 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. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Cara Bardine, regarding the California Academy of Sciences. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco Budget. File Nos. 260616, 260596, and 260597. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From members of the public, regarding the renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding banning retail animal sales. 9 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding banning plastic cigarette filters. 113 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing ("PSH") that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents ("Drug-Free PSH") to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone ("Drug-Tolerant PSH"), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH's strategies to meet PSH residents' demands. File No. 251003. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to, for transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2026: halve the real property transfer tax rate from 5.5% to 2.75% when the consideration or value of the property conveyed equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 but is less than \$25,000,000, and from 6% to 3% when the consideration or value equals or exceeds \$25,000,000; exempt from these reductions the transfer of single-family residences; reduce the penalties for delinquent real property transfer taxes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 260178. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution authorizing the Sheriff's Office to contract with the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial) for Pretrial Services for a three year period from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2029, for a contract total not to exceed amount of \$22,532,145, with two one-year options to extend. File No. 260442. 56 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 11, 2026
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Reappointment - Recreation and Park Commission

On June 5, 2026, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following reappointment pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). This reappointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (July 5, 2026).

Reappointment to the Recreation and Park Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.113:

- **Larry Mazzolla Jr.** - term ending June 27, 2030

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on Mayoral appointments by timely notifying the Clerk in writing. Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the transmittal letter as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you wish to hold a hearing on this reappointment, please let me know in writing by Wednesday, June 17, 2026.

c: Supervisor Shamann Walton - Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Brad Russi - Deputy City Attorney
Adam Thongsavat - Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
Andre Adeyemi - Director of Appointments



Notice of Reappointment

June 5, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100(18) (Charter § 4.113) of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby submit the following reappointment to the Recreation and Park Commission:

Larry J. Mazzola Jr., for the Recreation and Park Commission for a four-year term ending June 27, 2030.

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

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

All my best,

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 12, 2026
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *ACC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Renominations - Various Bodies

On June 5, 2026, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete nomination packages. These nominations shall be subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing and vote within 60 days (August 4, 2026).

Renomination to the Board of Appeals, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.106:

- John Trasvina - Seat 4 - term ending July 1, 2030

Renomination to the Building Inspection Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.121:

- Lindsey MacLise - Seat 3 - term ending July 1, 2028

Renomination to the Entertainment Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.117:

- Leonard Poggio - Seat 7 - term ending July 1, 2030

Renominations to the Public Utilities Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.112:

- Joshua Arce - Seat 2 - term ending August 1, 2030
- Kate Herrmann Stacy - Seat 5 - term ending August 1, 2030

Renominations to the Public Works Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.141:

- Paul Woodford - Seat 2 - term ending July 2, 2030
- Eleanor Blume - Seat 4 - term ending July 2, 2030

Renomination to Sanitation and Streets Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.139:

- Azalina Eusope - Seat 5 - term ending July 1, 2030

If the Board fails to act on the nomination within 60 days from the date the Notice of Appointment was received by the Clerk of the Board, the appointment shall be deemed approved.

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.1, the Clerk of the Board shall refer these Motions to the Rules Committee and work with the Rules Committee Chair to schedule these nominations for hearings.

- c: President Rafael Mandelman - Board of Supervisors
 Supervisor Shamann Walton - Chair, Rules Committee, Board of Supervisors
 Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
 Victor Young - Rules Clerk
 Brad Russi - Deputy City Attorney
 Adam Thongsavat - Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
 Andre Adeyemi - Mayor's Director of Appointments



Notice of Nomination

June 5, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter §4.106, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

John Trasvina (Seat 4), for the Board of Appeals for a four-year term ending July 1, 2030.

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

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

All my best,

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Notice of Nomination

June 5, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.121, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

Lindsey Maclise, to the Building Inspection Commission (Seat 3) for a two-year term ending July 1, 2028.

I am confident that Ms. Maclise will serve our community well. Attached are her qualifications, which reflect how her nomination represents the City's communities of interest, neighborhoods, and diverse populations.

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

All my best,

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Notice of Nomination

June 5, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter §4.117, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

Leonard Poggio (Seat 7), for the Entertainment Commission for a four-year term ending July 1, 2030.

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

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this nomination. Should you have any questions about this nomination, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at 415-554-4000.

All my best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "D. Lurie", written in a cursive style.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Notice of Nomination

June 5, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter §4.112(a), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

Kate Herrman Stacy (seat 4), for the Public Utilities Commission for a four-year term ending August 1, 2030. Kate fulfills the seat requirement of experience in water systems, power systems, or public utility management.

Joshua Arce (seat 2), for the Public Utilities Commission for a four-year term ending August 1, 2030. Joshua fulfills the seat requirement of experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy.

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

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of these nominations. Should you have any questions about this nomination, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at 415-554-4000.

All my best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Notice of Reappointment

June 5, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

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

Paul Woolford (seat 2), for the Public Works Commission for a four-year term ending July 2, 2030.

Eleanor Blume (seat 4), for the Public Works Commission for a four-year term ending July 2, 2030.

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

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

All my best,

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Reappointment

June 5, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Section §4.139 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby make the following reappointment:

Azalina Eusope (seat 5), to the Sanitation and Streets Commission, to serve a four-year term ending July 1, 2030.

I am confident that Ms. Eusope will serve our community with dedication and integrity. Attached are her qualifications, which illustrate how her appointment reflects the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of the nomination for this appointment. Should you have any questions about this appointment nomination, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

All my best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 3 Police Commission Resolutions
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:44:45 AM
Attachments: [3 Police Commission Resolutions.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting 3 Police Commission Resolutions.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Wu, Kimmie \(POL\)](#); [Wu, Li \(POL\)](#); [Yeung, Fannie \(POL\)](#); [Ashpole, Robert \(POL\)](#); [Kilshaw, Rachael \(POL\)](#); [Reynolds, Sondra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Singh, Kristine \(POL\)](#); [Tom, Risa \(POL\)](#); [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 26-25
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:49:06 PM
Attachments: [Res 26-25 Approval to accept in-kind donation of naloxone \\$43,200.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached resolution.

Thank you,

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Secretary
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and 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.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

June 4, 2026

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

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

C. DON CLAY
President

PRATIBHA TEKKEY
Vice President

CINDY ELIAS
Commissioner

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

W.S. WILSON LEUNG
Commissioner

MATTIE SCOTT
Commissioner

LARRY LOW
Commissioner

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, June 3, 2026, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 26-25

APPROVAL TO ACCEPT AN IN-KIND GIFT OF NALOXONE VALUED AT \$43,200;

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission approves accepting an in-kind gift of Naloxone valued at \$43,200.

AYES: Commissioners Low, Tekkey, Scott, Leung, Elias, Vice President Benedicto, and President Clay

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "S. Youngblood", is written over a blue circular stamp or seal.

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission

1211/SR

cc:

Manager Li Wu/Fiscal
CFO Kimmie Wu/Fiscal
Manager Li Wu/Fiscal
Grants Manager Fannie Yeung/Fiscal
Grants Analyst Robert Ashpole/Fiscal



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEADQUARTERS
1245 3RD Street
San Francisco, California 94158



DERRICK LEW
CHIEF OF POLICE

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: San Francisco Police Department

DATE: January 12, 2026

SUBJECT: Accept and Expend Resolution for In-Kind Gift

GIFT TITLE: In-Kind Gift through Naloxone Distribution Project

The following documents are attached to this memo:

- X** 1. Proposed Gift Resolution
- X** 2. Grant/Gift Information Form, including disability checklist
- X** 3. Value of In-Kind Gift
- X** 4. Three (3) Applications
- X** 5. Three (3) Acceptance Letters
- N/A** Ethics Form 126 (if applicable)
- N/A** Contracts, Leases/Agreements (if applicable)
- N/A** Other (Explain):

Special Timeline Requirements:

Departmental representative to receive a copy of the adopted resolution:

Name: **Kimmie Wu / Robert Ashpole** Phone: **415-837-7211**

Interoffice Mail Address: **SFPD Fiscal Division**
1245 3rd Street, 6th Floor, SF, CA 94158

Certified copy required Yes ☐ No ☒

(Note: certified copies have the seal of the City/County affixed and are occasionally required by funding agencies. In most cases ordinary copies without the seal are sufficient).

File Number: _____
(Provided by Clerk of Board of Supervisors)

Grant Resolution Information Form
(Effective July 2011)

Purpose: Accompanies proposed Board of Supervisors resolutions authorizing a Department to accept and expend grant funds.

The following describes the grant referred to in the accompanying resolution:

1. Grant Title: **In-Kind Gift through Naloxone Distribution Project (NDP)**
2. Department: **San Francisco Police Department**
3. Contact Person: **Kimmie Wu / Robert Ashpole** Telephone: **415-837-7211**
4. Grant Approval Status (check one):
☒ Approved by funding agency ☐ Not yet approved
5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: **1,800 units of Naloxone (in-kind gift), valued at \$43,200**
6. a. Matching Funds Required: **N/A**
b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable): **N/A**
7. a. Grant Source Agency: **Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)**
b. Grant Pass-Through Agency (if applicable):
8. Proposed Grant Project Summary: **Naloxone from this project will be used to help combat opioid overdose-related deaths.**
9. Grant Project Schedule, as allowed in approval documents, or as proposed:
Start-Date: January 27, 2025 **End-Date: December 31, 2025**
10. a. Amount budgeted for contractual services: **N/A**
b. Will contractual services be put out to bid? **N/A**
c. If so, will contract services help to further the goals of the Department's Local Business Enterprise (LBE) requirements? **N/A**
d. Is this likely to be a one-time or ongoing request for contracting out? **N/A**
11. a. Does the budget include indirect costs? ☐ Yes ☒ No
b. 1. If yes, how much? **N/A**
2. How was the amount calculated? **N/A**
c. 1. If no, why are indirect costs not included?
☐ Not allowed by granting agency ☐ To maximize use of grant funds on direct services
☒ Other (please explain): **this is an in-kind gift**
2. If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs? **N/A**
12. Any other significant grant requirements or comments: **None**

****Disability Access Checklist** (Department must forward a copy of all completed Grant Information Forms to the Mayor's Office of Disability)**

13. This Grant is intended for activities at (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ☐ Existing Site(s) | ☐ Existing Structure(s) | ☒ Existing Program(s) or Service(s) |
| ☐ Rehabilitated Site(s) | ☐ Rehabilitated Structure(s) | ☐ New Program(s) or Service(s) |
| ☐ New Site(s) | ☐ New Structure(s) | |

14. The Departmental ADA Coordinator or the Mayor's Office on Disability have reviewed the proposal and concluded that the project as proposed will be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and all other Federal, State and local disability rights laws and regulations and will allow the full inclusion of persons with disabilities. These requirements include, but are not limited to:

1. Having staff trained in how to provide reasonable modifications in policies, practices and procedures;
2. Having auxiliary aids and services available in a timely manner in order to ensure communication access;
3. Ensuring that any service areas and related facilities open to the public are architecturally accessible and have been inspected and approved by the DPW Access Compliance Officer or the Mayor's Office on Disability Compliance Officers.

If such access would be technically infeasible, this is described in the comments section below:

Comments:

Departmental ADA Coordinator or Mayor's Office of Disability Reviewer:

Penny Si
(Name)

Departmental ADA Coordinator
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 1/14/2026

(Signature Required)

Department Head or Designee Approval of Grant Information Form:

Derrick Lew
(Name)

Chief of Police
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 01/14/26

(Signature Required)



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEADQUARTERS
1245 3RD Street
San Francisco, California 94158



DERRICK LEW
CHIEF OF POLICE

TO: Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair, Budget & Finance Committee

FROM: Kimmie Wu, Chief Financial Officer

DATE: January 12, 2026

SUBJECT: [Accept and Expend In-Kind Gift – Retroactive – Naloxone Distribution Project -
Naloxone Valued at \$43,200]

The San Francisco Police Department is proposing a resolution retroactively authorizing the Department to accept and expend in-kind gift of a total of 1,800 units of Naloxone valued at \$43,200 through the Naloxone Distribution Project, which is funded by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and administered by the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) in 2025.

This resolution is retroactive because we have already received the units of naloxone. The gift is provided by DHCS's Naloxone Distribution Project and the State automatically sends out the units once a request has been reviewed and approved. Please let me know if you would like additional information. Thank you for considering this item.

Naloxone Distribution Project (NDP)					
Application Date	Award Date	Date Narcan Received	# of Units Awarded	Public Interest Price Per Unit	Value of Units
1/27/2025	1/29/2025	2/6/2025	600	\$24.00	\$14,400.00
5/16/2025	5/21/2025	5/29/2025	600	\$24.00	\$14,400.00
11/14/2025	11/19/2025	12/8/2025	600	\$24.00	\$14,400.00
			1800		\$43,200.00

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Wu, Kimmie \(POL\)](#); [Wu, Li \(POL\)](#); [Yeung, Fannie \(POL\)](#); [Ashpole, Robert \(POL\)](#); [Kilshaw, Rachael \(POL\)](#); [Reynolds, Sondra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Singh, Kristine \(POL\)](#); [Tom, Risa \(POL\)](#); [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 26-27
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:49:05 PM
Attachments: [Res 26-27 Approval to accept DOJ COPS Grant \\$6,250,000.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached resolution.

Thank you,

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Secretary
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and 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.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

June 4, 2026

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

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

C. DON CLAY
President

PRATIBHA TEKKEY
Vice President

CINDY ELIAS
Commissioner

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

W.S. WILSON LEUNG
Commissioner

MATTIE SCOTT
Commissioner

LARRY LOW
Commissioner

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, June 3, 2026, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 26-27

APPROVAL TO ACCEPT DOJ COPS HIRING GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,250,000.;

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission approves accepting an the DOJ COPS Hiring Grant in the amount of \$6,250,000.

AYES: Commissioners Low, Tekkey, Scott, Leung, Elias, Vice President Benedicto, and President Clay

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Stacy Youngblood", is positioned above the typed name of the Secretary.

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission

1211/SR

cc:

Manager Li Wu/Fiscal
CFO Kimmie Wu/Fiscal
Manager Li Wu/Fiscal
Grants Manager Fannie Yeung/Fiscal
Grants Analyst Robert Ashpole/Fiscal

[Accept and Expend Grant - Retroactive - FY25 COPS Hiring Program - U.S. Department of Justice - Amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance for FYs 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 - \$6,250,000]

Ordinance retroactively authorizing the San Francisco Police Department to accept and expend a grant in the amount of \$6,250,000 from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) under the FY25 COPS Hiring Program to fund 50 new police officer positions for approximately one year for the period of October 1, 2025, through September 30, 2030; and amending the Annual Salary Ordinance No. 120-25 (Annual Salary Ordinance, File No. 250590 for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027) to provide for the addition of fifty grant-funded positions, in Class Q002, Police Officer (50 FTEs).

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in single-underline italics Times New Roman font.
Deletions to Codes are in ~~strikethrough italics Times New Roman font~~.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The San Francisco Police Department applied for the FY25 COPS Hiring Program from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) to increase community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts.

(b) On October 10, 2025, the DOJ COPS Office approved the Police Department's application in the amount of \$6,250,000 to fund 50 new police officer positions with a match amount of \$18,064,100.

1 (c) The grant award period is from October 1, 2025, to September 30, 2030.

2 (d) The grant will fund 50 entry-level police officer positions for approximately one year
3 within a three-year project period, and includes a minimum retention requirement of 12
4 months.

5 (e) The City Attorney's Office filed a lawsuit challenging certain unlawful conditions the
6 DOJ sought to impose on the Police Department's acceptance of this grant. *See City and*
7 *County of San Francisco, et al. v. U.S. Department of Justice, et al.*, Northern District Court for
8 California, Case No. 3:25-cv-09277. The challenged conditions include requirements that
9 grant recipients agree to comply with all Presidential Memoranda and all Executive Orders by
10 the President, and certify that they do not operate any programs (including any such programs
11 having components relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion) that violate any applicable
12 Federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws. On January 21, 2026, the City obtained a
13 preliminary injunction against the DOJ enjoining its enforcement of the challenged, unlawful
14 conditions, which enabled the Police Department to accept the grant award without agreeing
15 to the challenged conditions.

16 (f) The Court's Order granting the preliminary injunction is on file with the Clerk of the
17 Board of Supervisors in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by reference. The City
18 Attorney's Office will be seeking summary judgment and a permanent injunction against the
19 challenged conditions.

20 (g) The grant award package, with the enjoined conditions in strikeout text, and the
21 Police Department's accompanying supplemental statement confirming its award acceptance
22 is subject to the Preliminary Injunction, is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in
23 File No. _____ and are incorporated herein by reference
24

25 **Section 2. Authorization to Accept and Expend Grant Funds.**

1 (a) The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the Police Department to retroactively
2 accept and expend, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, grant funds from the
3 DOJ COPS Office in the amount of \$6,250,000.

4 (b) The Board of Supervisors hereby retroactively authorizes the Police Chief or the
5 Police Chief's designee to accept the grant award, subject to the Preliminary Injunction
6 enjoining the challenged conditions.

7 (c) The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the Police Chief or the Police Chief's
8 designee to enter into, execute, and deliver any and all documents that the Police Department
9 determines, in consultation with the City Attorney, are in the best interests of the City, do not
10 otherwise materially increase the obligations or liabilities of the City, are necessary to
11 effectuate the purposes of the grant, and are in compliance with all applicable laws.

12 (d) The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the Police Department to maximize
13 use of available grants funds on program expenditures by not including indirect costs in the
14 grant budget, and waiving indirect costs.

15
16 **Section 3. Grant funded positions: Amendment to Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and**
17 **2026-2027 Annual Salary Ordinance.**

18 The hereinafter designated sections and items of Ordinance No. 120-25 (Annual Salary
19 Ordinance File No. 250590 for FY 2025-2026 and FY 2026-2027) are hereby amended to add
20 fifty (50) full-time positions (FTEs) to the Police Department as follows:

21
22 Department: 232086 POL Administration

23 Fund: 13550 SR Public Protection-Grant

24 Authority: 10001 Grants

25 Project: 10043247

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

APPROVED AS TO CLASSIFICATION

Department of Human Resources

11

By: _____

12

Carol Isen

13

Human Resources Director

15

18

19

21

24

25

Recommended:

Derrick Lew
Chief of Police

Standard Applicant Information

Project Information

Project Title

FY25 COPS Hiring Program

Federal Estimated Funding (Federal Share)

6250000.0

Total Estimated Funding

24314100

Proposed Project Start Date

10/1/25

Applicant Estimated Funding (Non-Federal Share)

18064100

Proposed Project End Date

9/30/30

Program Income Estimated Funding

0.0

Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.)

No Items

Type Of Applicant

Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

C: City or Township Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

B: County Government

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

Other (specify):

Application Submitter Contact Information

Application POC Prefix Name

Application POC First Name

Fannie

Application POC Middle Name

Application POC Last Name

Yeung

Application POC Suffix Name

Organizational Affiliation

Title

Grants Manager

Email ID

fannie.yeung@sfgov.org

Phone Number

415-837-7212

Fax Number

ORINumber

Executive Order and Delinquent Debt Information

Is Application Subject to Review by State Under Executive Order 12372? 

a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on: **State Review Available Date**

06/20/2025

Is the Applicant Delinquent on Federal Debt?

No

SF424 Attachments (3)

Name
[Form SF424_4_0-V4.0.pdf](#)

Date Added
6/20/25



Name
[SF424_4_0-1234-California US Districts.docx](#)

Date Added
6/20/25



Name
[GrantApplication.xml](#)

Date Added
6/20/25

Authorized Representative**Law Enforcement Executive Information****Title**

SFPD Interim Chief of Police

Prefix Name

First Name **Middle Name** **Last Name**

Paul _____ Yep

Suffix Name

Government Executive Information**Title**

Chief Financial Officer

Prefix Name

First Name **Middle Name** **Last Name**

Kimmie _____ Wu

Suffix Name

Verify Legal Name, Doing Business As, and Legal Address**Legal Name**

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Doing Business As**UEI**

SRZKDOWN293M2

Legal Address**Street 1**

1245 3RD ST

Street 2

FL 6

City

SAN FRANCISCO

State

CA

Zip/Postal Code

94158

Congressional District

11

Country

USA

Certification

The legal name + Doing Business As (DBA) and legal address define a unique entity in the system as represented in its entity profile. The profile legal name and address is applicable to ALL applications and awards associated to this fiscal agent.

1. If this information is correct confirm/acknowledge to continue with completion of this application.

I confirm this is the correct entity.

Signer Name

FANNIE YEUNG

Certification Date / Time

06/27/2025 03:39 PM

2. If the information displayed does not accurately represent the legal entity applying for federal assistance:

- Contact your Entity Administrator.
- Contact the System for Award Management (SAM.gov) to update the entity legal name/address.

3. If the above information is not the entity for which this application is being submitted, Withdraw/Delete this application. Please initiate a new application in Grants.gov with using the correct UEI/SAM profile.

Proposal Abstract

Data Requested with Application

› CHP NOFO FY2025

Proposal Narrative

Budget and Associated Documentation

Budget Summary

Budget Category	Total Cost
Sworn Officer Positions:	\$24,314,100.00
Civilian or Non-Sworn Personnel:	\$0.00
Travel:	\$0.00
Equipment:	\$0.00
Supplies:	\$0.00
SubAwards:	\$0.00
Procurement Contracts:	\$0.00
Other Costs:	\$0.00
Total Direct Costs:	\$24,314,100.00
Indirect Costs:	\$0.00
Total Project Costs:	\$24,314,100.00
Federal Funds:	\$6,250,000.00
Match Amount:	\$18,064,100.00
Program Income:	\$0.00

Local Match Details

Local Match Progression Table

As part of the local match requirement for the COPS Hiring Program, grantees must assume a progressively larger share of the cost of the grant with local funds over the three-year grant period. This means that your local match must increase each year, while the federal share must decrease.

Please project in the chart below how your agency plans to assume a progressively larger share of the grant cost during each year of the program. The chart is only a projection of your plans. While your agency may deviate from these specific projects during the grant period, it must still ensure that the federal share decreases and the local share increases.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Total from Budget
Local Match	\$1,650,367	\$8,112,936	\$8,300,796	\$18,064,100	\$18,064,100
Federal Share	\$6,250,000			\$6,250,000	\$6,250,000
Total	\$7,900,367.48	\$8,112,936.35	\$8,300,796.17	\$24,314,100	\$24,314,100

Waiver of Local Match

The COPS Office may waive some or all of a grantee's local match requirement based on severe fiscal distress. During the application review process, your agency's waiver request will be evaluated based on the availability of funding, a demonstration of severe fiscal distress as reflected through the fiscal health data provided in the application, and a comparison of your fiscal health data with that of the overall applicant pool.

No

Budget / Financial Attachments

Additional Attachments

No documents have been uploaded for Additional Attachments

Budget and Associated Documentation

DOES THIS BUDGET CONTAIN CONFERENCE COSTS WHICH IS DEFINED BROADLY TO INCLUDE MEETINGS, RETREATS, SEMINARS, SYMPOSIA, AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES?

Base Salary and Fringe Benefits for Sworn Officer

Sworn Officer

Position
Position Title
Sworn Officer

Position Description
Entry level officer

Number of Positions

50

~ Salary per Officer
Salary

Year 1

\$119,251.00

Year 2

\$122,708.00

Year 3

\$125,759.00

~ Fringe Benefits per Officer

Year 1

Year 2

Year 3

Social Security

6.2%

6.20%

\$7,393.58

\$7,607.77

\$7,797.08

Medicare

1.45%

1.45%

\$1,729.14

\$1,779.24

\$1,823.51

Health Insurance

Fixed Amount

\$9,836.00

\$9,836.00

\$9,836.00

\$9,836.00

\$9,836.00

\$9,836.00

Life Insurance

Exempt

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

Vacation

Included in Salary?

No

Hours

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

Sick Leave

Included in Salary?

No

Hours

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

Retirement

Fixed Rate

\$18,364.65

\$18,896.72

\$19,386.89

15.40%

15.40%

15.40%

Workers Compensation

Exempt

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

Unemployment Insurance

Exempt

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

Other Benefit

\$1,433.00

\$1,433.00

\$1,433.00

Dental Insurance

Fixed Amount

\$1,433.00

\$1,433.00

\$1,433.00

Other Benefit

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$0.00

None

Other Benefit	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
None			

Summary Totals	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Benefits per Officer	\$38,756.35	\$39,552.73	\$40,256.46
Salary per Officer	\$119,251.00	\$122,706.00	\$125,759.00
Total per Officer	\$158,007.35	\$162,258.73	\$166,015.46
Total per Officer All Years			
\$486,282			
Total Salary and Benefits			
\$24,314,100			

Personnel

Instructions

List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization. In the narrative section, please provide a specific description of the responsibilities and duties for each position, and explain how the responsibilities and duties support the project goals and objectives outlined in your application.

Year 1

Year 1

Personnel Detail

Name	Position	Salary	Rate	Time Worked	Percentage of Time (%)	Total Cost
No Items						

Personnel Total Cost

\$0

Additional Narrative

Fringe Benefits

Instructions

Fringe benefits should be based on the actual known costs or an approved negotiated rate by a Federal Agency. If not based on an approved negotiated rate, list the composition of the fringe benefit package. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in Personnel budget category listed and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project. In the narrative section, please provide a specific description for each item

Year 1

Fringe Benefit Detail

Name	Base	Rate (%)	Total Cost
No Items			

Fringe Benefits Total Cost

\$0

Additional Narrative

Travel

Instructions

Itemize travel expenses of staff personnel (e.g. staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Describe the purpose of each travel expenditure in reference to the project objectives. Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and the unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known; or if unknown, indicate "location to be determined." Indicate whether applicant's formal written travel policy or the Federal Travel Regulations are followed. Note: Travel expenses for consultants should be included in the "Consultant Travel" data fields under the "Subawards (Subgrants)/Procurement Contracts" category. For each Purpose Area applied for, the budget should include the estimated cost for travel and accommodations for two staff to attend two three-day long meetings, with one in Washington D.C. and one in their region, with the exception of Purpose Area 1, which should budget for one meeting in Washington D.C. and Purpose Areas 6 and 7, which should budget for 3 meetings within a 3 year period, with 2 in Washington D.C. and 1 within their region. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.

Year 1

Travel Detail

Purpose of Travel	Location	Type of Expense	Basis	Cost	Quantity	# Of Staff	# Of Trips	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
No items										

Travel Total Cost
\$0

Equipment

Instructions

List non-expendable items that are to be purchased (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy for classification of equipment should be used). Expendable items should be included in the "Supplies" category. Applications should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technological advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the "Contracts" data fields under the "Sub awards" (Sub grants)/Procurement Contracts" category. In the budget narrative, explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project, and describe the procurement method to be used. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.

Year 1

Equipment Detail

Equipment Item	# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
No items					

Equipment Total Cost
\$0

Supply Items

Instructions

List items by type (office supplies, postage, training materials, copy paper, and expendable equipment items costing less than \$10,000, such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.

Year 1

Supply Item Detail

Purpose of Supply Items	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
No items					

Supplies Total Cost
\$0

Construction

Instructions

As a rule, construction costs are not allowable. In some cases, minor repairs or renovations may be allowable. Consult with the DOJ grant-making component before budgeting funds in this category. In the narrative section, please provide a specific description for each item, and explain how the item supports the project goals and objectives outlined in your application.

Year 1

Construction Detail

Purpose of Construction	Description of Work	# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
-------------------------	---------------------	------------	------	------------	--------------------------	-----------------

No Items

Construction Total Cost
\$0

Subawards

Instructions

Subawards (see "Subaward" definition at 2 CFR 200.92) : Provide a description of the Federal Award activities proposed to be carried out by any subrecipient and an estimate of the cost (include the cost per subrecipient, to the extent known prior to the application submission). For each subrecipient, enter the subrecipient entity name, if known. Please indicate any subaward information included under budget category Subawards (Subgrants) Contracts by including the label "(subaward)" with each subaward category.

Year 1

Subaward (Subgrant) Detail

Description	Purpose	Consultant	Country	State/U.S. Territory	City	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
-------------	---------	------------	---------	----------------------	------	------------	--------------------------	-----------------

No Items

Subawards Total Cost
\$0

Add Consultant Travel

Procurement contracts (see "Contract" definition at 2 CFR 200.22): Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Indicate whether the applicant's formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulation is followed. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding procurement contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold set in accordance with 41 U.S.C. 1908 (currently set at \$250,000) for prior approval. Please provide a specific description for each item, and explain how the item supports the project goals and objectives outlined in your application. Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Unless otherwise approved by the COPS Office, approved consultant rates will be based on the salary a consultant receives from his or her primary employer. Consultant fees in excess of \$650 per day require additional written justification, and must be pre-approved in writing by the COPS Office if the consultant is hired via a noncompetitive bidding process. Please provide a specific description for each item, and explain how the item supports the project goals and objectives outlined in your application. Please visit <https://cops.usdoj.gov/grants> for a list of allowable and unallowable costs for this program.

Instructions

Procurement contracts (see "Contract" definition at 2 CFR 200.1): Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Indicate whether the applicant's formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulation is followed. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding procurement contracts. A separate justification must be provided for noncompetitive procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold set in accordance with 41 U.S.C. 1908 (currently set at \$250,000).

Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Written prior approval and additional justification is required for consultant fees in excess of the DOJ grant-making component's threshold for an 8-hour day.

In the narrative section, please provide a specific description for each item, and explain how the item supports the project goals and objectives outlined in your application.

Year 1

Procurement Contract Detail

Description	Purpose	Consultant	Country	State/U.S. Territory	City	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
-------------	---------	------------	---------	----------------------	------	------------	--------------------------	-----------------

No Items

Do you need Consultant Travel?
No

Procurement Cost
\$0

Other Direct Costs

Instructions

List items (e.g., rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, or provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.

Year 1

Other Cost Detail							
Description	Quantity	Basis	Costs	Length of Time	Total Costs	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
No Items							
Other Costs Total Cost							
\$0							

Indirect Costs

Instructions

Indirect costs are allowed only if: a) the applicant has a current, federally approved indirect cost rate; or b) the applicant is eligible to use and elects to use the "de minimis" indirect cost rate described in 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f). (See paragraph D.1.b. in Appendix VII to Part 200—States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals for a description of entities that may not elect to use the "de minimis" rate.) An applicant with a current, federally approved indirect cost rate must attach a copy of the rate approval, (a fully-executed, negotiated agreement). If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant's cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct costs categories. (Applicant Indian tribal governments, in particular, should review Appendix VII to Part 200—States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals regarding submission and documentation of indirect cost proposals.) All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative. In order to use the "de minimis" indirect rate an applicant would need to attach written documentation to the application that advises DOJ of both the applicant's eligibility (to use the "de minimis" rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the de minimis method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as the applicant entity chooses to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.

Year 1

Indirect Cost Detail					
Description	Base	Indirect Cost Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
No Items					
Indirect Costs Total Cost					
\$0					
Additional Narrative					

Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and Other Supportive Documents

Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and Other Supportive Documents

Upload

The recommended files to upload are PDF, Microsoft Word and Excel.

No documents have been uploaded for Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and Other Supportive Documents

Additional Application Components

Letters of Support

No documents have been uploaded for Letters of Support.

Additional Attachments

No documents have been uploaded for Additional Attachments.

Disclosures and Assurances

No Lobbying Activities

The applicant is not required to submit a lobbying disclosure under 31 U.S.C. 1352 for this application.

No documents have been uploaded for Disclosure of Lobbying Activities.

DOJ Certified Standard Assurances

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CERTIFIED STANDARD ASSURANCES

On behalf of the Applicant, and in support of this application for a grant or cooperative agreement, I certify under penalty of perjury to the U.S. Department of Justice ("Department"), that all of the following are true and correct:

- (1) I have the authority to make the following representations on behalf of myself and the Applicant. I understand that these representations will be relied upon as material in any Department decision to make an award to the Applicant based on its application.
- (2) I certify that the Applicant has the legal authority to apply for the federal assistance sought by the application, and that it has the institutional, managerial, and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay any required non-federal share of project costs) to plan, manage, and complete the project described in the application properly.
- (3) I assure that, throughout the period of performance for the award (if any) made by the Department based on the application--
 - a. the Applicant will comply with all award requirements and all federal statutes and regulations applicable to the award;
 - b. the Applicant will require all subrecipients to comply with all applicable award requirements and all applicable federal statutes and regulations; and
 - c. the Applicant will maintain safeguards to address and prevent any organizational conflict of interest, and also to prohibit employees from using their positions in any manner that poses, or appears to pose, a personal or financial conflict of interest.
- (4) The Applicant understands that the federal statutes and regulations applicable to the award (if any) made by the Department based on the application specifically include statutes and regulations pertaining to civil rights and nondiscrimination, and, in addition--
 - a. the Applicant understands that the applicable statutes pertaining to civil rights will include section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d); section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794); section 901 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. § 1681); and section 303 of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. § 6102);
 - b. the Applicant understands that the applicable statutes pertaining to nondiscrimination may include section 809(c) of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. § 10228(c)); section 1407(e) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. § 20110(e)); section 299A(b) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 (34 U.S.C. § 11182(b)); and that the grant condition set out at section 40002(b)(13) of the Violence Against Women Act (34 U.S.C. § 12291(b)(13)), which will apply to all awards made by the Office on Violence Against Women, also may apply to an award made otherwise;
 - c. the Applicant understands that it must require any subrecipient to comply with all such applicable statutes (and associated regulations); and
 - d. on behalf of the Applicant, I make the specific assurances set out in 28 C.F.R. §§ 42.105 and 42.204.
- (5) The Applicant also understands that (in addition to any applicable program-specific regulations and to applicable federal regulations that pertain to civil rights and nondiscrimination) the federal regulations applicable to the award (if any) made by the Department based on the application may include, but are not limited to, 2 C.F.R. Part 2800 (the DOJ "Part 200 Uniform Requirements") and 28 C.F.R. Parts 22 (confidentiality - research and statistical information), 23 (criminal intelligence systems), 38 (regarding faith-based or religious organizations participating in federal financial assistance programs), and 46 (human subjects protection).
- (6) I assure that the Applicant will assist the Department as necessary (and will require subrecipients and contractors to assist as necessary) with the Department's compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (54 U.S.C. § 306106), the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1974 (54 U.S.C. §§ 312501-312508), and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4335), and 28 C.F.R. Parts 61 (NEPA) and 63 (floodplains and wetlands).
- (7) I assure that the Applicant will give the Department and the Government Accountability Office, through any authorized representative, access to, and opportunity to examine, all paper or electronic records related to the award (if any) made by the Department based on the application.
- (8) If this application is for an award from the National Institute of Justice or the Bureau of Justice Statistics pursuant to which award funds may be made available (whether by the award directly or by any subaward at any tier) to an institution of higher education (as defined at 34 U.S.C. § 10251(a)(17)), I assure that, if any award funds actually are made available to such an institution, the Applicant will require that, throughout the period of performance--
 - a. each such institution comply with any requirements that are imposed on it by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and
 - b. subject to par. a, each such institution comply with its own representations, if any, concerning academic freedom, freedom of inquiry and debate, research independence, and research integrity, at the institution, that are included in promotional materials, in official statements, in formal policies, in applications for grants (including this award application), for accreditation, or for licensing, or in submissions relating to such grants, accreditation, or licensing, or that otherwise are made or disseminated to students, to faculty, or to the general public.
- (9) I assure that, if the Applicant is a governmental entity, with respect to the award (if any) made by the Department based on the application--
 - a. it will comply with the requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4601-4655), which govern the treatment of persons displaced as a result of federal and federally-assisted programs; and
 - b. it will comply with requirements of 5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1508 and 7324-7328, which limit certain political activities of State or local government employees whose principal employment is in connection with an

(10) If the Applicant applies for and receives an award from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office), I assure that as required by 34 U.S.C. § 10382(c)(11), it will, to the extent practicable and consistent with applicable law—including, but not limited to, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act—seek, recruit, and hire qualified members of racial and ethnic minority groups and qualified women in order to further effective law enforcement by increasing their ranks within the sworn positions, as provided under 34 U.S.C. § 10382(c)(11).

(11) If the Applicant applies for and receives a DOJ award under the STOP School Violence Act program, I assure as required by 34 U.S.C. § 10552(a)(3), that it will maintain and report such data, records, and information (programmatic and financial) as DOJ may reasonably require.

I acknowledge that a materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement (or concealment or omission of a material fact) in this certification, or in the application that it supports, may be the subject of criminal prosecution (including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and/or 1621, and/or 34 U.S.C. §§ 10271-10273), and also may subject me and the Applicant to civil penalties and administrative remedies for false claims or otherwise (including under 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3730 and 3801-3812). I also acknowledge that the Department's awards, including certifications provided in connection with such awards, are subject to review by the Department, including by its Office of the Inspector General.

Please Acknowledge:

Signed

SignerID

fannie.yeung@sfgov.org

Signing Date / Time

6/25/25 7:04 PM

DOJ Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements; Law Enforcement and Community Policing

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS; COORDINATION WITH AFFECTED AGENCIES

Applicants should refer to the regulations and other requirements cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations or other cited requirements before completing this form. The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the U.S. Department of Justice ("Department") determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by 31 U.S.C. § 1352, as implemented by 28 C.F.R. Part 69, the Applicant certifies and assures (to the extent applicable) the following:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the Applicant, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, or the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If the Applicant's request for Federal funds is in excess of \$100,000, and any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the Applicant shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities" in accordance with its (and any DOJ awarding agency's) instructions; and

(c) The Applicant shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subgrants and procurement contracts (and their subcontracts) funded with Federal award funds and shall ensure that any certifications or lobbying disclosures required of recipients of such subgrants and procurement contracts (or their subcontractors) are made and filed in accordance with 31 U.S.C. § 1352.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS

A. Pursuant to Department regulations on nonprocurement debarment and suspension implemented at 2 C.F.R. Part 2867, and to other related requirements, the Applicant certifies, with respect to prospective participants in a primary tier "covered transaction," as defined at 2 C.F.R. § 2867.20(a), that neither it nor any of its principals--

(a) is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of Federal benefits by a State or Federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) has within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law, or been convicted or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, tribal, or local) transaction or private agreement or transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion or receiving stolen property, making false claims, or obstruction of justice, or commission of any offense indicating a lack of business integrity or business honesty that seriously and directly affects its (or its principals') present responsibilities;

(c) is presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, tribal, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (b) of this certification; and/or

(d) has within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, tribal, or local) terminated for cause or default.

B. Where the Applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, it shall attach an explanation to this application. Where the Applicant or any of its principals was convicted, within a three-year period preceding this application, of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law, the Applicant also must disclose such felony criminal conviction in writing to the Department (for OJP Applicants, to OJP at ojpcompliance@usdoj.gov; for OJV Applicants, to OJV at ovw.gfmd@usdoj.gov; or for COPS Applicants, to COPS at AskCOPS@usdoj.gov), unless such disclosure has already been made.

3. FEDERAL TAXES

A. If the Applicant is a corporation, it certifies either that (1) the corporation has no unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, or (2) the corporation has provided written notice of such an unpaid tax liability (or liabilities) to the Department (for OJP Applicants, to OJP at ojpcompliance@usdoj.gov; for OJV Applicants, to OJV at ovw.gfmd@usdoj.gov; or for COPS Applicants, to COPS at AskCOPS@usdoj.gov).

B. Where the Applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, it shall attach an explanation to this application.

4. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, as implemented at 28 C.F.R. Part 83, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 C.F.R. §§ 83.620 and 83.650:

A. The Applicant certifies and assures that it will, or will continue to, provide a drug-free workplace by--

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in its workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about--

- (1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
- (2) The Applicant's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
- (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
- (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the award be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the award, the employee will--

- (1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and
- (2) Notify the employer in writing of the employee's conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the Department, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title of any such convicted employee to the Department, as follows:

For COPS award recipients - COPS Office, 145 N Street, NE, Washington, DC, 20530;

For OJP and OJV award recipients - U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 999 North Capitol Street, NE Washington, DC 20531.

Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected award;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency; and

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

5. COORDINATION REQUIRED UNDER PUBLIC SAFETY AND COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAMS

As required by the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994, at 34 U.S.C. § 10382(c) (5), if this application is for a COPS award, the Applicant certifies that there has been appropriate coordination with all agencies that may be affected by its award. Affected agencies may include, among others, Offices of the United States Attorneys; State, local, or tribal prosecutors; or correctional agencies.

I acknowledge that a materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement (or concealment or omission of a material fact) in this certification, or in the application that it supports, may be the subject of criminal prosecution (including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and/or 1621, and/or 34 U.S.C. §§ 10271-10273), and also may subject me and the Applicant to civil penalties and administrative remedies for false claims or otherwise (including under 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3730 and 3801-3812). I also acknowledge that the Department's awards, including certifications provided in connection with such awards, are subject to review by the Department, including by its Office of the Inspector General.

Please Acknowledge *

Certified

Signed

fannie.yeung@sfgov.org

Signing Date / Time

8/25/25 7:05 PM

Other Disclosures and Assurances

No documents have been uploaded for Other Disclosures and Assurances

Declaration and Certification to the U.S. Department of Justice as to this Application Submission

By [taking this action], I –

1. Declare the following to the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), under penalty of perjury: (1) I have authority to make this declaration and certification on behalf of the applicant; (2) I have conducted or there was conducted (including by the applicant's legal counsel as appropriate, and made available to me) a diligent review of all requirements pertinent to and all matters encompassed by this declaration and certification.
2. Certify to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that the following are true as of the date of this application submission: (1) I have reviewed this application and all supporting materials submitted in connection therewith (including anything submitted in support of this application by any person on behalf of the applicant before or at the time of the application submission and any materials that accompany this declaration and certification); (2) The information in this application and in all supporting materials is accurate, true, and complete information as of the date of this request; and (3) I have the authority to submit this application on behalf of the applicant.
3. Declare the following to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant: (1) I understand that, in taking (or not taking) any action pursuant to this declaration and certification, DOJ will rely upon this declaration and certification as a material representation; and (2) I understand that any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent information or statement in this declaration and certification (or concealment or omission of a material fact as to either) may be the subject of criminal prosecution (including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and/or 1621, and/or 34 U.S.C. §§ 10271-10273), and also may subject me and the applicant to civil penalties and administrative remedies under the federal False Claims Act (including under 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3730 and/or §§ 3801-3812) or otherwise.

Please Acknowledge •

Signed

SignerID

fannie.yeung@sfgov.org

Signing Date / Time

6/25/25 7:06 PM

Other

No documents have been uploaded for Other

Certified



Department of Justice (DOJ)

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office)

Washington, D.C. 20531

Name and Address of Recipient:	CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 1245 3RD ST FL 6
City, State and Zip:	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94158
Recipient UEI:	SRZKDWN293M2
Project Title: FY25 COPS Hiring Program	Award Number: 15JCOPS-25-GG-00974-UHPX
Solicitation Title: FY25 COPS Hiring Program	
Federal Award Amount: \$6,250,000.00	Federal Award Date: 10/10/25
Awarding Agency:	Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
Award Type:	Initial
Funding Instrument Type:	Grant
Opportunity Category: D Assistance Listing: 16.068 - COPS Hiring Program	
Project Period Start Date: 10/1/25	Project Period End Date: 9/30/30
Budget Period Start Date: 10/1/25	Budget Period End Date: 9/30/30
Project Description: The FY25 COPS Hiring Program (CHP) provides funding to law enforcement agencies to hire and/or rehire additional career law enforcement officers in an effort to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts. Anticipated outcomes of CHP awards include engagement in planned community partnerships, implementation of projects to analyze and assess problems, implementation of changes to personnel and agency management in support of community policing, and increased capacity of agency to engage in community policing activities	

Award Letter

October 10, 2025

Dear Paul Yep,

On behalf of Attorney General Pamela Bondi, it is my pleasure to inform you the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) has approved the application submitted by CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO for an award under the funding opportunity entitled 2025 FY25 COPS Hiring Program. The approved award amount is \$6,250,000.

Review the Award Instrument below carefully and familiarize yourself with all conditions and requirements before accepting your award. The Award Instrument includes the Award Offer (Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions) and Award Acceptance. For COPS Office and OVW funding the Award Offer also includes any Other Award Documents.

Please note that award requirements include not only the conditions and limitations set forth in the Award Offer, but also compliance with assurances and certifications that relate to conduct during the period of performance for the award. These requirements encompass financial, administrative, and programmatic matters, as well as other important matters (e.g., specific restrictions on use of funds). Therefore, all key staff should receive the award conditions, the

assurances and certifications, and the application as approved by the COPS Office, so that they understand the award requirements. Information on all pertinent award requirements also must be provided to any subrecipient of the award.

Should you accept the award and then fail to comply with an award requirement, DOJ will pursue appropriate remedies for non-compliance, which may include termination of the award and/or a requirement to repay award funds.

Prior to accepting the award, your Entity Administrator must assign a Financial Manager, Grant Award Administrator, and Authorized Representative(s) in the Justice Grants System (JustGrants). The Entity Administrator will need to ensure the assigned Authorized Representative(s) is current and has the legal authority to accept awards and bind the entity to the award terms and conditions. To accept the award, the Authorized Representative(s) must accept all parts of the Award Offer in the Justice Grants System (JustGrants), including by executing the required declaration and certification, within 45 days from the award date.

To access your funds, you will need to enroll in the Automated Standard Application for Payments (ASAP) system, if you haven't already completed the enrollment process in ASAP. The Entity Administrator should have already received an email from ASAP to initiate this process.

Congratulations, and we look forward to working with you.

Cory D. Randolph
COPS Acting Director

Office for Civil Rights Notice for All Recipients

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) enforces federal civil rights laws and other provisions that prohibit discrimination by recipients of federal financial assistance from OJP, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW).

Several civil rights laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, require recipients of federal financial assistance (recipients) to give assurances that they will comply with those laws. Taken together, these and other civil rights laws prohibit recipients from discriminating in the provision of services and employment because of race, color, national origin, religion, disability, and sex or from discriminating in the provision of services on the bases of age.

Some recipients of DOJ financial assistance have additional obligations to comply with other applicable nondiscrimination provisions like the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of religion in addition to race, color, national origin, and sex. Recipients may also have related requirements regarding the development and implementation of equal employment opportunity programs.

OCR provides technical assistance, training, and other resources to help recipients comply with civil rights obligations. Further, OCR administratively enforces civil rights laws and nondiscrimination provisions by investigating DOJ recipients that are the subject of discrimination complaints. In addition, OCR conducts compliance reviews of DOJ recipients based on regulatory criteria. These investigations and compliance reviews permit OCR to evaluate whether DOJ recipients are providing services to the public and engaging in employment practices in a nondiscriminatory manner.

For more information about OCR, your civil rights and nondiscrimination responsibilities, how to notify your employees or beneficiaries of their civil rights protections and responsibilities and how to file a complaint, as well as technical assistance, training, and other resources, please visit www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights-office/outreach. If you would like OCR to assist you in fulfilling your civil rights or nondiscrimination responsibilities, please contact us at askOCR@ojp.usdoj.gov or www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights-office/about#ocr-contacts.

Award Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Recipient Information

Recipient Name
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

UEI
SRZKDWN293M2

ORI Number

Street 1
1245 3RD ST

Street 2
FL 6

City
SAN FRANCISCO

State/U.S. Territory
California

Zip/Postal Code
94158

Country
United States

County/Parish

Province

Award Details

Federal Award Date
10/10/25

Award Type
Initial

Award Number
15JCOPS-25-GG-00974-UHPX

Supplement Number
00

Federal Award Amount
\$6,250,000.00

Funding Instrument Type
Grant

Assistance Listing Number	Assistance Listings Program Title
16.068	COPS Hiring Program

Statutory Authority
The Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994, 34 U.S.C. § 10381 et seq

[X] I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.

Project Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Solicitation Title
2025 FY25 COPS Hiring Program

Awarding Agency
COPS

Application Number

GRANT14447390

Grant Manager Name

Tammy Richardson

Phone Number

202-598-6908

E-mail Address

tammy.richardson2@usdoj.gov

Project Title

FY25 COPS Hiring Program

Performance Period Start Date

10/01/2025

Performance Period End Date

09/30/2030

Budget Period Start Date

10/01/2025

Budget Period End Date

09/30/2030

Project Description

The FY25 COPS Hiring Program (CHP) provides funding to law enforcement agencies to hire and/or rehire additional career law enforcement officers in an effort to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts. Anticipated outcomes of CHP awards include engagement in planned community partnerships, implementation of projects to analyze and assess problems, implementation of changes to personnel and agency management in support of community policing, and increased capacity of agency to engage in community policing activities

[X] *I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.*

Financial Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

A financial analysis of budgeted costs has been completed. All costs listed in the approved budget below were programmatically approved based on the final proposed detailed budget and budget narratives submitted by your agency to the COPS Office. Any adjustments or edits to the proposed budget are explained below.

Budget Clearance Date: 9/15/25 1:42 PM

Comments

No items

Budget Summary

Budget Category	Proposed Budget	Change	Approved Budget	Percentages
Sworn Officer Positions:	\$24,314,077	\$23	\$24,314,100	
Civilian or Non-Sworn Personnel:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Travel:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Equipment:	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Supplies:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SubAwards:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Procurement Contracts:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Other Costs:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Direct Costs:	\$24,314,077	\$23	\$24,314,100	
Indirect Costs:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Project Costs:	\$24,314,077	\$23	\$24,314,100	
Federal Funds:	\$6,250,000	\$0	\$6,250,000	25.71%
Match Amount:	\$18,064,100	\$0	\$18,064,100	74.29%
Program Income:	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%

[X] *I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.*

Other Award Documents

Approved Problem Focus Area: Violent Crime: Cracking Down on the Open Use of Illegal Drugs

50 Full-Time Officers Funded

50 New Hires

0 Rehires Previously Laid Off

0 Rehires Scheduled for Lay Off

Veteran: 0

SRO's: 0

[X] *I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.*

Award Conditions

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Condition 1

Restrictions on Internal Confidentiality Agreements: No recipient or subrecipient under this award, or entity that receives a contract or subcontract with any funds under this award, may require any employee or contractor to sign an

internal confidentiality agreement or statement that prohibits or otherwise restricts the lawful reporting of waste, fraud, or abuse to an investigative or law enforcement representative of a federal department or agency authorized to receive such information. Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2025, Public Law 119-4; Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024, Public Law 118-47, Division B, Title VII, Section 742.

Condition 2

Compliance with 8 U.S.C. § 1373: Authority to obligate or expend contingent on compliance with this condition. State or local government entity recipients of this award, and any subrecipient of this award at any tier that is an entity of a State or of a unit of local government, must comply with 8 U.S.C. §1373, which provides that such entities may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, receiving from, maintaining, or exchanging information regarding citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual with components of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security or any other federal, state or local government entity. This includes any prohibitions or restrictions imposed or established by a State or local government entity or official.

Any obligations or expenditures of a recipient or subrecipient that are impermissible under this condition shall be unallowable costs for purposes of this award.

References to the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 8 U.S.C. 1373 are to be read, as a legal matter, as references to components of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Condition 3

Federal Civil Rights and Nondiscrimination Laws (certification): The recipient agrees that its compliance with all applicable Federal civil rights and nondiscrimination laws is material to the government's decision to make this award and any payment thereunder, including for purposes of the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. 3729-3730 and 3801-3812), and, by accepting this award, certifies that it does not operate any programs (including any such programs having components relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion) that violate any applicable Federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws.

Condition 4

Federal Laws, Presidential Memoranda, and Executive Orders: Recipients of grant funding must comply with all applicable federal laws and Presidential Memoranda and all Executive Orders by the President.

Condition 5

Award Monitoring Activities: Federal law requires that recipients receiving federal funding from the COPS Office must be monitored to ensure compliance with their award conditions and other applicable statutes and regulations. The COPS Office is also interested in tracking the progress of our programs and the advancement of community policing. Both aspects of award implementation—compliance and programmatic benefits—are part of the monitoring process coordinated by the U.S. Department of Justice. Award monitoring activities conducted by the COPS Office include site visits, enhanced office-based grant reviews, alleged noncompliance reviews, financial and programmatic reporting, and audit resolution. As a COPS Office award recipient, you agree to cooperate with and respond to any requests for information pertaining to your award. This includes all financial records, such as general accounting ledgers and all supporting documents. All information pertinent to the implementation of the award is subject to agency review throughout the life of the award, during the close-out process and for three-years after the submission of the final expenditure report. 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.334 and 200.337, and, as applicable, 34 U.S.C. § 10385(a).

Condition 6

Authorized Representative Responsibility: The recipient understands that, in accepting this award, the Authorized Representatives declare and certify, among other things, that they possess the requisite legal authority to accept the award on behalf of the recipient entity and, in so doing, accept (or adopt) all material requirements throughout the period of performance under this award. The recipient further understands, and agrees, that it will not assign anyone to the role of Authorized Representative during the period of performance under the award without first ensuring that the individual has the requisite legal authority.

Condition 7

Contract Provision: All contracts made by the award recipients under the federal award must contain the provisions required under 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Appendix II to Part 200—Contract Provisions for Non-Federal Entity Contracts Under

Federal Awards. Please see appendices in the Award Owner's Manual for a full text of the contract provisions.

Condition 8

Award Owner's Manual: The recipient agrees to comply with the terms and conditions in the applicable award year COPS Office Program Award Owner's Manual; DOJ Grants Financial Guide; COPS Office statute (34 U.S.C. § 10381, et seq.) as applicable; Students, Teachers, and Officers Preventing (STOP) School Violence Act of 2018 (34 U.S.C. § 10551, et seq.) as applicable; the requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 200 (Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards), including subsequent changes, as adopted by the U.S. Department of Justice in 2 C.F.R. § 2800.101; 48 C.F.R. Part 31 (FAR Part 31) as applicable (Contract Cost Principles and Procedures); the Cooperative Agreement as applicable; representations made in the application; and all other applicable program requirements, laws, orders, regulations, or circulars.

Failure to comply with one or more award requirements may result in remedial action including, but not limited to, withholding award funds, disallowing costs, suspending, or terminating the award, or other legal action as appropriate.

Should any provision of a condition of this award be held to be invalid or unenforceable by its terms, then that provision shall first be applied with a limited construction so as to give it the maximum effect permitted by law (to any person or circumstance) under this award. Should it be held, instead, that a condition (or a provision thereof) is of utter invalidity or unenforceability, such condition (or such provision) shall be deemed severable from this award.

Condition 9

Federal Civil Rights: The recipient and any subrecipient must comply with applicable federal civil rights and nondiscrimination statutes and regulations including: Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d), as implemented in Subparts C and D of 28 C.F.R. Part 42; section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794), as implemented in Subpart G of 28 C.F.R. Part 42; section 901 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. § 1681), as implemented in Subpart D of 28 C.F.R. Parts 42 and 54; section 303 of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. § 6102), as implemented in Subpart I of 28 C.F.R. Part 42; and section 809(c) of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. § 10228(c)), as implemented in Subpart D of 28 C.F.R. Part 42. In addition to applicable federal statutes and regulations that pertain to civil rights and nondiscrimination, the recipient and any subrecipient must comply with the requirements in 28 C.F.R. Parts 22 (Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information); 28 C.F.R. Part 23 (Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies); 28 C.F.R. Part 38 (Partnerships with Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations); and 28 C.F.R. Part 46 (Protection of Human Subjects). For an overview of the civil rights laws and nondiscrimination requirements in connection with your award, please see <https://www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights/overview>.

Condition 10

Duplicative Funding: The recipient understands and agrees to notify the COPS Office if it receives, from any other source, funding for the same item or service also funded under this award.

Condition 11

Prohibited conduct by recipients and subrecipients related to trafficking in persons (including reporting requirements and COPS Office authority to terminate award): The recipient and subrecipient agree to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 175, Appendix A to Part 175 – Award Term:

I. Trafficking in Persons

- (a) Provisions applicable to a recipient that is a private entity. (1) Under this award, the recipient, its employees, subrecipients under this award, and subrecipient's employees must not engage in:
- (i) Severe forms of trafficking in persons;
 - (ii) The procurement of a commercial sex act during the period of time that this award or any subaward is in effect;
 - (iii) The use of forced labor in the performance of this award or any subaward; or
 - (iv) Acts that directly support or advance trafficking in persons, including the following acts:
 - (A) Destroying, concealing, removing, confiscating, or otherwise denying an employee access to that employee's identity or immigration documents;
 - (B) Failing to provide return transportation or pay for return transportation costs to an employee from a country outside the United States to the country from which the employee was recruited upon the end of employment if requested by the employee, unless:

(1) Exempted from the requirement to provide or pay for such return transportation by the Federal department or agency providing or entering into the grant or cooperative agreement; or

(2) The employee is a victim of human trafficking seeking victim services or legal redress in the country of employment or a witness in a human trafficking enforcement action;

(C) Soliciting a person for the purpose of employment, or offering employment, by means of materially false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises regarding that employment;

(D) Charging recruited employees a placement or recruitment fee; or

(E) Providing or arranging housing that fails to meet the host country's housing and safety standards.

(2) The Federal agency may unilaterally terminate this award or take any remedial actions authorized by 22 U.S.C. 7104b(c), without penalty, if any private entity under this award:

(i) Is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix; or

(ii) Has an employee that is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix through conduct that is either:

(A) Associated with the performance under this award; or

(B) Imputed to the recipient or the subrecipient using the standards and due process for imputing the conduct of an individual to an organization that are provided in 2 CFR part 180, "OMB Guidelines to Agencies on Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement)," as implemented by DOJ at 2 C.F.R. Part 2867.

(b) Provision applicable to a recipient other than a private entity. (1) The Federal agency may unilaterally terminate this award or take any remedial actions authorized by 22 U.S.C. 7104b(c), without penalty, if a subrecipient that is a private entity under this award:

(i) Is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix; or

(ii) Has an employee that is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix through conduct that is either:

(A) Associated with the performance under this award; or

(B) Imputed to the subrecipient using the standards and due process for imputing the conduct of an individual to an organization that are provided in 2 CFR part 180, "OMB Guidelines to Agencies on Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement)," as implemented by 2 C.F.R. Part 2867.

(c) Provisions applicable to any recipient.

(1) The recipient must inform the Federal agency and the Inspector General of the Federal agency immediately of any information you receive from any source alleging a violation of a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix.

(2) The Federal agency's right to unilaterally terminate this award as described in paragraphs (a)(2) or (b)(1) of this appendix:

(i) Implements the requirements of 22 U.S.C. 78, and

(ii) Is in addition to all other remedies for noncompliance that are available to the Federal agency under this award.

(3) The recipient must include the requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of this award term in any subaward it makes to a private entity.

(4) If applicable, the recipient must also comply with the compliance plan and certification requirements in 2 CFR 175.105(b).

(d) Definitions. For purposes of this award term:

Employee means either:

(1) An individual employed by the recipient or a subrecipient who is engaged in the performance of the project or program under this award; or

(2) Another person engaged in the performance of the project or program under this award and not compensated by the recipient including, but not limited to, a volunteer or individual whose services are contributed by a third party as an in-kind contribution toward cost sharing requirements.

Private Entity means any entity, including for-profit organizations, nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, and hospitals. The term does not include foreign public entities, Indian Tribes, local governments, or states as defined in 2 CFR 200.1.

The terms "severe forms of trafficking in persons," "commercial sex act," "sex trafficking," "Abuse or threatened abuse of law or legal process," "coercion," "debt bondage," and "involuntary servitude" have the meanings given at section 103 of the TVPA, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7102).

Condition 12

Termination: Recipient understands and agrees that the COPS Office may terminate funding, in whole or in part, for the following reasons:

- (1) When the recipient fails to comply with the terms and conditions of a Federal award.
 - (2) When the recipient agrees to the termination and termination conditions.
 - (3) When the recipient provides the COPS Office written notification requesting termination including the reasons, effective date, and the portion of the award to be terminated. The COPS Office may terminate the entire award if the remaining portion will not accomplish the purposes of the award.
 - (4) Pursuant to any other award terms and conditions, including, when an award no longer effectuates the program goals or agency priorities to the extent such termination is authorized by law.
2. C.F.R. § 200.340.

Condition 13

Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters: For awards over \$500,000, the recipient agrees to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Appendix XII to Part 200 – Award Term and Condition for Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters:

I. Reporting of Matters Related to Recipient Integrity and Performance

(a) General Reporting Requirement.

(1) If the total value of your active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from all Federal agencies exceeds \$10,000,000 for any period of time during the period of performance of this Federal award, then you as the recipient must ensure the information available in the responsibility/qualification records through the System for Award Management (SAM.gov), about civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings described in paragraph (b) of this award term is current and complete. This is a statutory requirement under section 872 of Public Law 110–417, as amended (41 U.S.C. 2313). As required by section 3010 of Public Law 111–212, all information posted in responsibility/qualification records in SAM.gov on or after April 15, 2011 (except past performance reviews required for Federal procurement contracts) will be publicly available.

(b) Proceedings About Which You Must Report.

(1) You must submit the required information about each proceeding that—

(i) Is in connection with the award or performance of a grant, cooperative agreement, or procurement contract from the Federal Government;

(ii) Reached its final disposition during the most recent five-year period; and

(iii) Is one of the following—

(A) A criminal proceeding that resulted in a conviction;

(B) A civil proceeding that resulted in a finding of fault and liability and payment of a monetary fine, penalty, reimbursement, restitution, or damages of \$5,000 or more;

(C) An administrative proceeding that resulted in a finding of fault and liability and your payment of either a monetary fine or penalty of \$5,000 or more or reimbursement, restitution, or damages in excess of \$100,000; or

(D) Any other criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding if—

(1) It could have led to an outcome described in paragraph (b)(1)(iii)(A) through (C);

(2) It had a different disposition arrived at by consent or compromise with an acknowledgment of fault on your part; and

(3) The requirement in this award term to disclose information about the proceeding does not conflict with applicable laws and regulations.

(c) **Reporting Procedures.** Enter the required information in SAM.gov for each proceeding described in paragraph (b) of this award term. You do not need to submit the information a second time under grants and cooperative agreements that you received if you already provided the information in SAM.gov because you were required to do so under Federal procurement contracts that you were awarded.

(d) **Reporting Frequency.** During any period of time when you are subject to the requirement in paragraph (a) of this award term, you must report proceedings information in SAM.gov for the most recent five-year period, either to report new information about a proceeding that you have not reported previously or affirm that there is no new information to report. If you have Federal contract, grant, and cooperative agreement awards with a cumulative total value greater than \$10,000,000, you must disclose semiannually any information about the criminal, civil, and administrative proceedings.

(e) Definitions. For purposes of this award term—

Administrative proceeding means a nonjudicial process that is adjudicatory in nature to make a determination of fault or liability (for example, Securities and Exchange Commission Administrative proceedings, Civilian Board of Contract Appeals proceedings, and Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals proceedings). This includes proceedings at the Federal and State level but only in connection with the performance of a Federal contract or grant. It does not include audits, site visits, corrective plans, or inspection of deliverables.

Conviction means a judgment or conviction of a criminal offense by any court of competent jurisdiction, whether entered upon a verdict or a plea, and includes a conviction entered upon a plea of nolo contendere. Total value of currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts includes the value of the Federal share already received plus any anticipated Federal share under those awards (such as continuation funding).

Condition 14

Reporting Subawards and Executive Compensation: The recipient agrees to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 170, Appendix A to Part 170 – Award Term:

I. Reporting Subawards and Executive Compensation

(a) Reporting of first-tier subawards—(1) Applicability. Unless the recipient is exempt as provided in paragraph (d) of this award term, the recipient must report each subaward that equals or exceeds \$30,000 in Federal funds for a subaward to an entity or Federal agency. The recipient must also report a subaward if a modification increases the Federal funding to an amount that equals or exceeds \$30,000. All reported subawards should reflect the total amount of the subaward.

(2) Reporting Requirements. (i) The entity or Federal agency must report each subaward described in paragraph (a)(1) of this award term to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) at <http://www.fsrs.gov>.

(ii) For subaward information, report no later than the end of the month following the month in which the subaward was issued. (For example, if the subaward was made on November 7, 2025, the subaward must be reported by no later than December 31, 2025).

(b) Reporting total compensation of recipient executives for entities—(1) Applicability. The recipient must report the total compensation for each of the recipient's five most highly compensated executives for the preceding completed fiscal year if:

(i) The total Federal funding authorized to date under this Federal award equals or exceeds \$30,000;

(ii) in the preceding fiscal year, the recipient received:

(A) 80 percent or more of the recipient's annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts) and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and

(B) \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts) and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and,

(iii) The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after receiving this subaward. (To determine if the public has access to the compensation information, see the U.S. Security and Exchange Commission total compensation filings at <http://www.sec.gov/answers/execomp.htm>.)

(2) Reporting Requirements. The recipient must report executive total compensation described in paragraph (b)(1) of this appendix:

(i) As part of the recipient's registration profile at <https://www.sam.gov>.

(ii) No later than the month following the month in which this Federal award is made, and annually after that. (For example, if this Federal award was made on November 7, 2025, the executive total compensation must be reported by no later than December 31, 2025.)

(c) Reporting of total compensation of subrecipient executives—(1) Applicability. Unless a first-tier subrecipient is exempt as provided in paragraph (d) of this appendix, the recipient must report the executive total compensation of each of the subrecipient's five most highly compensated executives for the subrecipient's preceding completed fiscal year, if:

(i) The total Federal funding authorized to date under the subaward equals or exceeds \$30,000;

(ii) In the subrecipient's preceding fiscal year, the subrecipient received:

(A) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts

(and subcontracts) and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and,

(B) \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts), and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and

(iii) The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after receiving this subaward. (To determine if the public has access to the compensation information, see

the U.S. Security and Exchange Commission total compensation filings at <http://www.sec.gov/answers/execomp.htm>.)

(2) Reporting Requirements. Subrecipients must report to the recipient their executive total compensation described in paragraph

(c)(1) of this appendix. The recipient is required to submit this information to the

Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) at <http://www.fsrs.gov> no

later than the end of the month following the month in which the subaward was made. (For example, if the subaward was made on November 7, 2025, the subaward must be reported by no later than December 31, 2025).

(d) Exemptions. (1) A recipient with gross income under \$300,000 in the previous tax year is exempt from the requirements to report:

(i) Subawards, and

(ii) The total compensation of the five most highly compensated executives of any subrecipient.

(e) Definitions. For purposes of this award term:

Entity includes:

(1) Whether for profit or nonprofit:

(i) A corporation;

(ii) An association;

(iii) A partnership;

(iv) A limited liability company;

(v) A limited liability partnership;

(vi) A sole proprietorship;

(vii) Any other legal business entity;

(viii) Another grantee or contractor that is not excluded by subparagraph (2); and

(ix) Any State or locality;

(2) Does not include:

(i) An individual recipient of Federal financial assistance; or

(ii) A Federal employee.

Executive means an officer, managing partner, or any other employee holding a management position.

Subaward has the meaning given in 2 CFR200.1.

Subrecipient has the meaning given in 2CFR 200.1.

Total Compensation means the cash and noncash dollar value an executive earns during an entity's preceding fiscal year. This includes all items of compensation as prescribed in 17 CFR 229.402(c)(2).

Condition 15

Assurances and Certifications: The recipient acknowledges its agreement to comply with the Assurances and Certifications forms that were signed as part of its application.

Condition 16

Conflict of Interest: Recipients and subrecipients must disclose in writing to the COPS Office or pass-through entity, as applicable, any potential conflict of interest affecting the awarded federal funding in 2 C.F.R. § 200.112.

Condition 17

Debarment and Suspension: The recipient agrees not to award federal funds under this program to any party which is debarred or suspended from participation in federal assistance programs. 2 C.F.R. Part 180 (Government-wide Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension) and 2 C.F.R. Part 2867 (DOJ Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension).

Condition 18

Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (EEOP): Please see the Office for Civil Rights website <https://www.ojp.gov/eeop>-notice for current information on the recipient's responsibilities related to the federal regulations pertaining to the development and implementation of an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan.

Condition 19

Employment Eligibility: The recipient agrees to complete and keep on file, as appropriate, the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Employment Eligibility Verification Form (I-9). This form is to be used by recipients of federal funds to verify that persons are eligible to work in the United States. Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), Public Law 99-603.

Condition 20

Enhancement of Contractor Protection from Reprisal for Disclosure of Certain Information: Recipients and subrecipients agree not to discharge, demote, or otherwise discriminate against an employee as reprisal for the employee disclosing information that he or she reasonably believes is evidence of gross mismanagement of a federal

contract or award, a gross waste of federal funds, an abuse of authority relating to a federal contract or award, a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, or a violation of law, rule, or regulation related to a Federal contract (including the competition for or negotiation of a contract) or award. Recipients and subrecipients also agree to provide to their employees in writing (in the predominant native language of the workforce) of the rights and remedies provided in 41 U.S.C. § 4712. Please see appendices in the Award Owner's Manual for a full text of the statute.

Condition 21

False Statements: False statements or claims made in connection with COPS Office awards may result in fines, imprisonment, debarment from participating in federal awards or contracts, and/or any other remedy available by law. 31 U.S.C. § 3729-3733.

Condition 22

Mandatory Disclosure: Recipients and subrecipients must timely disclose in writing to the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity, as applicable, all federal criminal law violations involving fraud, bribery, or gratuity that may potentially affect the awarded federal funding. Recipients that receive an award over \$500,000 must also report certain civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings in SAM and are required to comply with the Term and Condition for Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters as set out in 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Appendix XII to Part 200. Failure to make required disclosures can result in any of the remedies, including suspension and debarment, described in 2 C.F.R. § 200.339. 2 C.F.R. § 200.113.

Condition 23

Reports/Performance Goals: To assist the COPS Office in monitoring and tracking the performance of your award, your agency will be responsible for submitting semi-annual programmatic performance reports that describe project activities during the reporting period and quarterly Federal Financial Reports using Standard Form 425 (SF-425). 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.328 - 200.329. The performance report is used to track your agency's progress in implementing the award, and, as applicable, community policing strategies including gauging the effectiveness of your agency's community policing capacity. The Federal Financial Report is used to track the expenditures of the recipient's award funds on a cumulative basis throughout the life of the award.

Condition 24

System for Award Management (SAM.gov) and Universal Identifier Requirements: The recipient agrees to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 25, Appendix A to Part 25 – Award Term:

I. System for Award Management (SAM.gov) and Universal Identifier Requirements

(a) **Requirement for System for Award Management.** (1) Unless exempt from this requirement under 2 CFR 25.110, the recipient must maintain a current and active registration in SAM.gov. The recipient's registration must always be current and active until the recipient submits all final reports required under this Federal award or receives the final payment, whichever is later. The recipient must review and update its information in SAM.gov at least annually from the date of its initial registration or any subsequent updates to ensure it is current, accurate, and complete. If applicable, this includes identifying the recipient's immediate and highest-level owner and subsidiaries and providing information about the recipient's predecessors that have received a Federal award or contract within the last three years.

(b) **Requirement for Unique Entity Identifier (UEI).** (1) If the recipient is authorized to make subawards under this Federal award, the recipient:

(i) Must notify potential subrecipients that no entity may receive a subaward until the entity has provided its UEI to the recipient.

(ii) Must not make a subaward to an entity unless the entity has provided its UEI to the recipient. Subrecipients are not required to complete full registration in SAM.gov to obtain a UEI.

(c) **Definitions.** For the purposes of this award term:

System for Award Management (SAM.gov) means the Federal repository into which a recipient must provide the information required for the conduct of business as a recipient. Additional information about registration procedures may be found in SAM.gov (currently at <https://www.sam.gov>).

Unique entity identifier means the universal identifier assigned by SAM.gov to uniquely identify an entity.

Entity is defined at 2 CFR 25.400 and includes all of the following types as defined in 2 CFR 200.1:

- (1) Non-Federal entity;
- (2) Foreign organization;
- (3) Foreign public entity;

- (4) Domestic for-profit organization; and
(5) Federal agency.
Subaward has the meaning given in 2 CFR 200.1.
Subrecipient has the meaning given in 2 CFR 200.1.

Condition 25

Additional High-Risk Recipient Requirements: The recipient agrees to comply with any additional requirements that may be imposed during the award performance period if the awarding agency determines that the recipient is a high-risk recipient. 2 C.F.R. § 200.208.

Condition 26

Evaluations: The COPS Office may conduct monitoring or sponsor national evaluations of its award programs. The recipient agrees to cooperate with the monitors and evaluators. 34 U.S.C. § 10385(b).

Condition 27

Background Investigations: Recipients agree to ensure that each officer(s) hired with CHP funding will be subject to a background investigation, notify the COPS Office upon completion of the background investigation for each officer hired under the CHP award, and cooperate with the COPS Office and provide updates on the status of background investigations upon request. 2 C.F.R. § 200.208

If the COPS Office determines that CHP funds are being used to pay the salary and fringe benefits of an officer who has not undergone a background investigation, the COPS Office may temporarily suspend grant funds in accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.339 until the agency can demonstrate the background investigation has been completed.

Condition 28

Retention: At the time of award application, your agency committed to retaining all sworn officer positions awarded under the CHP award with state and/or local funds for a minimum of 12 months following the conclusion of 36 months of federal funding for each position, over and above the number of locally-funded sworn officer positions that would have existed in the absence of the award. Your agency cannot satisfy the retention requirement by using CHP-funded positions to fill locally-funded vacancies resulting from attrition. 34 U.S.C. § 10382 (c)(8).

Condition 29

Allowable Costs Condition: The funding under this project is for the payment of three years (36 months) of approved full-time entry-level salaries and fringe benefits during the five-year (60 months) period of performance. The maximum federal share is \$125,000 per officer position (unless a local match waiver is approved) for career law enforcement officer positions hired and/or rehired on or after the official award start date. Any salary and fringe benefit costs higher than entry-level that your agency pays a CHP-funded officer must be paid with local funds. Your agency is required to use CHP award funds for the specific hiring categories awarded. In accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.400(g), the recipient or subrecipient must not earn or keep any profit resulting from the award. Funding under this program may be used for the following categories:

- Hiring new officers, which includes filling existing officer vacancies that are no longer funded in your agency's budget;
- Rehiring officers laid off by any jurisdiction as a result of state, local, or Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) budget reductions; and/or
- Rehiring officers who were, at the time of award application, scheduled to be laid off (by your jurisdiction) on a specific future date as a result of state, local, or BIA budget reductions.

If your agency's local fiscal conditions have changed and your agency needs to change one or more of the funded hiring categories, your agency should request an award modification and receive prior approval before spending CHP funding under the new category. The approved budget in the award package specifies the amount of CHP funds awarded to your agency. Please note that the salary and fringe benefit costs requested in your CHP application may have been adjusted or removed. Your agency may only be reimbursed for the approved cost categories up to the amounts specified in the approved budget. Only actual allowable costs incurred during the award period will be eligible for reimbursement and drawdown. If your agency experiences any cost savings over the course of the award (for example, your award application overestimated the total entry-level officer salary and fringe benefits package), your agency may not use that excess funding to continue salary payments to the officers beyond 36 months. Any funds remaining after your agency has drawn down for the costs of approved salaries and fringe benefits incurred for each awarded position during the 36-month funding period will be deobligated during the closeout process and should not be spent by your agency.

Condition 30

Advancing Department of Justice Priority Problem Focus Areas: This condition applies to agencies that selected one of the following priority crime problem/focus areas to address in their COPS Hiring Program (CHP) application:

- Violent Crime
- Squatting and Encampment Enforcement
- Homeland and Border Security
- Nuisance and Abatement and Quality of Life
- School Based Policing

Your agency understands and agrees to the following: Your agency will implement the one specific community policing plan identified in your CHP award application?

Your agency will address its specific priority crime problem throughout the entire CHP award period?

Your agency will implement any organizational changes identified in its CHP award application;

Your agency will cooperate with any award monitoring by the COPS Office to ensure that it is initiating or enhancing its community policing efforts to address its priority crime problem, which may include your agency having to respond to additional or modified reporting requirements.

Condition 31

Supplementing, not Supplanting: State, local, and tribal government recipients must use award funds to supplement, and not supplant, state, local, or Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) funds that are already committed or otherwise would have been committed for award purposes (hiring, training, purchases, and/or activities) during the award period. In other words, state, local, and tribal government recipients may not use COPS Office funds to supplant (replace) state, local, or BIA funds that would have been dedicated to the COPS Office-funded item(s) in the absence of the COPS Office award. 34 U.S.C. § 10384(a).

Condition 32

Career Law Enforcement Officer: Officer hiring funds may only be used to pay entry-level salaries and fringe benefits for full-time "career law enforcement officers" for 36 months. The COPS Office's statute defines a "career law enforcement officer" as "a person hired on a permanent basis who is authorized by law or by a State or local public agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of violations of criminal laws." 34 U.S.C. §10389(1). A recipient agency may use officer hiring funds to pay the salary and benefits of recruits while in academy training to become "career law enforcement officers" if it is the standard practice of the agency to do so with locally-funded recruits. The State of Alaska, and any Indian tribe or tribal organization in that State, may also use officer hiring funds for a "village public safety officer" defined as "an individual employed as a village public safety officer under the program established by the State pursuant to Alaska Statute 18.65.670." Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010, Pub. L. 111-211, title II, § 247 (a)(2).

Condition 33

Local Match: COPS Hiring Program award recipients are required to contribute a local match of at least 25 percent towards the total cost of the approved award project, unless waived in writing by the COPS Office. The local match must be a cash match from funds not previously budgeted for law enforcement purposes and must be paid during the award period. The local match contribution must be made on an increasing basis during each year of the three-year award period, with the federal share decreasing accordingly. 34 U.S.C. § 10381(g).

Condition 34

Modifications: Occasionally, a change in an agency's fiscal or law enforcement situation necessitates a change in its COPS Office CHP award. Award modifications under CHP are evaluated on a case-by-case basis in accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.308(i). For federal awards in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold (currently \$250,000), any modification request involving the reallocation of funding between budget categories that exceed or are expected to exceed 10 percent (10%) of the total approved budget requires prior written approval by the COPS Office. Regardless of the federal award amount or budget modification percentage, any reallocation of funding is limited to approved budget categories. In addition, any budget modification that changes the scope of the project requires prior written approval by the COPS Office. In addition, please be aware that the COPS Office will not approve any modification request that results in an increase of federal funds.

In addition, modification requests should be submitted to the COPS Office when an agency determines that it will need

to shift officer positions awarded in one hiring category into a different hiring category and/or reduce the total number of positions awarded. For example, if an agency was awarded CHP funding for two new, additional sworn officer positions, but due to fiscal distress/constraints the agency needs to change the hiring category from the new hire category to the rehire category for officers laid off or scheduled for layoff on a specific future date post-application, the agency would have to request a modification. The COPS Office will only consider a modification request after an agency makes final, approved budget and/or personnel decisions. An agency may implement the modified award following written approval from the COPS Office. Please be aware that the COPS Office will not approve any modification request that results in an increase of federal funds.

During the CHP award period, it may become necessary for an agency to modify its CHP award due to changes in an agency's fiscal or law enforcement situation. Modification requests should be submitted to the COPS Office when an agency determines that it will need to shift officer positions awarded in one hiring category into a different hiring category, reduce the total number of positions awarded, shift funds among benefit categories, and/or reduce the entry-level salary and fringe benefit amounts. For example, an agency may have been awarded CHP funding for 10 new, additional full-time sworn officer positions, but due to severe fiscal distress/constraints, the agency determines it is unable to sustain all 10 positions and must reduce its request to five full-time positions; or an agency may have been awarded CHP funding for two new, additional sworn officer positions, but due to fiscal distress/constraints the agency needs to change the hiring category from the new hire category to the rehire category for officers laid off or scheduled for layoff on a specific future date post-application. Award modifications under CHP are evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The COPS Office will only consider a modification request after an agency makes final, approved budget and/or personnel decisions. An agency may implement the modified award following written approval from the COPS Office. Please be aware that the COPS Office will not approve any modification request that results in an increase of federal funds.

Condition 35

School Resource Officer (SRO) Training Requirement: COPS Office-funded SROs are required to complete a 40-hour basic SRO training course from a list of COPS Office-approved providers. Training must be completed no later than nine months after the date shown on the award congratulatory letter or six months from the date of the SRO's hire, whichever comes first. If a COPS Office-funded SRO leaves the recipient agency after completing the training, the recipient agrees to pay for the new SRO, who is assigned to backfill this position, to attend a 40-hour basic training course. The new SRO must complete the training no later than nine months after being placed in the school. If the officer has completed 40-hour basic training within the last 12 months prior to the award date, the condition has been fulfilled. Any longer than 12 months will require the officer to retake the course. The agency must coordinate with the training provider to secure funding to cover registration and travel expenses.

If your agency fails to comply with the SRO basic training within the specified timeframe, the COPS Office may temporarily suspend grant funds or take other remedial actions in accordance with 2 C.F.R. §200.339 until your agency complies with this requirement.

Condition 36

Extensions: Your agency may request an extension of the 60-month award performance period to receive additional time to implement your award program. Such extensions do not provide additional funding. Any request for an extension will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Only those recipients that can provide a reasonable justification for delays will be granted no-cost extensions. Reasonable justifications may include difficulties in filling COPS Office-funded positions, officer turnover, or other circumstances that interrupt the 36-month funding period. An extension allows your agency to compensate for such delays by providing additional time to complete the full 36 months of funding for each position awarded. 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.308(f)(10) and 200.309. Extension requests must be received prior to the end date of the award.

Condition 37

Contracts and/or MOUs with other Jurisdictions: Sworn law enforcement officer positions awarded must be used for law enforcement activities or services that benefit your agency and the population that it serves. The items funded under the CHP award cannot be utilized by other agencies unless the items benefit the population that your agency serves. Your agency may use items funded under the CHP award to assist other law enforcement agencies under a resource sharing, mutual aid, or other agreement to address multi-jurisdictional issues as described in the agreement.

Condition 38

Community Policing: Community policing activities to be initiated or enhanced by your agency and the officers funded by this award program were identified and described in your CHP award application. Your agency developed a

community policing plan for the CHP award with specific reference to a crime or disorder problem and the following elements of community policing: (a) problem solving—your agency's plan to assess and respond to the problem identified; (b) community partnerships and support, including related governmental and community initiatives that complement your agency's proposed use of CHP funding; and (c) organizational transformation—how your agency will use the funds to reorient its mission to community policing or enhance its involvement in and commitment to community policing. Throughout the CHP award period, your agency is required to implement the community policing plan it set forth in the CHP award application.

The COPS Office defines community policing as a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime. CHP awards through the specific officers funded (or an equal number of redeployed veteran officers) must be used to initiate or enhance community policing activities. All newly hired additional or rehired officers (or an equal number of redeployed veteran officers) funded under CHP must implement your agency's approved community policing plan, which you described in your award application.

Condition 39

Memorandum of Understanding Requirement (for School Resource Officers only)

Recipients using award funding to hire and/or deploy School Resource Officers into schools understand and agree to the following:

- Your agency must submit a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the law enforcement agency and the school partner(s) to the COPS Office before obligating or drawing down funds under this award. The MOU must be submitted to the COPS Office within 90 days of the date shown on the award letter. If your agency fails to submit the MOU within the 90 days, the COPS Office may temporarily suspend grant funds in accordance with 2 C.F.R. §200.339 until your agency submits the MOU.
- Your agency's MOU must contain the following information?

- o The purpose of the MOU

- o Clearly defined roles and responsibilities of the school district and the law enforcement agency, focusing officers' roles on safety

- o Information sharing

- o Supervision responsibility and chain of command for the SRO

- o Signatures

Note: Please refer to the MOU Fact Sheet for a detailed explanation of the requirements under each of the bullets.

☒ *I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.*

Award Acceptance

Declaration and Certification to the U.S. Department of Justice as to Acceptance

By checking the declaration and certification box below, I--

A. Declare to the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), under penalty of perjury, that I have authority to make this declaration and certification on behalf of the applicant.

B. Certify to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that the following are true as of the date of this award acceptance: (1) I have conducted or there was conducted (including by applicant's legal counsel as appropriate and made available to me) a diligent review of all terms and conditions of, and all supporting materials submitted in connection with, this award, including any assurances and certifications (including anything submitted in connection therewith by a person on behalf of the applicant before, after, or at the time of the application submission and any materials that accompany this acceptance and certification); and (2) I have the legal authority to accept this award on behalf of the applicant.

C. Accept this award on behalf of the applicant.

D. Declare the following to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant: (1) I understand

that, in taking (or not taking) any action pursuant to this declaration and certification, DOJ will rely upon this declaration and certification as a material representation; and (2) I understand that any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent information or statement in this declaration and certification (or concealment or omission of a material fact as to either) may be the subject of criminal prosecution (including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and/or 1621, and/or 34 U.S.C. §§ 10271-10273), and also may subject me and the applicant to civil penalties and administrative remedies under the federal False Claims Act (including under 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3730 and/or §§ 3801-3812) or otherwise.

Agency Approval

Title of Approving Official	COPS Acting Director
Name of Approving Official	Cory D. Randolph
Signed Date And Time	9/29/25 1:32 AM

Authorized Representative

☒ Declaration and Certification (Law Enforcement Executive/Program Official)

Entity Acceptance

Title of Authorized Entity Official
Chief of Police

Name of Authorized Entity Official

Derrick Lew

Signed Date And Time

1/23/2026 3:23 PM

☒ Declaration and Certification (Government Executive/Financial Official)

Entity Acceptance

Title of Authorized Entity Official
Chief Financial Officer

Name of Authorized Entity Official

Kimie Wu

Signed Date And Time

1/23/2026 3:27 PM



Department of Justice (DOJ)

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office)

Washington, D.C. 20531

Name and Address of Recipient:	CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 1245 3RD ST FL 6
City, State and Zip:	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94158
Recipient UEI:	SRZKDWN293M2
Project Title: FY25 COPS Hiring Program	Award Number: 15JCOPS-25-GG-00974-UHPX
Solicitation Title: FY25 COPS Hiring Program	
Federal Award Amount: \$6,250,000.00	Federal Award Date: 10/10/25
Awarding Agency:	Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
Award Type:	Initial
Funding Instrument Type:	Grant
Opportunity Category: D Assistance Listing: 16.068 - COPS Hiring Program	
Project Period Start Date: 10/1/25	Project Period End Date: 9/30/30
Budget Period Start Date: 10/1/25	Budget Period End Date: 9/30/30
Project Description: The FY25 COPS Hiring Program (CHP) provides funding to law enforcement agencies to hire and/or rehire additional career law enforcement officers in an effort to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts. Anticipated outcomes of CHP awards include engagement in planned community partnerships, implementation of projects to analyze and assess problems, implementation of changes to personnel and agency management in support of community policing, and increased capacity of agency to engage in community policing activities	

Award Letter

October 10, 2025

Dear Paul Yep,

On behalf of Attorney General Pamela Bondi, it is my pleasure to inform you the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) has approved the application submitted by CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO for an award under the funding opportunity entitled 2025 FY25 COPS Hiring Program. The approved award amount is \$6,250,000.

Review the Award Instrument below carefully and familiarize yourself with all conditions and requirements before accepting your award. The Award Instrument includes the Award Offer (Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions) and Award Acceptance. For COPS Office and OVW funding the Award Offer also includes any Other Award Documents.

Please note that award requirements include not only the conditions and limitations set forth in the Award Offer, but also compliance with assurances and certifications that relate to conduct during the period of performance for the award. These requirements encompass financial, administrative, and programmatic matters, as well as other important matters (e.g., specific restrictions on use of funds). Therefore, all key staff should receive the award conditions, the

assurances and certifications, and the application as approved by the COPS Office, so that they understand the award requirements. Information on all pertinent award requirements also must be provided to any subrecipient of the award.

Should you accept the award and then fail to comply with an award requirement, DOJ will pursue appropriate remedies for non-compliance, which may include termination of the award and/or a requirement to repay award funds.

Prior to accepting the award, your Entity Administrator must assign a Financial Manager, Grant Award Administrator, and Authorized Representative(s) in the Justice Grants System (JustGrants). The Entity Administrator will need to ensure the assigned Authorized Representative(s) is current and has the legal authority to accept awards and bind the entity to the award terms and conditions. To accept the award, the Authorized Representative(s) must accept all parts of the Award Offer in the Justice Grants System (JustGrants), including by executing the required declaration and certification, within 45 days from the award date.

To access your funds, you will need to enroll in the Automated Standard Application for Payments (ASAP) system, if you haven't already completed the enrollment process in ASAP. The Entity Administrator should have already received an email from ASAP to initiate this process.

Congratulations, and we look forward to working with you.

Cory D. Randolph
COPS Acting Director

Office for Civil Rights Notice for All Recipients

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) enforces federal civil rights laws and other provisions that prohibit discrimination by recipients of federal financial assistance from OJP, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW).

Several civil rights laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, require recipients of federal financial assistance (recipients) to give assurances that they will comply with those laws. Taken together, these and other civil rights laws prohibit recipients from discriminating in the provision of services and employment because of race, color, national origin, religion, disability, and sex or from discriminating in the provision of services on the bases of age.

Some recipients of DOJ financial assistance have additional obligations to comply with other applicable nondiscrimination provisions like the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of religion in addition to race, color, national origin, and sex. Recipients may also have related requirements regarding the development and implementation of equal employment opportunity programs.

OCR provides technical assistance, training, and other resources to help recipients comply with civil rights obligations. Further, OCR administratively enforces civil rights laws and nondiscrimination provisions by investigating DOJ recipients that are the subject of discrimination complaints. In addition, OCR conducts compliance reviews of DOJ recipients based on regulatory criteria. These investigations and compliance reviews permit OCR to evaluate whether DOJ recipients are providing services to the public and engaging in employment practices in a nondiscriminatory manner.

For more information about OCR, your civil rights and nondiscrimination responsibilities, how to notify your employees or beneficiaries of their civil rights protections and responsibilities and how to file a complaint, as well as technical assistance, training, and other resources, please visit www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights-office/outreach. If you would like OCR to assist you in fulfilling your civil rights or nondiscrimination responsibilities, please contact us at askOCR@ojp.usdoj.gov or www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights-office/about#ocr-contacts.

Award Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Recipient Information

Recipient Name

UEI
SRZKDWN293M2

ORI Number

Street 1
1245 3RD ST

Street 2
FL 6

City
SAN FRANCISCO

State/U.S. Territory
California

Zip/Postal Code
94158

Country
United States

County/Parish

Province

Award Details

Federal Award Date
10/10/25

Award Type
Initial

Award Number
15JCOPS-25-GG-00974-UHPX

Supplement Number
00

Federal Award Amount
\$6,250,000.00

Funding Instrument Type
Grant

Assistance Listing Number	Assistance Listings Program Title
16.068	COPS Hiring Program

Statutory Authority
The Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994, 34 U.S.C. § 10381 et seq

[] I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.

Project Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Solicitation Title
2025 FY25 COPS Hiring Program

Awarding Agency
COPS

Application Number

Grant Manager Name

Tammy Richardson

Phone Number

202-598-6908

E-mail Address

tammy.richardson2@usdoj.gov

Project Title

FY25 COPS Hiring Program

Performance Period Start Date

10/01/2025

Performance Period End Date

09/30/2030

Budget Period Start Date

10/01/2025

Budget Period End Date

09/30/2030

Project Description

The FY25 COPS Hiring Program (CHP) provides funding to law enforcement agencies to hire and/or rehire additional career law enforcement officers in an effort to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts. Anticipated outcomes of CHP awards include engagement in planned community partnerships, implementation of projects to analyze and assess problems, implementation of changes to personnel and agency management in support of community policing, and increased capacity of agency to engage in community policing activities

[] I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.

Financial Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

A financial analysis of budgeted costs has been completed. All costs listed in the approved budget below were programmatically approved based on the final proposed detailed budget and budget narratives submitted by your agency to the COPS Office. Any adjustments or edits to the proposed budget are explained below.

Budget Clearance Date: 9/15/25 5:42 PM

Comments

No items

Budget Summary

Budget Category	Proposed Budget	Change	Approved Budget	Percentage
Sworn Officer Positions:	\$24,314,077	\$23	\$24,314,100	
Civilian or Non-Sworn Personnel:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Travel:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Equipment:	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Supplies:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SubAwards:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Procurement Contracts:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Other Costs:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Direct Costs:	\$24,314,077	\$23	\$24,314,100	
Indirect Costs:	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Project Costs:	\$24,314,077	\$23	\$24,314,100	
Federal Funds:	\$6,250,000	\$0	\$6,250,000	25.71%
Match Amount:	\$18,064,100	\$0	\$18,064,100	74.29%
Program Income:	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%

[] I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.

Award Conditions

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Condition 1

Restrictions on Internal Confidentiality Agreements: No recipient or subrecipient under this award, or entity that receives a contract or subcontract with any funds under this award, may require any employee or contractor to sign an internal confidentiality agreement or statement that prohibits or otherwise restricts the lawful reporting of waste, fraud, or abuse to an investigative or law enforcement representative of a federal department or agency authorized to receive such information. Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2025, Public Law 119-4; Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024, Public Law 118-47, Division B, Title VII, Section 742.

Condition 2

Compliance with 8 U.S.C. § 1373: Authority to obligate or expend contingent on compliance with this condition. State or local government entity recipients of this award, and any subrecipient of this award at any tier that is an entity of a State or of a unit of local government, must comply with 8 U.S.C. §1373, which provides that such entities may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, receiving from, maintaining, or exchanging information regarding citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual with components of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security or any other federal, state or local government entity. This includes any prohibitions or restrictions imposed or established by a State or local government entity or official.

Any obligations or expenditures of a recipient or subrecipient that are impermissible under this condition shall be unallowable costs for purposes of this award.

References to the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 8 U.S.C. 1373 are to be read, as a legal matter, as references to components of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

~~Condition 3~~

~~Federal Civil Rights and Nondiscrimination Laws (certification): The recipient agrees that its compliance with all applicable Federal civil rights and nondiscrimination laws is material to the government's decision to make this award and any payment thereunder, including for purposes of the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. 3729-3730 and 3801-3812),~~

~~and, by accepting this award, certifies that it does not operate any programs (including any such programs having components relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion) that violate any applicable Federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws.~~

Condition 4

~~Federal Laws, Presidential Memoranda, and Executive Orders: Recipients of grant funding must comply with all applicable federal laws and Presidential Memoranda and all Executive Orders by the President.~~

Condition 5

Award Monitoring Activities: Federal law requires that recipients receiving federal funding from the COPS Office must be monitored to ensure compliance with their award conditions and other applicable statutes and regulations. The COPS Office is also interested in tracking the progress of our programs and the advancement of community policing. Both aspects of award implementation—compliance and programmatic benefits—are part of the monitoring process coordinated by the U.S. Department of Justice. Award monitoring activities conducted by the COPS Office include site visits, enhanced office-based grant reviews, alleged noncompliance reviews, financial and programmatic reporting, and audit resolution. As a COPS Office award recipient, you agree to cooperate with and respond to any requests for information pertaining to your award. This includes all financial records, such as general accounting ledgers and all supporting documents. All information pertinent to the implementation of the award is subject to agency review throughout the life of the award, during the close-out process and for three-years after the submission of the final expenditure report. 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.334 and 200.337, and, as applicable, 34 U.S.C. § 10385(a).

Condition 6

Authorized Representative Responsibility: The recipient understands that, in accepting this award, the Authorized Representatives declare and certify, among other things, that they possess the requisite legal authority to accept the award on behalf of the recipient entity and, in so doing, accept (or adopt) all material requirements throughout the period of performance under this award. The recipient further understands, and agrees, that it will not assign anyone to the role of Authorized Representative during the period of performance under the award without first ensuring that the individual has the requisite legal authority.

Condition 7

Contract Provision: All contracts made by the award recipients under the federal award must contain the provisions required under 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Appendix II to Part 200—Contract Provisions for Non-Federal Entity Contracts Under Federal Awards. Please see appendices in the Award Owner's Manual for a full text of the contract provisions.

Condition 8

Award Owner's Manual: The recipient agrees to comply with the terms and conditions in the applicable award year COPS Office Program Award Owner's Manual; DOJ Grants Financial Guide; COPS Office statute (34 U.S.C. § 10381, et seq.) as applicable; Students, Teachers, and Officers Preventing (STOP) School Violence Act of 2018 (34 U.S.C. § 10551, et seq.) as applicable; the requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 200 (Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards), including subsequent changes, as adopted by the U.S. Department of Justice in 2 C.F.R. § 2800.101; 48 C.F.R. Part 31 (FAR Part 31) as applicable (Contract Cost Principles and Procedures); the Cooperative Agreement as applicable; representations made in the application; and all other applicable program requirements, laws, orders, regulations, or circulars.

Failure to comply with one or more award requirements may result in remedial action including, but not limited to, withholding award funds, disallowing costs, suspending, or terminating the award, or other legal action as appropriate.

Should any provision of a condition of this award be held to be invalid or unenforceable by its terms, then that provision shall first be applied with a limited construction so as to give it the maximum effect permitted by law (to any person or circumstance) under this award. Should it be held, instead, that a condition (or a provision thereof) is of utter invalidity or unenforceability, such condition (or such provision) shall be deemed severable from this award.

Condition 9

Federal Civil Rights: The recipient and any subrecipient must comply with applicable federal civil rights and nondiscrimination statutes and regulations including: Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d),

as implemented in Subparts C and D of 28 C.F.R. Part 42; section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794), as implemented in Subpart G of 28 C.F.R. Part 42; section 901 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. § 1681), as implemented in Subpart D of 28 C.F.R. Parts 42 and 54; section 303 of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. § 6102), as implemented in Subpart I of 28 C.F.R. Part 42; and section 809(c) of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. § 10228(c)), as implemented in Subpart D of 28 C.F.R. Part 42. In addition to applicable federal statutes and regulations that pertain to civil rights and nondiscrimination, the recipient and any subrecipient must comply with the requirements in 28 C.F.R. Parts 22 (Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information); 28 C.F.R. Part 23 (Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies); 28 C.F.R. Part 38 (Partnerships with Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations); and 28 C.F.R. Part 46 (Protection of Human Subjects). For an overview of the civil rights laws and nondiscrimination requirements in connection with your award, please see <https://www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights/overview>.

Condition 10

Duplicative Funding: The recipient understands and agrees to notify the COPS Office if it receives, from any other source, funding for the same item or service also funded under this award.

Condition 11

Prohibited conduct by recipients and subrecipients related to trafficking in persons (including reporting requirements and COPS Office authority to terminate award): The recipient and subrecipient agree to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 175, Appendix A to Part 175 – Award Term:

I. Trafficking in Persons

(a) Provisions applicable to a recipient that is a private entity. (1) Under this award, the recipient, its employees, subrecipients under this award, and subrecipient's employees must not engage in:

(i) Severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(ii) The procurement of a commercial sex act during the period of time that this award or any subaward is in effect;

(iii) The use of forced labor in the performance of this award or any subaward; or

(iv) Acts that directly support or advance trafficking in persons, including the following acts:

(A) Destroying, concealing, removing, confiscating, or otherwise denying an employee access to that employee's identity or immigration documents;

(B) Failing to provide return transportation or pay for return transportation costs to an employee from a country outside the United States to the country from which the employee was recruited upon the end of employment if requested by the employee, unless:

(1) Exempted from the requirement to provide or pay for such return transportation by the Federal department or agency providing or entering into the grant or cooperative agreement; or

(2) The employee is a victim of human trafficking seeking victim services or legal redress in the country of employment or a witness in a human trafficking enforcement action;

(C) Soliciting a person for the purpose of employment, or offering employment, by means of materially false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises regarding that employment;

(D) Charging recruited employees a placement or recruitment fee; or

(E) Providing or arranging housing that fails to meet the host country's housing and safety standards.

(2) The Federal agency may unilaterally terminate this award or take any remedial actions authorized by 22 U.S.C. 7104b(c), without penalty, if any private entity under this award:

(i) Is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix; or

(ii) Has an employee that is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph

(a)(1) of this this appendix through conduct that is either:

(A) Associated with the performance under this award; or

(B) Imputed to the recipient or the subrecipient using the standards and due process for imputing the conduct of an individual to an organization that are provided in 2 CFR part 180, "OMB

Guidelines to Agencies on Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement)," as implemented by DOJ at 2 C.F.R. Part 2867.

(b) Provision applicable to a recipient other than a private entity. (1) The Federal agency may unilaterally terminate this award or take any remedial actions authorized by 22 U.S.C.

7104b(c), without penalty, if a subrecipient that is a private entity under this award:

(i) Is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix; or

(ii) Has an employee that is determined to have violated a prohibition in paragraph

(a)(1) of this appendix through conduct that is either:

(A) Associated with the performance under this award; or
 (B) Imputed to the subrecipient using the standards and due process for imputing the conduct of an individual to an organization that are provided in 2 CFR part 180, "OMB Guidelines to Agencies on Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement)," as implemented by 2 C.F.R. Part 2867.
 (c) Provisions applicable to any recipient.
 (1) The recipient must inform the Federal agency and the Inspector General of the Federal agency immediately of any information you receive from any source alleging a violation of a prohibition in paragraph (a)(1) of this appendix.
 (2) The Federal agency's right to unilaterally terminate this award as described in paragraphs (a)(2) or (b)(1) of this appendix:
 (i) Implements the requirements of 22 U.S.C. 78, and
 (ii) Is in addition to all other remedies for noncompliance that are available to the Federal agency under this award.
 (3) The recipient must include the requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of this award term in any subaward it makes to a private entity.
 (4) If applicable, the recipient must also comply with the compliance plan and certification requirements in 2 CFR 175.105(b).
 (d) Definitions. For purposes of this award term:
 Employee means either:
 (1) An individual employed by the recipient or a subrecipient who is engaged in the performance of the project or program under this award; or
 (2) Another person engaged in the performance of the project or program under this award and not compensated by the recipient including, but not limited to, a volunteer or individual whose services are contributed by a third party as an in-kind contribution toward cost sharing requirements.
 Private Entity means any entity, including for-profit organizations, nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, and hospitals. The term does not include foreign public entities, Indian Tribes, local governments, or states as defined in 2 CFR 200.1.
 The terms "severe forms of trafficking in persons," "commercial sex act," "sex trafficking," "Abuse or threatened abuse of law or legal process," "coercion," "debt bondage," and "involuntary servitude" have the meanings given at section 103 of the TVPA, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7102).

Condition 12

Termination: Recipient understands and agrees that the COPS Office may terminate funding, in whole or in part, for the following reasons:

- (1) When the recipient fails to comply with the terms and conditions of a Federal award.
 - (2) When the recipient agrees to the termination and termination conditions.
 - (3) When the recipient provides the COPS Office written notification requesting termination including the reasons, effective date, and the portion of the award to be terminated. The COPS Office may terminate the entire award if the remaining portion will not accomplish the purposes of the award.
 - (4) Pursuant to any other award terms and conditions, including, when an award no longer effectuates the program goals or agency priorities to the extent such termination is authorized by law.
2. C.F.R. § 200.340.

Condition 13

Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters: For awards over \$500,000, the recipient agrees to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Appendix XII to Part 200 – Award Term and Condition for Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters:

I. Reporting of Matters Related to Recipient Integrity and Performance

(a) General Reporting Requirement.

(1) If the total value of your active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from all Federal agencies exceeds \$10,000,000 for any period of time during the period of performance of this Federal award, then you as the recipient must ensure the information available in the responsibility/qualification records through the System for Award Management (SAM.gov), about civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings described in paragraph (b) of this award term is current and complete. This is a statutory requirement under section 872 of Public Law 110–417, as amended (41 U.S.C. 2313). As required by section 3010 of Public Law 111– 212, all information posted in responsibility/qualification records in SAM.gov on or after April 15, 2011 (except past performance reviews required for Federal procurement contracts) will be publicly available.

(b) Proceedings About Which You Must Report.

- (1) You must submit the required information about each proceeding that—
- (i) Is in connection with the award or performance of a grant, cooperative agreement, or procurement contract from the Federal Government;
 - (ii) Reached its final disposition during the most recent five-year period; and
 - (iii) Is one of the following—
 - (A) A criminal proceeding that resulted in a conviction;
 - (B) A civil proceeding that resulted in a finding of fault and liability and payment of a monetary fine, penalty, reimbursement, restitution, or damages of \$5,000 or more;
 - (C) An administrative proceeding that resulted in a finding of fault and liability and your payment of either a monetary fine or penalty of \$5,000 or more or reimbursement, restitution, or damages in excess of \$100,000; or
 - (D) Any other criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding if—
 - (1) It could have led to an outcome described in paragraph (b)(1)(iii)(A) through (C);
 - (2) It had a different disposition arrived at by consent or compromise with an acknowledgment of fault on your part; and
 - (3) The requirement in this award term to disclose information about the proceeding does not conflict with applicable laws and regulations.
- (c) Reporting Procedures. Enter the required information in SAM.gov for each proceeding described in paragraph (b) of this award term. You do not need to submit the information a second time under grants and cooperative agreements that you received if you already provided the information in SAM.gov because you were required to do so under Federal procurement contracts that you were awarded.
- (d) Reporting Frequency. During any period of time when you are subject to the requirement in paragraph (a) of this award term, you must report proceedings information in SAM.gov for the most recent five-year period, either to report new information about a proceeding that you have not reported previously or affirm that there is no new information to report. If you have Federal contract, grant, and cooperative agreement awards with a cumulative total value greater than \$10,000,000, you must disclose semiannually any information about the criminal, civil, and administrative proceedings.
- (e) Definitions. For purposes of this award term—
- Administrative proceeding means a nonjudicial process that is adjudicatory in nature to make a determination of fault or liability (for example, Securities and Exchange Commission Administrative proceedings, Civilian Board of Contract Appeals proceedings, and Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals proceedings). This includes proceedings at the Federal and State level but only in connection with the performance of a Federal contract or grant. It does not include audits, site visits, corrective plans, or inspection of deliverables.
- Conviction means a judgment or conviction of a criminal offense by any court of competent jurisdiction, whether entered upon a verdict or a plea, and includes a conviction entered upon a plea of nolo contendere. Total value of currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts includes the value of the Federal share already received plus any anticipated Federal share under those awards (such as continuation funding).

Condition 14

Reporting Subawards and Executive Compensation: The recipient agrees to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 170, Appendix A to Part 170 – Award Term:

I. Reporting Subawards and Executive Compensation

- (a) Reporting of first-tier subawards—(1) Applicability. Unless the recipient is exempt as provided in paragraph (d) of this award term, the recipient must report each subaward that equals or exceeds \$30,000 in Federal funds for a subaward to an entity or Federal agency. The recipient must also report a subaward if a modification increases the Federal funding to an amount that equals or exceeds \$30,000. All reported subawards should reflect the total amount of the subaward.
- (2) Reporting Requirements. (i) The entity or Federal agency must report each subaward described in paragraph (a)(1) of this award term to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) at <http://www.fsr.gov>.
- (ii) For subaward information, report no later than the end of the month following the month in which the subaward was issued. (For example, if the subaward was made on November 7, 2025, the subaward must be reported by no later than December 31, 2025).
- (b) Reporting total compensation of recipient executives for entities—(1) Applicability. The recipient must report the total compensation for each of the recipient's five most highly compensated executives for the preceding completed fiscal year if:
- (i) The total Federal funding authorized to date under this Federal award equals or exceeds \$30,000;
 - (ii) in the preceding fiscal year, the recipient received:
 - (A) 80 percent or more of the recipient's annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and

subcontracts) and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and

(B) \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts) and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and,

(iii) The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after receiving this subaward. (To determine if the public has access to the compensation information, see the U.S. Security and Exchange Commission total compensation filings at <http://www.sec.gov/answers/execomp.htm>.)

(2) Reporting Requirements. The recipient must report executive total compensation described in paragraph (b)(1) of this appendix:

(i) As part of the recipient's registration profile at <https://www.sam.gov>.

(ii) No later than the month following the month in which this Federal award is made, and annually after that. (For example, if this Federal award was made on November 7, 2025, the executive total compensation must be reported by no later than December 31, 2025.)

(c) Reporting of total compensation of subrecipient executives—(1) Applicability. Unless a first-tier subrecipient is exempt as provided in paragraph (d) of this appendix, the recipient must report the executive total compensation of each of the subrecipient's five most highly compensated executives for the subrecipient's preceding completed fiscal year, if:

(i) The total Federal funding authorized to date under the subaward equals or exceeds \$30,000;

(ii) In the subrecipient's preceding fiscal year, the subrecipient received:

(A) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts) and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and,

(B) \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal procurement contracts (and subcontracts), and Federal awards (and subawards) subject to the Transparency Act; and

(iii) The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after receiving this subaward. (To determine if the public has access to the compensation information, see the U.S. Security and Exchange Commission total compensation filings at <http://www.sec.gov/answers/execomp.htm>.)

(2) Reporting Requirements. Subrecipients must report to the recipient their executive total compensation described in paragraph (c)(1) of this appendix. The recipient is required to submit this information to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) at <http://www.fsr.gov> no later than the end of the month following the month in which the subaward was made. (For example, if the subaward was made on November 7, 2025, the subaward must be reported by no later than December 31, 2025).

(d) Exemptions. (1) A recipient with gross income under \$300,000 in the previous tax year is exempt from the requirements to report:

(i) Subawards, and

(ii) The total compensation of the five most highly compensated executives of any subrecipient.

(e) Definitions. For purposes of this award term:

Entity includes:

(1) Whether for profit or nonprofit:

(i) A corporation;

(ii) An association;

(iii) A partnership;

(iv) A limited liability company;

(v) A limited liability partnership;

(vi) A sole proprietorship;

(vii) Any other legal business entity;

(viii) Another grantee or contractor that is not excluded by subparagraph (2); and

(ix) Any State or locality;

(2) Does not include:

(i) An individual recipient of Federal financial assistance; or

(ii) A Federal employee.

Executive means an officer, managing partner, or any other employee holding a management position.

Subaward has the meaning given in 2 CFR 200.1.

Subrecipient has the meaning given in 2CFR 200.1.

Total Compensation means the cash and noncash dollar value an executive earns during an entity's preceding fiscal year. This includes all items of compensation as prescribed in 17 CFR 229.402(c)(2).

Condition 15

Assurances and Certifications: The recipient acknowledges its agreement to comply with the Assurances and Certifications forms that were signed as part of its application.

Condition 16

Conflict of Interest: Recipients and subrecipients must disclose in writing to the COPS Office or pass-through entity, as applicable, any potential conflict of interest affecting the awarded federal funding in 2 C.F.R. § 200.112.

Condition 17

Debarment and Suspension: The recipient agrees not to award federal funds under this program to any party which is debarred or suspended from participation in federal assistance programs. 2 C.F.R. Part 180 (Government-wide Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension) and 2 C.F.R. Part 2867 (DOJ Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension).

Condition 18

Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (EEOP): Please see the Office for Civil Rights website <https://www.ojp.gov/eeop> notice for current information on the recipient's responsibilities related to the federal regulations pertaining to the development and implementation of an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan.

Condition 19

Employment Eligibility: The recipient agrees to complete and keep on file, as appropriate, the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Employment Eligibility Verification Form (I-9). This form is to be used by recipients of federal funds to verify that persons are eligible to work in the United States. Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), Public Law 99-603.

Condition 20

Enhancement of Contractor Protection from Reprisal for Disclosure of Certain Information: Recipients and subrecipients agree not to discharge, demote, or otherwise discriminate against an employee as reprisal for the employee disclosing information that he or she reasonably believes is evidence of gross mismanagement of a federal contract or award, a gross waste of federal funds, an abuse of authority relating to a federal contract or award, a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, or a violation of law, rule, or regulation related to a Federal contract (including the competition for or negotiation of a contract) or award. Recipients and subrecipients also agree to provide to their employees in writing (in the predominant native language of the workforce) of the rights and remedies provided in 41 U.S.C. § 4712. Please see appendices in the Award Owner's Manual for a full text of the statute.

Condition 21

False Statements: False statements or claims made in connection with COPS Office awards may result in fines, imprisonment, debarment from participating in federal awards or contracts, and/or any other remedy available by law. 31 U.S.C. § 3729-3733.

Condition 22

Mandatory Disclosure: Recipients and subrecipients must timely disclose in writing to the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity, as applicable, all federal criminal law violations involving fraud, bribery, or gratuity that may potentially affect the awarded federal funding. Recipients that receive an award over \$500,000 must also report certain civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings in SAM and are required to comply with the Term and Condition for Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters as set out in 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Appendix XII to Part 200. Failure to make required disclosures can result in any of the remedies, including suspension and debarment, described in 2 C.F.R. § 200.339. 2 C.F.R. § 200.113.

Condition 23

Reports/Performance Goals: To assist the COPS Office in monitoring and tracking the performance of your award,

your agency will be responsible for submitting semi-annual programmatic performance reports that describe project activities during the reporting period and quarterly Federal Financial Reports using Standard Form 425 (SF-425). 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.328 - 200.329. The performance report is used to track your agency's progress in implementing the award, and, as applicable, community policing strategies including gauging the effectiveness of your agency's community policing capacity. The Federal Financial Report is used to track the expenditures of the recipient's award funds on a cumulative basis throughout the life of the award.

Condition 24

System for Award Management (SAM.gov) and Universal Identifier Requirements: The recipient agrees to comply with the following requirements of 2 C.F.R. Part 25, Appendix A to Part 25 – Award Term:

I. System for Award Management (SAM.gov) and Universal Identifier Requirements

(a) Requirement for System for Award Management. (1) Unless exempt from this requirement under 2 CFR 25.110, the recipient must maintain a current and active registration in SAM.gov. The recipient's registration must always be current and active until the recipient submits all final reports required under this Federal award or receives the final payment, whichever is later. The recipient must review and update its information in SAM.gov at least annually from the date of its initial registration or any subsequent updates to ensure it is current, accurate, and complete. If applicable, this includes identifying the recipient's immediate and highest-level owner and subsidiaries and providing information about the recipient's predecessors that have received a Federal award or contract within the last three years.

(b) Requirement for Unique Entity Identifier (UEI). (1) If the recipient is authorized to make subawards under this Federal award, the recipient:

(i) Must notify potential subrecipients that no entity may receive a subaward until the entity has provided its UEI to the recipient.

(ii) Must not make a subaward to an entity unless the entity has provided its UEI to the recipient. Subrecipients are not required to complete full registration in SAM.gov to obtain a UEI.

(c) Definitions. For the purposes of this award term:

System for Award Management (SAM.gov) means the Federal repository into which a recipient must provide the information required for the conduct of business as a recipient. Additional information about registration procedures may be found in SAM.gov (currently at <https://www.sam.gov>).

Unique entity identifier means the universal identifier assigned by SAM.gov to uniquely identify an entity.

Entity is defined at 2 CFR 25.400 and includes all of the following types as defined in 2 CFR 200.1:

- (1) Non-Federal entity;
- (2) Foreign organization;
- (3) Foreign public entity;
- (4) Domestic for-profit organization; and
- (5) Federal agency.

Subaward has the meaning given in 2 CFR 200.1.

Subrecipient has the meaning given in 2 CFR 200.1.

Condition 25

Additional High-Risk Recipient Requirements: The recipient agrees to comply with any additional requirements that may be imposed during the award performance period if the awarding agency determines that the recipient is a high-risk recipient. 2 C.F.R. § 200.208.

Condition 26

Evaluations: The COPS Office may conduct monitoring or sponsor national evaluations of its award programs. The recipient agrees to cooperate with the monitors and evaluators. 34 U.S.C. § 10385(b).

Condition 27

Background Investigations: Recipients agree to ensure that each officer(s) hired with CHP funding will be subject to a background investigation, notify the COPS Office upon completion of the background investigation for each officer hired under the CHP award, and cooperate with the COPS Office and provide updates on the status of background investigations upon request. 2 C.F.R. § 200.208

If the COPS Office determines that CHP funds are being used to pay the salary and fringe benefits of an officer who has not undergone a background investigation, the COPS Office may temporarily suspend grant funds in accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.339 until the agency can demonstrate the background investigation has been completed.

Condition 28

Retention: At the time of award application, your agency committed to retaining all sworn officer positions awarded under the CHP award with state and/or local funds for a minimum of 12 months following the conclusion of 36 months of federal funding for each position, over and above the number of locally-funded sworn officer positions that would have existed in the absence of the award. Your agency cannot satisfy the retention requirement by using CHP-funded positions to fill locally-funded vacancies resulting from attrition. 34 U.S.C. § 10382 (c)(8).

Condition 29

Allowable Costs Condition: The funding under this project is for the payment of three years (36 months) of approved full-time entry-level salaries and fringe benefits during the five-year (60 months) period of performance. The maximum federal share is \$125,000 per officer position (unless a local match waiver is approved) for career law enforcement officer positions hired and/or rehired on or after the official award start date. Any salary and fringe benefit costs higher than entry-level that your agency pays a CHP-funded officer must be paid with local funds. Your agency is required to use CHP award funds for the specific hiring categories awarded. In accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.400(g), the recipient or subrecipient must not earn or keep any profit resulting from the award. Funding under this program may be used for the following categories:

- Hiring new officers, which includes filling existing officer vacancies that are no longer funded in your agency's budget;
- Rehiring officers laid off by any jurisdiction as a result of state, local, or Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) budget reductions; and/or
- Rehiring officers who were, at the time of award application, scheduled to be laid off (by your jurisdiction) on a specific future date as a result of state, local, or BIA budget reductions.

If your agency's local fiscal conditions have changed and your agency needs to change one or more of the funded hiring categories, your agency should request an award modification and receive prior approval before spending CHP funding under the new category. The approved budget in the award package specifies the amount of CHP funds awarded to your agency. Please note that the salary and fringe benefit costs requested in your CHP application may have been adjusted or removed. Your agency may only be reimbursed for the approved cost categories up to the amounts specified in the approved budget. Only actual allowable costs incurred during the award period will be eligible for reimbursement and drawdown. If your agency experiences any cost savings over the course of the award (for example, your award application overestimated the total entry-level officer salary and fringe benefits package), your agency may not use that excess funding to continue salary payments to the officers beyond 36 months. Any funds remaining after your agency has drawn down for the costs of approved salaries and fringe benefits incurred for each awarded position during the 36-month funding period will be deobligated during the closeout process and should not be spent by your agency.

Condition 30

Advancing Department of Justice Priority Problem Focus Areas: This condition applies to agencies that selected one of the following priority crime problem/focus areas to address in their COPS Hiring Program (CHP) application:

- Violent Crime
- Squatting and Encampment Enforcement
- Homeland and Border Security
- Nuisance and Abatement and Quality of Life
- School Based Policing

Your agency understands and agrees to the following: Your agency will implement the one specific community policing plan identified in your CHP award application?

Your agency will address its specific priority crime problem throughout the entire CHP award period?

Your agency will implement any organizational changes identified in its CHP award application;

Your agency will cooperate with any award monitoring by the COPS Office to ensure that it is initiating or enhancing its community policing efforts to address its priority crime problem, which may include your agency having to respond to additional or modified reporting requirements.

Condition 31

Supplementing, not Supplanting: State, local, and tribal government recipients must use award funds to supplement, and not supplant, state, local, or Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) funds that are already committed or otherwise would have been committed for award purposes (hiring, training, purchases, and/or activities) during the award period. In other words, state, local, and tribal government recipients may not use COPS Office funds to supplant (replace) state, local, or BIA funds that would have been dedicated to the COPS Office-funded item(s) in the absence of the COPS

Condition 32

Career Law Enforcement Officer: Officer hiring funds may only be used to pay entry-level salaries and fringe benefits for full-time “career law enforcement officers” for 36 months. The COPS Office’s statute defines a “career law enforcement officer” as “a person hired on a permanent basis who is authorized by law or by a State or local public agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of violations of criminal laws.” 34 U.S.C. §10389(1). A recipient agency may use officer hiring funds to pay the salary and benefits of recruits while in academy training to become “career law enforcement officers” if it is the standard practice of the agency to do so with locally-funded recruits. The State of Alaska, and any Indian tribe or tribal organization in that State, may also use officer hiring funds for a “village public safety officer” defined as “an individual employed as a village public safety officer under the program established by the State pursuant to Alaska Statute 18.65.670.” Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010, Pub. L. 111-211, title II, § 247 (a)(2).

Condition 33

Local Match: COPS Hiring Program award recipients are required to contribute a local match of at least 25 percent towards the total cost of the approved award project, unless waived in writing by the COPS Office. The local match must be a cash match from funds not previously budgeted for law enforcement purposes and must be paid during the award period. The local match contribution must be made on an increasing basis during each year of the three-year award period, with the federal share decreasing accordingly. 34 U.S.C. § 10381(g).

Condition 34

Modifications: Occasionally, a change in an agency’s fiscal or law enforcement situation necessitates a change in its COPS Office CHP award. Award modifications under CHP are evaluated on a case-by-case basis in accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.308(i). For federal awards in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold (currently \$250,000), any modification request involving the reallocation of funding between budget categories that exceed or are expected to exceed 10 percent (10%) of the total approved budget requires prior written approval by the COPS Office. Regardless of the federal award amount or budget modification percentage, any reallocation of funding is limited to approved budget categories. In addition, any budget modification that changes the scope of the project requires prior written approval by the COPS Office. In addition, please be aware that the COPS Office will not approve any modification request that results in an increase of federal funds.

In addition, modification requests should be submitted to the COPS Office when an agency determines that it will need to shift officer positions awarded in one hiring category into a different hiring category and/or reduce the total number of positions awarded. For example, if an agency was awarded CHP funding for two new, additional sworn officer positions, but due to fiscal distress/constraints the agency needs to change the hiring category from the new hire category to the rehire category for officers laid off or scheduled for layoff on a specific future date post-application, the agency would have to request a modification. The COPS Office will only consider a modification request after an agency makes final, approved budget and/or personnel decisions. An agency may implement the modified award following written approval from the COPS Office. Please be aware that the COPS Office will not approve any modification request that results in an increase of federal funds.

During the CHP award period, it may become necessary for an agency to modify its CHP award due to changes in an agency’s fiscal or law enforcement situation. Modification requests should be submitted to the COPS Office when an agency determines that it will need to shift officer positions awarded in one hiring category into a different hiring category, reduce the total number of positions awarded, shift funds among benefit categories, and/or reduce the entry-level salary and fringe benefit amounts. For example, an agency may have been awarded CHP funding for 10 new, additional full-time sworn officer positions, but due to severe fiscal distress/constraints, the agency determines it is unable to sustain all 10 positions and must reduce its request to five full-time positions; or an agency may have been awarded CHP funding for two new, additional sworn officer positions, but due to fiscal distress/constraints the agency needs to change the hiring category from the new hire category to the rehire category for officers laid off or scheduled for layoff on a specific future date post-application. Award modifications under CHP are evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The COPS Office will only consider a modification request after an agency makes final, approved budget and/or personnel decisions. An agency may implement the modified award following written approval from the COPS Office. Please be aware that the COPS Office will not approve any modification request that results in an increase of federal funds.

Condition 35

School Resource Officer (SRO) Training Requirement: COPS Office-funded SROs are required to complete a 40-hour basic SRO training course from a list of COPS Office-approved providers. Training must be completed no later than nine months after the date shown on the award congratulatory letter or six months from the date of the SRO's hire, whichever comes first. If a COPS Office-funded SRO leaves the recipient agency after completing the training, the recipient agrees to pay for the new SRO, who is assigned to backfill this position, to attend a 40-hour basic training course. The new SRO must complete the training no later than nine months after being placed in the school. If the officer has completed 40-hour basic training within the last 12 months prior to the award date, the condition has been fulfilled. Any longer than 12 months will require the officer to retake the course. The agency must coordinate with the training provider to secure funding to cover registration and travel expenses.

If your agency fails to comply with the SRO basic training within the specified timeframe, the COPS Office may temporarily suspend grant funds or take other remedial actions in accordance with 2 C.F.R. §200.339 until your agency complies with this requirement.

Condition 36

Extensions: Your agency may request an extension of the 60-month award performance period to receive additional time to implement your award program. Such extensions do not provide additional funding. Any request for an extension will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Only those recipients that can provide a reasonable justification for delays will be granted no-cost extensions. Reasonable justifications may include difficulties in filling COPS Office-funded positions, officer turnover, or other circumstances that interrupt the 36-month funding period. An extension allows your agency to compensate for such delays by providing additional time to complete the full 36 months of funding for each position awarded. 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.308(f)(10) and 200.309. Extension requests must be received prior to the end date of the award.

Condition 37

Contracts and/or MOUs with other Jurisdictions: Sworn law enforcement officer positions awarded must be used for law enforcement activities or services that benefit your agency and the population that it serves. The items funded under the CHP award cannot be utilized by other agencies unless the items benefit the population that your agency serves. Your agency may use items funded under the CHP award to assist other law enforcement agencies under a resource sharing, mutual aid, or other agreement to address multi-jurisdictional issues as described in the agreement.

Condition 38

Community Policing: Community policing activities to be initiated or enhanced by your agency and the officers funded by this award program were identified and described in your CHP award application. Your agency developed a community policing plan for the CHP award with specific reference to a crime or disorder problem and the following elements of community policing: (a) problem solving—your agency's plan to assess and respond to the problem identified; (b) community partnerships and support, including related governmental and community initiatives that complement your agency's proposed use of CHP funding; and (c) organizational transformation—how your agency will use the funds to reorient its mission to community policing or enhance its involvement in and commitment to community policing. Throughout the CHP award period, your agency is required to implement the community policing plan it set forth in the CHP award application.

The COPS Office defines community policing as a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime. CHP awards through the specific officers funded (or an equal number of redeployed veteran officers) must be used to initiate or enhance community policing activities. All newly hired additional or rehired officers (or an equal number of redeployed veteran officers) funded under CHP must implement your agency's approved community policing plan, which you described in your award application.

Condition 39

Memorandum of Understanding Requirement (for School Resource Officers only)

Recipients using award funding to hire and/or deploy School Resource Officers into schools understand and agree to the following:

- Your agency must submit a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the law enforcement agency and the school partner(s) to the COPS Office before obligating or drawing down funds under this award. The MOU must be submitted to the COPS Office within 90 days of the date shown on the award letter. If your agency fails to submit the MOU within the 90 days, the COPS Office may temporarily suspend grant funds in accordance with 2 C.F.R. §200.339 until your agency submits the MOU.

• Your agency's MOU must contain the following information?

o The purpose of the MOU

o Clearly defined roles and responsibilities of the school district and the law enforcement agency, focusing officers' roles on safety

o Information sharing

o Supervision responsibility and chain of command for the SRO

o Signatures

Note: Please refer to the MOU Fact Sheet for a detailed explanation of the requirements under each of the bullets.

[] *I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.*

Award Acceptance

Declaration and Certification to the U.S. Department of Justice as to Acceptance

By checking the declaration and certification box below, I--

A. Declare to the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), under penalty of perjury, that I have authority to make this declaration and certification on behalf of the applicant.

B. Certify to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that the following are true as of the date of this award acceptance: (1) I have conducted or there was conducted (including by applicant's legal counsel as appropriate and made available to me) a diligent review of all terms and conditions of, and all supporting materials submitted in connection with, this award, including any assurances and certifications (including anything submitted in connection therewith by a person on behalf of the applicant before, after, or at the time of the application submission and any materials that accompany this acceptance and certification); and (2) I have the legal authority to accept this award on behalf of the applicant.

C. Accept this award on behalf of the applicant.

D. Declare the following to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant: (1) I understand that, in taking (or not taking) any action pursuant to this declaration and certification, DOJ will rely upon this declaration and certification as a material representation; and (2) I understand that any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent information or statement in this declaration and certification (or concealment or omission of a material fact as to either) may be the subject of criminal prosecution (including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and/or 1621, and/or 34 U.S.C. §§ 10271-10273), and also may subject me and the applicant to civil penalties and administrative remedies under the federal False Claims Act (including under 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3730 and/or §§ 3801-3812) or otherwise.

Agency Approval

Title of Approving Official

COPS Acting Director

Name of Approving Official

Cory D. Randolph

Signed Date And Time

9/29/25 5:32 AM

Authorized Representative

☐ Declaration and Certification (Law Enforcement Executive/Program Official)

Entity Acceptance

Title of Authorized Entity Official

no value

Name of Authorized Entity Official

no value

Signed Date And Time

no value

☐ Declaration and Certification (Government Executive/Financial Official)

Entity Acceptance

Title of Authorized Entity Official

Chief Financial Officer

Name of Authorized Entity Official

no value

Signed Date And Time

no value

Supplemental Statement to FY25 COPS Hiring Program Grant

The San Francisco Police Department's agreement to the terms of the grant award, including but not limited to "Federal Award Instrument" and "Award Conditions," for Grant Number 15JCOPS-25-GG-00974-UHPX, titled "FY25 COPS Hiring Program Grant," for an award amount of \$6,250,000 (collectively, the "Grant Agreement") is subject to limitations described below.

The San Francisco Police Department withholds consent to and objects to the inclusion of conditions in the FY25 COPS Hiring Program Grant Agreement and Notice of Funding Opportunity ("NOFO") that are enjoined by the Preliminary Injunction in *City and County of San Francisco, et al. v. U.S. Department of Justice, et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-09277, ECF No. 49 (N.D. Cal.) dated Jan. 21, 2026 ("Preliminary Injunction") or that are otherwise inconsistent with that Preliminary Injunction, including but not limited to Condition 3 (Federal Civil Rights and Nondiscrimination Laws) and Condition 4 (Federal Laws, Presidential Memoranda, and Executive Orders) of the "Award Conditions" of the Grant Agreement and the "Federal Funding Restrictions" in the NOFO. For so long as this Preliminary Injunction or subsequent orders consistent with this Preliminary Injunction remain in effect, any incorporation of the restrained conditions shall not result in those conditions being imposed or enforced against the San Francisco Police Department and/or the City and County of San Francisco. The San Francisco Police Department's consent is contingent on these conditions being restrained, and further contingent on the understanding that if the Preliminary Injunction expires, the enjoined conditions will not be imposed or enforced against the San Francisco Police Department and/or the City and County of San Francisco as to the period that this Preliminary Injunction or other orders consistent with this Preliminary Injunction were or are in effect.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-09277-JD

**ORDER RE PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION**

The City and County of San Francisco, the County of Santa Clara, the City of Tucson, and the City of San Diego challenge certain conditions imposed on federal grants awarded by the United States Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) to fund community policing programs. Defendants are the United States Department of Justice; Attorney General Pam Bondi; the COPS Office; and Cory D. Randolph, a Deputy Director of the COPS Office.¹

The challenged conditions are requirements that grant recipients agree to comply with all “Presidential Memoranda and all Executive Orders by the President,” and certify that they do not “operate any programs (including any such programs having components relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion) that violate any applicable Federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws.” Grant applicants were also advised that their awards could be placed on hold and “other remedial action” taken if recipients are found to have used the funding (1) to support or subsidize an educational service agency that has a COVID-19 vaccination requirement for in-person program attendance, (2) to “promote gender ideology,” (3) to pay for projects that “provide or advance

¹ The complaint identified Randolph as the Acting Director of the COPS Office, *see* Dkt. No. 17 ¶ 21, but Randolph’s declaration states that he is a Deputy Director. Dkt. No. 33 ¶ 1.

diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, or environmental justice programs, services, or activities,” or (4) if the recipient “failed to protect public monuments, memorials, and statues from destruction or vandalism.”

The statute that authorizes the grants, the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act, 34 U.S.C. §§ 10381 et seq., directs the Attorney General to award funds to local governments for 24 enumerated purposes directed toward promoting public safety and community policing, and having more “cops on the beat.” See 34 U.S.C. §§ 10381(a), (b); see also *City of Los Angeles v. Barr*, 929 F.3d 1163, 1183 (9th Cir. 2019) (Wardlaw, J., dissenting). The statute expressly mandates that grant applicants must “provide assurances that the applicant will, to the extent practicable, seek, recruit, and hire members of racial and ethnic minority groups and women in order to increase their ranks within the sworn positions in the law enforcement agency.” 34 U.S.C. § 10382(c)(11).

The government demands that plaintiffs agree by January 23, 2026, to the challenged conditions if they want to receive the grants. The award letters mandate that grant recipients must “accept all parts of the Award Offer,” thereby “bind[ing] the entity to the award terms and conditions,” to accept the award. Dkt. No. 20-1 at ECF pp. 29-30. Anything short of that will deprive plaintiffs of the federal grant monies earmarked for them.

Plaintiffs ask the Court to preliminarily enjoin the imposition and enforcement of the challenged conditions. Dkt. No. 20. The record demonstrates that the challenged conditions do not serve the goals and purposes mandated by Congress in the community policing statute, but rather seek to force compliance with the Executive Branch’s policy views that are wholly external to the statute. Because plaintiffs have established that they are likely to succeed on the merits of their claims, the Court enjoins the challenged conditions on a preliminary basis.²

² Many other district courts have reached the same result in similar cases. See, e.g., *City of Chicago and City of Saint Paul v. United States Department of Justice*, No. 25 C 13863, 2026 WL 114294 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 15, 2026); *Cal. v. United States Dep’t of Transp.*, 788 F. Supp. 3d 316 (D.R.I. 2025); *Martin Luther King, Jr. County v. Turner*, 785 F. Supp. 3d 863 (W.D. Wash. 2025); *Housing Authority of City and County of San Francisco v. Turner*, No. 25-cv-08859-JST, 2025 WL 3187761 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2025); *County of Santa Clara v. Noem*, No. 25-cv-08330-WHO, 2025 WL 3251660 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2025).

BACKGROUND

I. THE COMMUNITY POLICING ACT AND THE COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES (COPS) OFFICE'S GRANTMAKING AUTHORITY

The parties' familiarity with the facts and the record is assumed. In pertinent summary, in 1994, the United States Congress passed the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act, 34 U.S.C. §§ 10381 et seq. (Community Policing Act, or the Act or statute). The statute authorized the Attorney General to "carry out a single grant program under which the Attorney General makes grants to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, other public and private entities, and multi-jurisdictional or regional consortia for the purposes described" in the Act. 34 U.S.C. § 10381(a). These purposes include: (1) "to hire and train new, additional career law enforcement officers for deployment in community-oriented policing"; (2) "to provide specialized training to law enforcement officers to (A) recognize individuals who have a mental illness; and (B) properly interact with individuals who have a mental illness, including strategies for verbal de-escalation of crises"; (3) "to establish collaborative programs that enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies to address the mental health, behavioral, and substance abuse problems of individuals encountered by law enforcement officers in the line of duty"; and (4) "to establish peer mentoring mental health and wellness pilot programs within State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies." 34 U.S.C. §§ 10381(b)(2), (19), (20), (24).

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) was created within the Department of Justice by Attorney General Janet Reno in 1994. Its role is "to handle applications and the awards of grants to cities and states for community-oriented policing" pursuant to the Community Policing Act (COPS grants). *City of Los Angeles*, 929 F.3d at 1183 (Wardlaw, J., dissenting); *see also* Dkt. No. 33 (Randolph Decl.) ¶¶ 1-3.

The statute directs that an application for a COPS grant "shall be submitted in such form, and contain such information, as the Attorney General may prescribe by regulation or guidelines," and no grant may be made unless an application has been approved by the Attorney General. 34 U.S.C. §§ 10382(a), (b). The statute also provides that, "[i]n accordance with the regulations or guidelines established by the Attorney General, each application for a grant under this subchapter

1 shall . . . provide assurances that the applicant will, to the extent practicable, seek, recruit, and hire
2 members of racial and ethnic minority groups and women in order to increase their ranks within
3 the sworn positions in the law enforcement agency.” *Id.* § 10382(c)(11).

4 Four categories of COPS grants are at issue in this case. Grants made under the COPS
5 Hiring Program provide “funding to law enforcement agencies to hire and/or rehire additional
6 career law enforcement officers in an effort to increase their community policing capacity and
7 crime prevention efforts.” Dkt. No. 21-1 at 6. Community Policing Development Microgrants are
8 designed to fund “novel or innovative approaches to problem solving by local, state, tribal, and
9 territorial law enforcement agencies that help develop law enforcement’s community policing
10 capacity through the implementation of common sense policing strategies.” Dkt. No. 21-3 at 8.
11 The Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act Implementation Projects (Mental Health
12 grants) “provide funding . . . to implement new or enhance existing programs that offer training
13 and services to support officers[’] emotional and mental health including through counseling
14 programs, peer mentoring, suicide prevention, stress reduction, and police officer family services.”
15 Dkt. No. 21-2 at 6. The Safer Outcomes grants are provided to law enforcement training
16 academies “with the goal of promoting safe outcomes during police encounters with persons in
17 crisis through the integration of de-escalation and crisis response training into their curricula.”
18 Dkt. No. 21-4 at 6.

19 **II. THE FY25 COPS GRANT PROCESS AND THE CHALLENGED CONDITIONS**

20 In May 2025, the COPS Office issued Notices of Funding Opportunities (NOFOs) to
21 announce the availability of, and application requirements for, the COPS grants at issue. *See* Dkt.
22 No. 21-1 at 1 (advising potential applicants that the COPS Office “is seeking applications for
23 funding for the FY25 COPS Hiring Program”); *see also* Dkt. No. 21-2 at 1 (Mental Health grants);
24 Dkt. No. 21-3 at 1 (Community Policing Development Microgrants); Dkt. No. 21-4 at 1 (Safer
25 Outcomes grants).

26 Each NOFO included the ensuing “restrictions,” which together constitute one of the three
27 conditions plaintiffs are challenging in this case. They were presented under the heading “Federal
28 Funding Restrictions” in the NOFO for the COPS Hiring Program, and that is the term plaintiffs

use to refer to this set of conditions in this action for all four categories of COPS grants at issue. See Dkt. No. 20 at 5, 7-8.

As the Hiring Program NOFO stated:

Federal Funding Restrictions

Please be advised that COPS Office funding must not be used for the following:

1. To directly or indirectly support or subsidize an educational service agency, state educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, secondary school, or institution of higher education that requires students to have received a COVID-19 vaccination to attend any in-person education program.
2. To promote gender ideology.
3. For projects that provide or advance diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, or environmental justice programs, services, or activities.
4. State and local governments and law enforcement agencies that have failed to protect public monuments, memorials, and statues from destruction or vandalism.

If awarded, and it is determined that the applicant is not in compliance with the funding restrictions, the COPS Office may place a hold on the award and/or take other remedial action.

Dkt. No. 21-1 at 15; *see also* Dkt. No. 21-2 at 15; Dkt. No. 21-3 at 22; Dkt. No. 21-4 at 20.

In June 2025, plaintiffs applied for the COPS grants at issue. See Dkt. Nos. 33-8, 33-9, 33-10, 33-11. In October 2025, plaintiffs were advised that their applications had been approved. San Francisco was approved for a \$6.25 million COPS Hiring grant award. Dkt. No. 20-4 ¶ 14. Santa Clara was offered a \$200,000 Mental Health grant award. Dkt. No. 20-3 ¶ 12. Tucson was approved for a \$175,000 Microgrant award to assist with recruiting new officers, Dkt. No. 20-1 ¶ 17, and San Diego for a \$750,000 COPS Hiring grant award as well as a \$500,000 Safer Outcomes grant award. Dkt. No. 20-2 ¶¶ 4, 9.

Each of these awards included the other two funding conditions that plaintiffs challenge. The Microgrant award to Tucson spells them out under the heading “Award Conditions.” The same conditions appear in each of the grants awarded to plaintiffs:

Condition 3

Federal Civil Rights and Nondiscrimination Laws (certification):
The recipient agrees that its compliance with all applicable Federal civil rights and nondiscrimination laws is material to the government's decision to make this award and any payment thereunder, including for purposes of the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. 3729-3730 and 3801-3812), and by accepting this award, certifies that it does not operate any programs (including any such programs having components relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion) that violate any applicable Federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws.

Condition 4

Federal Laws, Presidential Memoranda, and Executive Orders:
Recipients of grant funding must comply with all applicable federal laws and Presidential Memoranda and all Executive Orders by the President.

Dkt. No. 20-1 at ECF pp. 33-34; *see also* Dkt. No. 20-2 at ECF pp. 11-12, 30; Dkt. No. 20-3 at ECF p. 15; Dkt. No. 20-4 at ECF pp. 11-12.

The parties could not agree on how to refer to these conditions. Plaintiffs called Condition 3 the “Discrimination Condition” and Condition 4 the “EO Condition.” Dkt. No. 20. The government favored “Anti-Discrimination Condition” and the “EO Condition.” Dkt. No. 32. The Court will refer to them as the “Nondiscrimination/DEI Condition” and the “EO Condition,” which together with the Federal Funding Restrictions are the universe of the “Challenged Conditions” litigated here.

The Challenged Conditions embody the policy views stated by the Trump Administration in executive orders and other documents. For example, the Nondiscrimination/DEI Condition reflects an executive order signed by President Trump on his second inauguration day. The order declared that the federal government's support for “illegal and immoral discrimination programs, going by the name ‘diversity, equity, and inclusion’ (DEI) . . . ends today.” Exec. Order No. 14151, *Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs and Preferencing*, 90 Fed. Reg. 8339 (Jan. 20, 2025). The order directed “[e]ach agency” to provide to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, a list of all “Federal grantees who received Federal funding to provide or advance DEI” so that they could be terminated. *Id.* §§ 2(a), (b)(ii)(C). Deputy agency or department heads were also to “recommend actions . . . to align . . . grants” with the policy outlined in the executive order. *Id.* §2(b)(iii)(B).

Another executive order issued the next day stated that “critical and influential institutions of American society, including the Federal Government . . . have adopted and actively use dangerous, demeaning, and immoral race- and sex-based preferences under the guise of so-called ‘diversity, equity, and inclusion’ (DEI) or ‘diversity, equity, inclusions, and accessibility’ (DEIA) that can violate the civil-rights laws of this Nation.” Exec. Order No. 14173, *Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity*, 90 Fed. Reg. 8633 (Jan. 21, 2025). The order further directed that “[t]he head of each agency shall include in every contract or grant award: (A) A term requiring the contractual counterparty or grant recipient to agree that its compliance in all respects with all applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws is material to the government’s payment decisions for purposes of section 3729(b)(4) of title 31, United States Code; and (B) A term requiring such counterparty or recipient to certify that it does not operate any programs promoting DEI that violate any applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws.” *Id.* § 3(b)(iv).

On July 29, 2025, Attorney General Pam Bondi issued a memorandum to all federal agencies titled, “Guidance for Recipients of Federal Funding Regarding Unlawful Discrimination.” *See* Dkt. No. 21-5 (AG Memorandum). The memorandum identifies “best practices” to help federal grant recipients “comply with federal antidiscrimination laws and avoid legal pitfalls.” *Id.* at 1. It states that “[u]sing race, sex, or other protected characteristics for employment, program participation, resource allocation, or other similar activities, opportunities, or benefits, is unlawful, except in rare cases where such discrimination satisfies the relevant level of judicial scrutiny.” *Id.* at 2. The memorandum says that “[f]acially neutral criteria (e.g., ‘cultural competence,’ ‘lived experience,’ geographic targeting) that function as proxies for protected characteristics violate federal law if designed or applied with the intention of advantaging or disadvantaging individuals based on protected characteristics.” *Id.*

III. THIS LITIGATION

San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Tucson filed a complaint on October 28, 2025. Dkt. No. 1. San Diego was added in a first amended complaint (FAC) filed on November 4, 2025, which is the operative complaint. *See* Dkt. No. 17. Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction,

Dkt. No. 22, and the motion is fully briefed. Dkt. Nos. 32, 35. A preliminary injunction hearing was held on December 18, 2025. See Dkt. No. 40.

At the Court’s request, the government extended plaintiffs’ original acceptance deadline of November 24, 2025, to accommodate the Court’s consideration of the injunction motion. The deadline to accept the COPS grant awards is January 23, 2026. Dkt. No. 33 (Randolph Decl.) ¶ 26.

DISCUSSION

I. LEGAL STANDARDS

Preliminary injunctions are “an extraordinary remedy never awarded as of right.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 24 (2008). “A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Id.* at 20.

In our circuit, it is well established that a preliminary injunction may also be issued where “the likelihood of success is such that ‘serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of hardships tips sharply in [plaintiff’s] favor.’” *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011) (citation omitted). Where the plaintiff has raised “at least ‘serious questions’ going to the merits” and clear irreparable injury would result in the absence of an injunction, the Court has the discretion to “preserve the *status quo* with provisional relief until the merits c[an] be sorted out.” *Id.* at 1134.³

II. THE TUCKER ACT AND THE COURT’S JURISDICTION

The government’s starting position in its opposition brief was that this case belonged in a different court. The government said that the Court “lacks jurisdiction over key aspects of what is, at base, a contractual dispute.” Dkt. No. 32 at 1. This theory was based on the Tucker Act, 28

³ Our circuit held after careful consideration that “the ‘serious questions’ approach survives *Winter* when applied as part of the four-element *Winter* test,” *Alliance for the Wild Rockies*, 632 F.3d at 1131-32, and has continued to apply the test. See, e.g., *hiQ Labs, Inc. v. LinkedIn Corp.*, 31 F.4th 1180, 1191 (9th Cir. 2022); *Doe v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist.*, 19 F.4th 1173, 1177 (9th Cir. 2021).

U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1), which vests exclusive jurisdiction over contract claims against the United States in the Court of Federal Claims, and “‘impliedly forbids’ bringing ‘contract actions’ against ‘the government in a federal district court.’” *Id.* at 6 (citation omitted).

But the government adopted a more nuanced position in subsequent statements to the Court. During the preliminary injunction hearing, counsel for the government forthrightly said that the government was not “suggesting that this Court . . . has zero jurisdiction under the Tucker Act to . . . enter an appropriately tailored injunction as to the challenged conditions.” Dkt. No. 41 (Hearing Transcript) at 7:3-6. Counsel underscored that “the Government’s not saying that the Court cannot issue an injunction enjoining the challenged conditions.” *Id.* at 7:7-8.

These statements correctly acknowledge that the Tucker Act is not a bar to the Court’s jurisdiction over this lawsuit. Plaintiffs’ case is rooted in statutory and constitutional commands, not in contract law. *See* Dkt. No. 17 ¶¶ 107-64. This is not a lawsuit that seeks to enforce contractual obligations. *See id.* at 35-37; Dkt. No. 20 at 24. It may be that the practical effect of the claims “would require the payment of money by the federal government” in the form of a release of funds without the challenged conditions, but that is not the same as suing for an award of money damages pursuant to a contract. *Bowen v. Mass.*, 487 U.S. 879, 893-94 (1988) (the “fact that a judicial remedy may require one party to pay money to another is not a sufficient reason to characterize the relief as ‘money damages’”); *see also Dep’t of Education v. Cal.*, 604 U.S. 650, 651 (2025) (recognizing that “a district court’s jurisdiction ‘is not barred by the possibility’ that an order setting aside an agency’s action may result in the disbursement of funds”) (quoting *Bowen*, 487 U.S. at 910). Plaintiffs’ claims are not “disguised breach-of-contract claim[s]” that are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims under the Tucker Act. *Thakur v. Trump*, -- F.4th --, No. 25-4249, 2025 WL 3760650, at *3 (9th Cir. Dec. 23, 2025) (quotations omitted).

III. THE INJUNCTION FACTORS

A. Success on the Merits

Plaintiffs have a rather elaborate architecture of claims. They say the Challenged Conditions (1) are unconstitutional because they violate (a) separation of powers and

(b) restrictions on the spending power pursuant to the Spending Clause, U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 1, and (2) violate the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 706, because they are (a) “contrary to the Constitution and in excess of statutory jurisdiction” and (b) “arbitrary and capricious.” Dkt. No. 20 at 9-21.⁴ The arguments for these propositions overlap to a substantial degree. The Court need not take up each theory because plaintiffs have established a likelihood of success on the APA claim that the COPS Office did not have the constitutional or statutory authority to impose the conditions. That is enough to warrant an injunction.

1. The APA Claim

The government’s starting position with respect to the APA is that there are no standards for the Court to apply because “the grant awards at issue are discretionary.” Dkt. No. 32 at 16-17. It is true that “[a]n agency’s allocation of appropriated funds is typically and presumptively committed to agency discretion by law,” *id.* at 17, but that is entirely beside the point here. The grants have already been allocated to plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are challenging the conditions that the COPS Office attached to the disbursement of the allocated funds, and not the discretion to allocate the funds in the first instance.

The governing standard for this claim is crystal clear. It is the plain text of the Community Policing Act, which is the sole statutory basis of the grantmaking authority held by the COPS Office, and sets the boundaries for the actions taken by it. The Act does not give the COPS Office unfettered discretion to attach conditions of its choice to the community policing grants it makes, and this case is not one of those “rare instances where statutes are drawn in such broad terms that . . . there is no law to apply, thereby leaving the court with no meaningful standard against which to judge the agency’s exercise of discretion.” *ASSE Int’l, Inc. v. Kerry*, 803 F.3d 1059, 1068 (9th Cir. 2015) (quotations omitted).⁵

⁴ The FAC also includes a Fifth Amendment due process claim for unconstitutional vagueness, Dkt. No. 17 ¶¶ 132-43, but plaintiffs do not rely on this claim for their preliminary injunction request. See Dkt. No. 20.

⁵ Judicial review under the APA requires the existence of a “final agency action.” 5 U.S.C. § 704. The government agreed at the preliminary injunction hearing that it is not contesting that the COPS Office’s imposition of the Challenged Conditions constituted a final agency action that is reviewable under the APA. See Dkt. No. 41 at 10:12-20.

Under the APA, the Court must set aside an agency action that is “contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity,” “in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations,” or “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. §706(2). Plaintiffs’ main contention on these grounds is that “the Executive Branch ‘has no power to act . . . unless and until Congress confers power upon it.’” Dkt. No. 20 at 10 (quoting *Louisiana Pub. Serv. Comm’n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 374 (1986)). In plaintiffs’ view, the plain language of the Community Policing Act leaves no room for the imposition of the Challenged Conditions, and no other statute fills in that void. *Id.* at 10-11, 18-19. Consequently, the conditions cannot survive review under the APA.

The point is well taken. The Community Policing Act authorizes the award of federal funds to local governments to promote public safety and community policing. Its language is clear and direct, and leaves no room for the conditions the government seeks to impose here. Where then does the government find statutory authority to impose conditions on local governments about COVID-19 vaccinations, “gender ideology,” or the vandalism of public monuments? It did not rely on anything in the statute, and the plain language of the Community Policing Act does not reveal a basis for the government’s actions.

As plaintiffs suggest, a good argument can be made that the conditions actually conflict with the statute. For example, the Nondiscrimination/DEI Condition and the DEI-related Federal Funding Restriction forbid efforts to “advance diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility,” Dkt. No. 21-1 at 15, and the President’s executive orders and the DOJ Memorandum described above amplify the message that grant recipients may not use the funds for programs that take into consideration an individual’s characteristics such as race or sex. But the Community Policing Act expressly requires that grant applicants “provide assurances that the applicant will, to the extent practicable, seek, recruit, and hire members of racial and ethnic minority groups and women in order to increase their ranks within the sworn positions in the law enforcement agency.” 34 U.S.C. § 10382(c)(11). There is no way to reconcile the conditions with the statute short of engaging in doublethink that forbidding considerations of race and gender is the same as taking

1 them into account. The stark conflict between the plain language of the statute and the Challenged
2 Conditions is a sure sign that the COPS Office acted outside its statutory authority.

3 The government’s main response to all of this is to say that the Challenged Conditions
4 simply require plaintiffs to follow the law. It points, for example, to Title VI of the Civil Rights
5 Act of 1964, which requires recipients of federal assistance to “comply with federal anti-
6 discrimination law.” Dkt. No. 32 at 8 (citing 42 U.S.C. § 2000d). In the government’s view, the
7 Nondiscrimination/DEI Condition merely “makes plain that recipients cannot violate federal anti-
8 discrimination law.” *Id.* at 9. For the EO Condition and the Federal Funding Restrictions as well,
9 the government says that “[t]he COPS Office is required to ensure that all grants comply with
10 federal law and the EO Condition and the Federal Funding Restrictions are another way to ensure
11 that requirement is met.” *Id.* at 16. In effect, the government declares executive orders to be the
12 law. It says that all of the Challenged Conditions “merely reiterate that recipients must comply
13 with federal anti-discrimination law and executive orders,” *id.* at 17, and that the “COPS Office is
14 required to enforce all federal anti-discrimination laws and has the authority to require recipients
15 to follow executive orders.” *Id.* at 18.

16 This theory is subject to serious doubt. To start, plaintiffs are required to follow federal
17 law irrespective of an express condition in a grant. They are no more free to flout the Community
18 Policing Act or any other federal law than the government is. The suggestion that executive
19 orders are on parity with statutes is bereft of any meaningful support in the government’s briefs,
20 all the more so when, as demonstrated, the executive orders’ directives stand in direct conflict with
21 the plain text of the Community Policing Act. So too for the government’s assertion that the
22 COPS Office may seek to compel compliance with executive orders under threat of losing funding
23 or even facing liability under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729. The government did not
24 identify any legal basis for those propositions. The government mentions a federal regulation
25 indicating that “the COPS Office is required to incorporate into the terms of its grants ‘national
26 policy requirements,’ including those flowing from ‘executive order[s],’” Dkt. No. 32 at 15
27 (quoting 2 C.F.R. § 200.211(c)(1)(ii)), but a regulation is not a statute. While Congress may
28 delegate to an agency the “authority to give meaning to a particular statutory term” or “to

1 prescribe rules to fill up the details of a statutory scheme,” in all cases it is the role of the courts to
 2 “effectuate the will of Congress subject to constitutional limits,” without giving deference to
 3 agency interpretations of statutes or the Constitution. *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603
 4 U.S. 369, 391-95 (2024) (cleaned up). Here, the government has failed to identify any
 5 constitutional or statutory provision that authorized the COPS Office to impose the Challenged
 6 Conditions.

7 Overall, plaintiffs have demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits of their fourth,
 8 fifth, and sixth causes of action under the APA. Dkt. No. 17 ¶¶ 144-64. While this likelihood of
 9 success could be analyzed in constitutional terms as well, the Court declines at this time to take up
 10 plaintiffs’ first and second causes of action, which squarely assert claims under the United States
 11 Constitution for “violation of separation of powers” and “violation of spending power.” *Id.*
 12 ¶¶ 107-31. The “fundamental and longstanding principle of judicial restraint” counsels courts to
 13 “avoid reaching constitutional questions in advance of the necessity of deciding them.” *Al Otro*
 14 *Lado v. Exec. Office for Immigration Review*, 138 F.4th 1102, 1123 (9th Cir. 2025) (quotations
 15 omitted). Plaintiffs’ likelihood of success for their APA claims establishes the most important
 16 element required for an injunction.

17 **B. Irreparable Harm**

18 Plaintiffs have demonstrated that they face a threat of irreparable harm. Because the
 19 conditions imposed on the grants are unlawful, being forced to accept them would impose
 20 irreparable harm on plaintiffs. *See Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 994 (9th Cir. 2017).

21 So too if plaintiffs lose the funds. San Francisco intends to use its \$6.25 million COPS
 22 Hiring grant to redress personnel shortages in its police department, which in 2025 was
 23 understaffed by about 30%. Dkt. No. 20-4 ¶¶ 5, 13, 14. San Francisco had a projected budget
 24 deficit of almost \$800 million for fiscal years 2025 through 2027, and it does not have any
 25 realistic alternative funding to hire officers if it cannot access its COPS grant funds. *Id.* ¶¶ 13, 15-
 26 17. San Diego received a \$500,000 Safer Outcomes grant to fund its police department’s efforts
 27 to train and support officers’ crisis response, and it too lacks alternative funding. Dkt. No. 20-2
 28 ¶ 7, 9, 15. Tucson received a \$175,000 Microgrant award to assist with recruiting new officers,

Dkt. No. 20-1 ¶ 17, and it plans to use the funds to “recruit[] a candidate pool from diverse backgrounds.” *Id.*, Ex. A at 3. Tucson says finding alternative funding would “present[] profound challenges.” Dkt. No. 20-1 ¶ 18. Santa Clara received a \$200,000 Mental Health grant award and plans to use the funds to address the acute need for mental health services for staff at the Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Office. Dkt. No. 20-3 ¶¶ 12, 18-20. Santa Clara is projecting a loss of \$1 billion in funding this fiscal year, and without the COPS Mental Health grant, Santa Clara will likely have to take away funding from other public safety services or forgo the planned mental health services. *Id.* ¶ 21. These are harms that cannot be remedied by an award of damages further down the road. *See Arizona Dream Act Coalition v. Brewer*, 757 F.3d 1053, 1068 (9th Cir. 2014).

C. Balance of Hardships and the Public Interest

The balance of hardships and the public interest are considered together in this case. *See E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Garland*, 994 F.3d 962, 984 (9th Cir. 2020) (“When the government is a party, the third and fourth preliminary injunction factors merge.”) (citing *Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell*, 743 F.3d 1073, 1092 (9th Cir. 2014)). A preliminary injunction will not be granted unless the public interests in favor of granting an injunction “outweigh other public interests that cut in favor of *not* issuing the injunction.” *Alliance for the Wild Rockies*, 632 F.3d at 1138 (emphasis in original).

The balance of hardships tips sharply in plaintiffs’ favor and the public interest supports an injunction. As discussed, plaintiffs have shown that they will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of an injunction. The government, on the other hand, has not shown that it will suffer any harm, monetary or otherwise, if an injunction were to issue. This is all the more so in light of the government’s frequent assertion that the Challenged Conditions seek only the enforcement of federal law as it currently stands. *See* Dkt. No. 32 at 10 (plaintiffs are simply being asked to “agree[] not to violate the laws currently in place”). Pausing the imposition and enforcement of the Challenged Conditions will have no effect on plaintiffs’ obligations to comply with all federal laws. Enjoining conditions that are likely to be unlawful is eminently in the public interest.

D. Bond

Rule 65(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a district court “may issue a preliminary injunction . . . only if the movant gives security in an amount that the court considers proper to pay the costs and damages sustained by any party found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c). The district court retains discretion “as to the amount of security required, if any.” *Johnson v. Couturier*, 572 F.3d 1067, 1086 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

The government asked for plaintiffs to post security, and to set the bond amount to “reflect the cost and disruption to the COPS Office’s administration to [sic] the grants at issue in this proceeding resulting from Plaintiffs’ requested relief.” Dkt. No. 32 at 22. But the government did not say what this amount might be, and did not provide any criteria or other guidance for the Court to consider in calculating a bond.

The Court declines to fill in the blanks for the government. There is also no evidence in the record of a “realistic likelihood of harm to the defendant from enjoining his or her conduct.” *Johnson*, 572 F.3d at 1086 (quotations and citation omitted). A bond will not be required.

CONCLUSION

A preliminary injunction to preserve the status quo pending trial is granted.

Defendants and their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and any person acting in concert with them, or at their behest, and who has knowledge of this injunction, are preliminarily enjoined from (a) imposing or enforcing the Challenged Conditions for the COPS grants to plaintiffs; and (b) withholding or terminating FY25 COPS grant funding on the ground that plaintiffs did not accept or comply with the Challenged Conditions.

The injunction will remain in place pending further order of the Court. Either side may request a modification of the injunction as circumstances warrant.

//

//

//

1 The parties are directed to file a joint status report by February 4, 2026, that includes a
2 proposed case schedule providing for a trial in August 2026. The case management conference
3 that was set for January 29, 2026, is vacated.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: January 21, 2026



JAMES DONATO
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Wu, Kimmie \(POL\)](#); [Wu, Li \(POL\)](#); [Yeung, Fannie \(POL\)](#); [Ashpole, Robert \(POL\)](#); [Kilshaw, Rachael \(POL\)](#); [Reynolds, Sondra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Singh, Kristine \(POL\)](#); [Tom, Risa \(POL\)](#); [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 26-28
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:49:05 PM
Attachments: [Res 26-28 Approval to accept CAP Grant Victim's Rights \\$5,000.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached resolution.

Thank you,

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Secretary
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and 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.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

June 4, 2026

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

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

C. DON CLAY
President

PRATIBHA TEKKEY
Vice President

CINDY ELIAS
Commissioner

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

W.S. WILSON LEUNG
Commissioner

MATTIE SCOTT
Commissioner

LARRY LOW
Commissioner

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, June 3, 2026, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 26-28

APPROVAL TO ACCEPT THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIM'S RIGHTS WEEK CAP GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,000;

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission approves accepting the National Crime Victim's Rights Week CAP Grant in the amount of \$5,000.

AYES: Commissioners Low, Tekkey, Scott, Leung, Elias, Vice President Benedicto, and President Clay

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "S. Youngblood", is written over a blue circular stamp or seal.

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission

1211/SR

cc:

Manager Li Wu/Fiscal
CFO Kimmie Wu/Fiscal
Manager Li Wu/Fiscal
Grants Manager Fannie Yeung/Fiscal
Grants Analyst Robert Ashpole/Fiscal

Memorandum

San Francisco Police Department



TO: Chief Derick Lew
Chief of Police

FROM: Kimmie Wu, Chief Financial Officer
Fiscal Division

DATE: April 6, 2026

SUBJECT: Acceptance of Grant Funds: National Association of VOCA Assistance

APPROVED	YES	NO
Kimmie Wu _____	☐	☐
Chief Financial Officer _____	☒	☐
Fiscal Division _____	☐	☐

The Police Department applied for and received a grant in the amount of \$5,000 through the National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators in cooperation with the US Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crimes.

These grant funds will be used to support the Department's efforts and participation in the 2026 National Crime Victims' Rights Week, April 19 to 25, 2026.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: 2026 Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance Reporting
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 2:26:00 PM
Attachments: [2025 Slavery Disclosure Report_Final.pdf](#)
[Slavery Disclosure Affidavit blank.pdf](#)
[Slavery Disclosure Ordinance 2007 Report.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2026 Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance from the City Administrator's Office.

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.sf.gov/bos

From: Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:59 PM
To: Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: 2026 Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance Reporting

Good afternoon,

Hope this email finds you well. We are sending a friendly reminder to all City departments regarding [Administrative Code Chapter 12Y](#), which requires insurance companies, financial services firms, and textile companies that participated in or received profits from the slave trade to research their records and file an affidavit reporting the results of that research to the City.

The ordinance also requires the City Administrator to file an annual report to the Board of Supervisors regarding the City's compliance with the ordinance.

Please submit affidavits using [this online form](#) by June 30, 2026, for inclusion in this

year's Slavery Disclosure Report. Please see details below and contact city.administrator@sfgov.org if you have any questions. We have received those submitted via the online form. No action is required if your department does not have contracts require such disclosure.

Thank you very much.

Office of the City Administrator

Attachments:

2007 & 2025 Slavery Disclosure Report

Blank Affidavit

From: Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>

Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 11:38 AM

To: Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>

Subject: 2026 Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance Reporting

To Department Heads,

The Slavery Disclosure Ordinance, approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2006 as [Administrative Code Chapter 12Y](#), requires insurance companies, financial services firms, and textile companies that participated in or received profits from the slave trade to research their records and file an affidavit reporting the results of that research to the City. The ordinance also requires the City Administrator to file an annual report to the Board of Supervisors regarding the City's compliance with the ordinance.

As noted in the standard City [P-600 contract](#), Article 10.12, all subject contractors must comply with Chapter 12Y. It is the responsibility of each department to ensure that any contractor who falls into the listed categories provides an affidavit and to transmit any affidavits received to the City Administrator.

******With the passage of the Open for Business Legislation in late 2025, the Chapter 12Y application threshold was increased from \$5,000 per vendor per year to Minimum Competitive Amount (MCA, \$230,000) per transaction. Therefore, all new contracts executed on or after 1/1/2026 under the MCA are NOT subject to reporting. Existing contracts executed before 1/1/26 should still be reported annually through their contract end date. ******

To ensure that all necessary affidavits have been provided and to support the development of the annual Slavery Era Disclosure Report to the Board, the City Administrator ***requests that you secure an affidavit from any of your contractors that must file one but has not previously done so.*** The [Ordinance](#) includes definitions of "contract", "participated in the slave trade," and various exceptions.

Please consult with the City Attorney's Office as to whether a specific contract requires an affidavit. Affidavits are reported in the Slavery Disclosure Report for the year they were provided. For your reference, 2007 report (first report) and 2025 (last year's report) to the Board of Supervisors, is attached as well as a copy of a blank affidavit.

Please submit affidavits using [this online form](#) by June 30, 2026, for inclusion in this year's Slavery Disclosure Report. Please contact city.administrator@sfgov.org if you have any questions.

Thank you very much.

Office of the City Administrator

Attachments:

2007 & 2025 Slavery Disclosure Report

Blank Affidavit

SLAVERY ERA DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Report to the Board of Supervisors
July 2025
FY 24-25 Update

Prepared by the Office of the City Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	Page 3
2. Update - Current Vendors and Affidavits	Page 4
3. Development Fund	Page 6
Appendix	
A. Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance, Chapter 12Y Administrative Code	Page 7

INTRODUCTION

The Slavery Disclosure Ordinance (Section 12Y of the Administrative Code) was passed in 2006 to support full and accurate disclosure to the public of City business with insurance, financial and textiles firms that, directly or indirectly or through their parent/legacy entities, were involved in slavery prior to 1865. For example, those companies include firms that bought or sold people subjected to slavery, provided property insurance for, provided loans to purchase, used people subjected to slavery as collateral for insurance policies or other transactions, profited from the trade in people subjected to slavery and/or provided related services to aid and abet such trade.

The ordinance requires every contractor providing insurance/insurance services, financial services or textiles to the City to file an affidavit with the City Administrator verifying that the contractor has searched all company records (including those of parent, predecessor or subsidiary companies) for any relevant records concerning whether the contractor, parent, subsidiary or predecessor participated in the slave trade or received profits from it. The ordinance also directed that a fund be established to which contractors covered by the ordinance, and others, could make voluntary contributions to ameliorate the legacy of the slavery era. (Section 12Y.5 (a).)

The City Attorney has advised that a firm must file an affidavit with the City only once, not for each new contract. Therefore, this annual report provides information on current vendors and new affidavits received as well as on any donations received for the Development Fund to Ameliorate the Effects of Slavery.

In March 2025, the Office of the City Administrator emailed all City departments to call to their attention the responsibility of applicable vendors to provide affidavits regarding their search of their company records. This year, six vendors completed new affidavits.

Departments that contract with one or more firm for financial/banking services, insurance services and/or textiles covered under the ordinance include the San Francisco Health Services System (SFHSS), San Francisco International Airport (SFO), Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), Office of Contract Administration (OCA), the Controller's Office of Public Finance, Risk Management, the Port of San Francisco, the Real Estate Division and the Treasurer-Tax Collector. Certain financial institutions are exempt from the ordinance. Those providing information did so voluntarily.

All affidavits received to date are available at [Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance | San Francisco \(sf.gov\)](#)

UPDATE – Current Vendors and Affidavits 2025 (FY 24-25)

Administrative Code Section 12Y.3 (a) (3) exempts **Controller’s Office of Public Finance** vendors from filing requirements. However, the following vendors filed voluntarily:

1. Bank of America, N.A. Filed in 2007
2. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. Filed in 2023
3. US Bank, N.A. Filed in 2007
4. Wells Fargo, N.A. Filed in 2008
5. ZB, National Association dba Zions Bank. Filed an affidavit in 2018

Additional vendors of the Controller’s Office of Public Finance did not file: Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, Bank of the West, TD Bank, and Wilmington Trust.

The Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) currently contracts with the following firms:

1. Backstrom, McCarley, Berry and Co, LLC. Filed an affidavit in 2023
2. Equilibrium Collaborative. Filed an affidavit in 2024
3. NBS Government Finance Group. Filed an affidavit in 2024

The Office of Risk Management currently contracts with the following firms:

1. Arthur J. Gallagher, Inc. Insurance Brokers of California. Filed an affidavit in 2013
2. AON Risk Solutions. Filed an affidavit in 2007
3. Alliant Insurance Services. Filed an affidavit in 2013
4. Merriwether & Williams Insurance Services. Filed an affidavit in 2013

The Office of Contract Administration (OCA) currently contracts with the following firm:

1. Macias, Gini & O’Connell LLP. Filed an affidavit in 2024

The Port of San Francisco currently contracts with the following firms:

1. Backstrom, McCarley, Berry and Co., LLC. Filed an affidavit in 2023
2. BLX Group LLC. Filed an affidavit in 2023
3. US Bank Corp. Filed an affidavit in 2007

Real Estate Division (RED, under the Office of the City Administrator), currently contracts with the following firms:

1. Chicago Title Company. Filed an affidavit in 2024.
2. Stewart Title Guaranty Company. Affidavit pending.

San Francisco Ethics Commission and Office of Cannabis (under the Office of the City Administrator) currently contract with the following firm. (Previously reported under the Office of Contract Administration (OCA) because OCA supported with the solicitation process):

1. Macias, Gini & O’Connell LLP. Filed an affidavit in 2024

San Francisco Health Services System (SFHSS) currently contracts with the following firms:

1. Aon Service Corporation. Filed an affidavit in 2025
2. Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company. Filed an affidavit in 2025

San Francisco International Airport (SFO) currently contracts with the following firms.

1. LeighFisher, Inc. Filed an affidavit in 2025
2. Robert Kuo Consulting, LLC. Filed an affidavit in 2025
3. Accenture Infrastructure and Capital Projects Consulting, LLC. Filed an affidavit in 2025

The Treasurer-Tax Collector (TTX) currently contracts with the following firms:

1. Bank of America. Filed an affidavit in 2007
2. U.S. Bank. Filed an affidavit in 2007
3. JP Morgan, Chase Bank. Filed an affidavit in 2023

Additionally, the Treasurer-Tax Collector has contracts with the following firms, however they are not required to file under Administrative Code Section 12Y.3 (a) (4): Citibank, First Data, Banc of America Merchant Services, American Express Piggyback, Bloomberg Inc., and City Base Inc.

Development Fund (Section 12Y.5)

Voluntary Contributions to Ameliorate the Effects of Slavery

In February of 2015, the Office of the City Administrator sent letters requesting voluntary contributions to all City vendors covered by the ordinance. No responses were received.

As provided in the ordinance, contributions to and expenditures from the account will be reported in each annual report.

APPENDIX A

Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance, Chapter 12Y Administrative Code

[Sec. 12Y.1. Findings and Purpose.](#)

[Sec. 12Y.2. Definitions.](#)

[Sec. 12Y.3. Exceptions.](#)

[Sec. 12Y.4. Slavery Era Disclosure.](#)

[Sec. 12Y.5. Voluntary Contributions to Ameliorate the Effects of Slavery.](#)

[Sec. 12Y.6. Enforcement.](#)

[Sec. 12Y.7. Severability.](#)

Sec. 12Y.1. Findings and Purpose

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby finds and declares that:

- (a) Insurance policies from the American slavery era, which have been discovered in the archives of several insurance companies, document insurance coverage to slaveholders for damage to or death of people subjected to slavery. In some cases, existing insurance firms or their predecessor firms issued these policies.
- (b) Further records may exist showing that insurance companies, financial services firms, and textile companies, either directly or through their parent entities, subsidiaries, predecessors in interest, or otherwise, bought or sold people subjected to slavery, provided property insurance covering people subjected to slavery, provided loans to purchase people subjected to slavery, used people subjected to slavery as collateral for insurance policies or other transactions, profited from the trade in people subjected to slavery, and/or provided related services to aid and abet such trade.
- (c) Discovery and publication of these records is an important first step in addressing the legacy of slavery in this country. For example, in June of 2005, the Wachovia Corporation, in the course of complying with a Chicago law similar to this Ordinance, discovered that some of its predecessor companies owned slaves and used slaves as collateral for loans. Wachovia issued an apology for the actions of its predecessor companies, and called for a “stronger dialogue about slavery and the experience of African-Americans in our country.”
- (d) Insurance policies, loan documents and other documents and records provide evidence of ill-gotten profits from slavery, which profits, in part, capitalized insurers, financial services providers and textile companies. The successors of these companies remain in existence today, and such profits from the uncompensated labor of enslaved Africans represent a continuing legacy of slavery.
- (e) Slavery was legal at the time that the contemptible practices outlined above occurred, but that does not make the practices any less repugnant, abhorrent or deplorable, nor in any way diminish the gravity of these wrongs or the importance of rectifying and remediating these travesties.
- (f) Deplorable treatment of Africans brought to this country as slaves was not limited to the southern states. In 1852, the California Legislature passed a California Fugitive Slave Act that gave white men the power to arrest Africans who they claimed were slaves, and return them to southern slave states. California's first governor, Peter Burnet, recommended during the first session of the California Legislature that the Assembly adopt a bill to exclude “Free Negroes” from California. In 1858, the Assembly passed House Bill 395, “an Act to Restrict and Prevent the Immigration to and Residence

in this State of Negroes and Mulattoes.” These laws, and others like them, were a major factor in the decision of several hundred African men and women to migrate from San Francisco to Victoria, Canada.

- (g) Many San Francisco residents are descendants of people subjected to slavery, people who were defined as private property and insured as such, people who were used as collateral for insurance policies, loans and other transactions, were dehumanized, snatched from their families, and coerced into performing labor without appropriate compensation or benefits.
- (h) Appropriate compensation to Africans for their labor would have been bequeathed to their descendants to assist them in developing a solid economic base that included individual wealth and thriving African American community institutions, thereby providing a level playing field and ensuring equal opportunity in this country.
- (i) The City and County of San Francisco acknowledges the loss of assets that rightfully should be the property of descendants of African people subjected to slavery, and extends its apologies to their descendants who continue to suffer the legacy of slavery.
- (j) The San Francisco Board of Supervisors pays tribute to and honors the people subjected to slavery who toiled and sacrificed their lives in building this country's economic foundation, and also honors descendants of those people subjected to slavery in America who, notwithstanding the degradation of slavery and discrimination, and the systematic efforts to deprive them of a sense of family, human dignity and prosperity, have developed a vibrant community, culture, and creative genius, and have made untold contributions to the fabric of our society, in the absence of which this nation would not be recognizable.
- (k) The effects of racism on the residents of the City and County of San Francisco have been well documented in the San Francisco Human Rights Commission's authorized study, *The Unfinished Agenda*, and in the Report of the 2004-2005 Civil Grand Jury for the City and County of San Francisco, *The More Things Change, The More They Stay The Same: The City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Unified School District Are Failing to Address the Educational Needs of the Bayview Hunters Point Community*.
- (l) The aforesaid residents, and all of the residents of San Francisco, are entitled to full disclosure of the information regarding the above-described transactions that compensated slaveholders for damages to and death of people subjected to slavery and provided other compensation and profits.
- (m) In 2000, the California State Legislature passed Senate Bill 2199, authored by then State Senator Tom Hayden, entitled “Slavery Era Insurance Policies.” Senate Bill 2199 (California Insurance Code section 13810 et seq.), effective January 1, 2001, requires that (1) the State Insurance Commissioner request and obtain information from insurers licensed and doing business in California regarding records of slaveholder insurance policies issued by predecessor corporations during the slavery era; (2) each insurer licensed and doing business in California research and report to the Insurance Commissioner with respect to any records in its possession or knowledge relating to insurance policies issued to slaveholders that provided coverage for damage to or death of people subjected to slavery; (3) the State Insurance Commissioner obtain the names of any slaveholders or people subjected to slavery described in the insurance records and make the information available to the public and the Legislature; and (4) descendants of people subjected to slavery, people who were defined as private property, dehumanized, divided from their families, forced to perform labor without appropriate compensation or benefits, and whose owners insured them as property, are entitled to full disclosure.

- (n) The Board of Supervisors finds that full disclosure of the facts and acknowledgement of the depth and scope of the shameful commerce in slavery furthers healing in the San Francisco community, both on the part of those who have been and are continuing to be harmed, as well as those who profited from this abhorrent practice.
- (o) The Board of Supervisors finds that the establishment of a fund to which contractors subject to this Ordinance and others may make voluntary contributions will promote healing and assist the City in rectifying and remedying some of the legacies of the shameful commerce in slavery, thereby protecting and promoting public health, safety and welfare of San Francisco residents and the San Francisco community.
- (p) The purpose of this Ordinance is to promote full and accurate disclosure to the public of: slavery insurance policies, including but not limited to policies issued to slaveholders for damage to or death of persons subjected to slavery, and policies issued to insure business transactions and operations related to the traffic in persons subjected to slavery; evidence of purchase and sale of people subjected to slavery; provision of loans to purchase people subjected to slavery; use of people subjected to slavery as collateral for insurance policies, loans or other transactions; provision of any related services to aid and abet such transactions; and profits derived from the slave trade; by (i) any contractors providing insurance services or financial services to the City, and (ii) any textile companies doing business with the City.
- (q) The purpose of this Ordinance is also is to establish a fund to which contractors subject to this ordinance and others may make voluntary contributions to promote healing and assist in remedying depressed economic conditions, poverty, unequal educational opportunity and other legacies of slavery era among the population of the City.
- (r) This Ordinance promotes important policy objectives of the City, and the City will suffer actual damages due to contractors' failure to comply with this Ordinance. Because these actual damages will be impractical or extremely difficult to prove, the City is justified in imposing liquidated damages for failure to comply with this Ordinance.

(Added by Ord. 275-06, File No. 060396, App. 11/17/2006)

Sec. 12Y.2. Definitions

As used in this Chapter, the following capitalized terms shall have the following meanings:

- (a) “Contract” shall mean an agreement between the City and any person, persons or other entity for public works or improvements to be performed, or for goods or services to be purchased, out of the treasury of the City and County, or out of trust monies under the control of or collected by the City and County.
- (b) “Contract Amendment” shall mean an agreement entered into on or after the effective date of this Ordinance pursuant to which a Contract entered into prior to the effective date of this Ordinance is modified or supplemented to: (1) extend the term of the Contract; (2) modify the total amount of money due from the City under the Contract; (3) modify the scope of services to be performed under the Contract; or (4) increase the amount, or change the nature of, goods to be provided under the Contract. The term “Contract Amendment” does not include construction change orders.
- (c) “Contractor” shall mean any person or persons, firm, partnership, corporation, or combination thereof, which enters into a Contract with a department head or other employee or officer empowered by law to enter into Contracts on the part of the City.

- (d) “Director” shall mean the Director of Administrative Services.
- (e) “Participated in the Slave Trade” shall mean: (1) issued slavery insurance policies, including but not limited to policies issued to Slaveholders for damage to or death of Persons Subjected to Slavery, and policies issued to insure business transactions and operations related to the traffic in Persons Subjected to Slavery; (2) purchased, sold or held Persons Subjected to Slavery; (3) provided loans to others to facilitate the purchase, sale, transport, or enslavement of Persons Subjected to Slavery; (4) used Persons Subjected to Slavery as collateral for insurance policies, loans or other transactions; (5) facilitated the traffic in Persons Subjected Slavery by transporting such persons by boat or rail; or (vi) provided any other services to aid and abet the traffic in Persons Subjected to Slavery.
- (f) “Person Subjected to Slavery” shall mean any person who was wholly subject to the will of another, whose person and services were wholly under the control of another, who was in a state of enforced and compulsory service to another, and who was deemed by law to be the property of another during the Slavery Era.
- (g) “Predecessor Company” shall mean an entity whose ownership, title and interest, including all rights, benefits, duties and liabilities, were acquired in an uninterrupted chain of succession by the Contractor.
- (h) “Profits from the Slave Trade” shall mean any economic advantage or financial benefit derived from the labor of Persons Subjected to Slavery or from Participation in the Slave Trade.
- (i) “Slaveholder” shall mean holders of Persons Subjected to Slavery, owners of business enterprises that used the labor of Persons Subjected to Slavery, owners of vessels or other modes of transport that transported Persons Subjected to Slavery, and merchants or financiers dealing in the purchase, sale or other business transactions related to Persons Subjected to Slavery.
- (j) “Slavery Era” shall mean that period of time in the United States of America prior to the year “1865.”

(Added by Ord. 275-06, File No. 060396, App. 11/17/2006)

Sec. 12Y.3. Exceptions

This Chapter shall not be applicable to the following:

- (a) Contracts for:
 - (1) the receipt, administration, management or investment of monies held in trust by the City in the Retirement Fund or the Health Service System Trust Fund;
 - (2) the provision of medical or dental insurance to City employees;
 - (3) the issuance, sale, management or administration of City bonds, notes or lease financings, or other similar obligations, and related credit, liquidity, payment exchange and other agreements;
 - (4) the safeguard, deposit and investment of City funds by the City Treasurer in accordance with Charter Section 6.106; and
 - (5) the subordination or reorganization of debt held by the City.

- (b) Contracts, loans or grant agreements with a federal or state agency, if the application of this Chapter would violate, or be inconsistent with, the terms or conditions of any such grant, loan or contract, or with the instructions or directions of the applicable Federal or State agency.
- (c) Contracts for urgent litigation expenses, and agreements entered into pursuant to the settlement of legal proceedings.
- (d) Contracts for needed goods or services where the Director finds that such goods or services are available from only one source that is (1) willing to enter into a contract with the City on the terms and conditions established by the City and (2) not currently disqualified from doing business with the City.
- (e) Contracts entered into in emergency situations in which it is necessary to immediately procure commodities or services, or to make repairs to safeguard the lives or property of the citizens of the City, or the property of the City, or to maintain public health or welfare as a result of extraordinary conditions created by war, epidemic, natural disaster, or the breakdown of any plant, equipment, or structure in the City.
- (f) Contracts for a cumulative amount of \$5,000.00 or less per vendor in each fiscal year.

(Added by Ord. 275-06, File No. 060396, App. 11/17/2006)

Sec. 12Y.4. Slavery Era Disclosure

- (a) Each Contractor providing: 1) insurance or insurance services; 2) financial services, or 3) textiles to the City, shall complete an affidavit verifying that the Contractor has searched through any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and has made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.
- (b) Each Contractor described above shall file an affidavit with the Director attesting to the search for relevant records, and stating whether the Contractor located any relevant records. If the Contractor located relevant records, the Contractor shall include in the affidavit: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records.
- (c) Information contained in the affidavits shall be subject to public disclosure. The Director, after consultation with the City Attorney, shall, to the extent consistent with local, state, and federal law: (1) provide the affidavits to the public upon request, (2) provide an initial report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, at an open public meeting no later than nine months following the effective date of this Ordinance, setting forth the number of affidavits received in the initial nine-month period, and summarizing the information contained in those affidavits; and (3) continue to provide such reports annually to the Board of Supervisors.
- (d) After the effective date of this Ordinance, no new Contract or new Contract Amendment shall be binding upon the City until the Director receives the affidavit described above.

(Added by Ord. 275-06, File No. 060396, App. 11/17/2006)

Sec. 12Y.5. Voluntary Contributions to Ameliorate the Effects of Slavery

- (a) The Controller shall establish an account for the collection of voluntary contributions from Contractors subject to this Ordinance, and from any other persons or entities, to be used to ameliorate the legacy of the Slavery Era on Persons Subjected to Slavery and their descendants.
- (b) The Director shall encourage all Contractors subject to this Ordinance to make voluntary contributions to the account.
- (c) The Director shall include in the report to the Board of Supervisors required by Section 12Y.4(c)(2), above, the amount of any contributions to the account collected during the first nine months after the effective date of this Ordinance. The Director, after consultation with the San Francisco African American Historical & Cultural Society, shall include in this initial report a recommendation for a method of determining how to expend monies contributed to the account.
- (d) The Director shall include a report on contributions to and expenditures from the account in each subsequent annual report required by Section 12Y.4(c)(3) of this Ordinance.

(Added by Ord. 275-06, File No. 060396, App. 11/17/2006)

Sec. 12Y.6. Enforcement

- (a) All Contracts shall provide that in the event the Director finds that a Contractor has failed to file an affidavit as required by Section 12Y.4(a), or has willfully filed a false affidavit, the Contractor shall be liable for liquidated damages for each Contract in an amount equal to the Contractor's net profit on the Contract, 10 percent of the total amount of the Contract, or \$1,000.00, whichever is greatest, as determined by the Director. All Contracts shall also contain a provision in which the Contractor acknowledges and agrees that the liquidated damages assessed shall be payable to the City upon demand and may be set off against any monies due to the Contractor from any Contract with the City.
- (b) All Contracts shall require Contractors to maintain records necessary for monitoring their compliance with this Ordinance.

(Added by Ord. 275-06, File No. 060396, App. 11/17/2006)

Sec. 12Y.7. Severability

In the event that a court or agency of competent jurisdiction holds that federal or state law, rule or regulation invalidates any clause, sentence, paragraph or section of this Chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, it is the intent of the Board of Supervisors that the court or agency sever such clause, sentence, paragraph or section so that the remainder of this Chapter shall remain in effect.

(Added by Ord. 275-06, File No. 060396, App. 11/17/2006)



Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, _____, am the authorized representative and custodian of records of _____ (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☐ I have ☐ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this ____ day of _____, 20____, in _____ (city), _____ (state).

Signature

Print name

Title

Company name

City contract number (if known): _____

Type of industry: ☐ financial services
☐ insurance
☐ textiles

See reverse for definitions.

Excerpts from the Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

Sec. 12Y.2. Definitions

As used in this Chapter, the following capitalized terms shall have the following meanings:

- (a) “Contract” shall mean an agreement between the City and any person, persons or other entity for public works or improvements to be performed, or for goods or services to be purchased, out of the treasury of the City and County, or out of trust monies under the control of or collected by the City and County.
- (b) “Contract Amendment” shall mean an agreement entered into on or after the effective date of this Ordinance pursuant to which a Contract entered into prior to the effective date of this Ordinance is modified or supplemented to: (1) extend the term of the Contract; (2) modify the total amount of money due from the City under the Contract; (3) modify the scope of services to be performed under the Contract; or (4) increase the amount, or change the nature of, goods to be provided under the Contract. The term “Contract Amendment” does not include construction change orders.
- (c) “Contractor” shall mean any person or persons, firm, partnership, corporation, or combination thereof, which enters into a Contract with a department head or other employee or officer empowered by law to enter into Contracts on the part of the City.
- (d) “Director” shall mean the Director of Administrative Services.
- (e) “Participated in the Slave Trade” shall mean: (1) issued slavery insurance policies, including but not limited to policies issued to Slaveholders for damage to or death of Persons Subjected to Slavery, and policies issued to insure business transactions and operations related to the traffic in Persons Subjected to Slavery; (2) purchased, sold or held Persons Subjected to Slavery; (3) provided loans to others to facilitate the purchase, sale, transport, or enslavement of Persons Subjected to Slavery; (4) used Persons Subjected to Slavery as collateral for insurance policies, loans or other transactions; (5) facilitated the traffic in Persons Subjected to Slavery by transporting such persons by boat or rail; or (vi) provided any other services to aid and abet the traffic in Persons Subjected to Slavery.
- (f) “Person Subjected to Slavery” shall mean any person who was wholly subject to the will of another, whose person and services were wholly under the control of another, who was in a state of enforced and compulsory service to another, and who was deemed by law to be the property of another during the Slavery Era.
- (g) “Predecessor Company” shall mean an entity whose ownership, title and interest, including all rights, benefits, duties and liabilities, were acquired in an uninterrupted chain of succession by the Contractor.
- (h) “Profits from the Slave Trade” shall mean any economic advantage or financial benefit derived from the labor of Persons Subjected to Slavery or from Participation in the Slave Trade.
- (i) “Slaveholder” shall mean holders of Persons Subjected to Slavery, owners of business enterprises that used the labor of Persons Subjected to Slavery, owners of vessels or other modes of transport that transported Persons Subjected to Slavery, and merchants or financiers dealing in the purchase, sale or other business transactions related to Persons Subjected to Slavery.
- (j) “Slavery Era” shall mean that period of time in the United States of America prior to the year “1865.”

*

The San Francisco Administrative Code is on the web at: <http://www.municode.com>

Click “Online Library”; then “California”; then “San Francisco.”

SLAVERY ERA DISCLOSURE ORDINANCE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors



Office of the City Administrator
November 8, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION

PAGE

1.	Executive Summary.....	3
2.	Introduction.....	5
3.	Process.....	6
4.	Affidavits: Insurance.....	6
5.	Affidavits: Financial Services.....	7
6.	Research.....	8
7.	Working with the African American Historical and Cultural Society.....	9
8.	Development Fund.....	9
9.	History and Similar Laws.....	9
10.	Pending Slavery Disclosure Laws.....	11
11.	Recommendations for Implementation.....	11
12.	Appendices	
	A. Spreadsheet: Summary of City and State Slavery Disclosure Laws.....	12A
	B. Affidavits	
	1. Marsh Risk & Insurance Services.....	12B.1
	2. Aon Risk Services.....	12B.2
	3. The CIMA Companies.....	12B.3
	4. Bear Stearns Companies, Inc.	12B.4
	5. Deutsche Bank National Trust Company	12B.5
	6. Bank of America	12B.6
	7. U.S. Bank	12B.7
	8. Wells Fargo & Co. (with Attachment B)	12B.8
	C. Institutional Histories	
	1. Bank of America (with affidavit)	12C.1
	2. U.S. Bank (with affidavit)	12C.2
	D. Summer 2007 Student Interns.....	12D

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With the approval of the Slavery Disclosure Ordinance by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor in November 2006, San Francisco joined with other jurisdictions throughout the United States in officially acknowledging the crime of African slavery and its ongoing ramifications for the descendants of slaves.

Pursuant to the ordinance, the City Administrator respectfully submits this Report, which, in addition to setting forth the information required by the Ordinance, represents an exceptional and productive community partnership deriving from the spirit of the Ordinance, as well as the intent.

In early March of 2007, I convened a workgroup to coordinate efforts required to implement the Ordinance. The workgroup create the affidavit form and provide any and all information necessary for the implementation of the ordinance. Participants included heads or representatives of departments and programs required by the ordinance to include disclosure requests with all new contracts and contract amendments: the Treasurer, the Director of the Office of Contract Administration, the Risk Manager and the Director of the Office of Public Finance. The African-American Historical and Cultural Society (AAHCS) were invited to participate as well.

My office developed an intern program to specifically assist in the preparation of this report. We worked with the AAHCS, local law schools and colleges to ensure the job announcements were distributed as widely as possible. Five students were selected and began work at the beginning of the summer.

Affidavits

We crafted an affidavit that would elicit the information necessary for us to determine whether vendors had been involved in the slave trade. Disclosure requests were issued to insurance brokers and financial institutions with which the City has contracts.

- Risk Management: ten requests; three affidavits returned each stating relevant records could not be located
- The Office of Public Finance: seven requests; two affidavits returned stating relevant records could not be located
- Treasurer/Tax Collector: ten requests; three affidavits on file; two affidavits returned stating relevant records had been located with historic information attached.


Fund

Pursuant to this ordinance, "...the Controller is required to establish an account for the collection of voluntary contributions from Contractors subject to the ordinance...to be used to ameliorate the legacy of the Slavery Era." The Controller has created the account. No funds have been deposited into this account as of this report.

Implementation

My office shall continue to collaborate and coordinate with the AAHCS in the ongoing implementation of this ordinance. We shall continue to ensure that affidavits are sent to City contractors in the mandated fields. We shall also continue to work with the Treasurer's Office, the Office of Public Finance and the Risk Manager to ensure that the City and County maintains its legislative commitment to help to lay bare historic truths and ameliorate the effects of the "peculiar institution" on the descendants of slaves.

It has been a privilege to participate in such an extraordinary undertaking.



Edwin M. Lee
City Administrator

November 8, 2007

INTRODUCTION

San Francisco's Slavery Disclosure Ordinance puts the City among a growing group of municipalities with such laws, including Chicago (where the first slavery disclosure law was passed in 2004), Los Angeles, Milwaukee and Oakland. San Francisco Supervisors Sophie Maxwell and Ross Mirkarimi drafted the ordinance in 2006 after meeting with members of the City's African-American community. The Board of Supervisors approved the Ordinance on November 7, 2006 and Mayor Gavin Newsom signed it into law ten days later. It is codified at Section 12Y of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Responsibility for implementation of this Ordinance is vested with the City Administrator who must ensure that contractors providing insurance, insurance services, financial services or textiles to the City disclose any participation in the slave trade by themselves or predecessor companies; that the Controller create an account to which contractors subject to the Ordinance and others may make voluntary contributions; and that monies donated to the account be used to fund economic development and educational initiatives designed to ameliorate the effects of slavery upon the residents of San Francisco.

The Ordinance also requires the City Administrator to present a report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors within nine months, "setting forth the number of affidavits received in the initial nine-month period, and summarizing the information contained in those affidavits."

Owing to the nature of the Ordinance as well as its manifest requirements, the City Administrator's Office worked closely with the San Francisco African American Historical and Cultural Society (AAHCS) to create a community awareness of the ordinance and involvement in its implementation by:

- Regularly consulting with the AAHCS director with respect to the implementation process;
- Collaborating on the preparation of this report by sharing information, inviting AAHCS's participation in the workgroup, jointly performing outreach for the hiring of interns, including AAHCS representation in the intern selection process;
- Advertising, attending and participating in AAHCS lectures on African-American slavery, its repercussions and the reparations movement;
- Inviting the AAHCS to participate in the writing of this report.

In conjunction with professors at San Francisco State University and the University of San Francisco Law School, the City Administrator's Office developed an intern program with a two-fold purpose: to assist with research of slavery disclosure laws throughout the nation and to provide an opportunity for students to learn how responsive government could be to societal imperatives. Consequently, credit for the report's research belongs to the student interns whose names are listed in the appendices.

PROCESS

After the ordinance took effect, the City Administrator organized a work group that met twice a month to coordinate the process for implementation and the research required for this report. Included were the offices of Risk Management, Public Finance, the Treasurer, Contract Administration, and AAHCS.

Five interns - two law school students and three graduate students, were hired to research and assist in the preparation of this report. Throughout the summer, the interns investigated similar laws in other jurisdictions, interviewed people in the public and private sectors, assisted in managing incoming documents and did extensive factual research on contractors and their disclosures.

The work group participants reviewed new and renewing City contracts to determine the applicability of the ordinance. Because the textile industry was distinctly involved with the slave trade, it was included in the ordinance as an industry to research. However, the City does not buy textiles—it buys uniforms and other finished goods made of cloth. No textile companies will report under this ordinance if it is not applicable to them. Insurance and financial sectors, on the other hand, yielded significant data.

AFFIDAVITS: INSURANCE

Because the City has no direct contract with insurers, but only with insurance brokers, it can only apply the ordinance to the brokers. (See below for information on the California Slavery Era Insurance Registry, which applies to insurers.)

Risk Management requested affidavits from eleven insurance brokers. Three responded stating they could not locate relevant records:

- Aon: affidavit on file
- Marsh: affidavit on file
- Driver Alliant
- CIMA-VIS: affidavit on file
- Woodruff & Sawyer
- Willis
- Union Bank Insurance Services
- IMWS
- Municipal Insurance Services
- Armstrong

AFFIDAVITS: FINANCIAL SERVICES

The Office of Public Finance requested affidavits from seven banks with which the City and County has done business, requesting voluntary cooperation since they are exempted from the ordinance. Two of those banks returned affidavits declaring they found no records indicating involvement in the slave trade. While J.P. Morgan and US Bank have not yet responded to the information request, they have publicly announced their institutional connection to the slave trade in response to disclosure laws in other jurisdictions.

- E.J. De La Rosa (remarketing agent)
- Bear Stearns (remarketing agent): affidavit on file
- J.P. Morgan (remarketing agent)
- Deutsche Bank (trustee): affidavit on file
- US Bank (trustee)
- Bank of New York (trustee)
- Koch Financial (trustee)

The Treasurer requested affidavits from ten financial institutions. Two responded confirming that predecessor companies had been involved in the slave trade:

- Bank of America: affidavit on file
- Wells Fargo Bank: affidavit on file
- Union Bank of California
- US Bank: affidavit on file
- Citibank
- Mission National Bank
- Mission Area Federal Credit Union
- First National Bank of Northern California
- Yosemite Bank
- San Francisco Employee Credit Union

Bank of America filed an affidavit with the Treasurer stating it had found relevant records. Enclosed with the affidavit was a document entitled, "Report on Bank of America Predecessor Institutions Research Regarding Slavery and the Slave Trade," produced by Heritage Research Center, Ltd. (see Appendices). While claiming it did not "identify any instances or occasions in which any Bank of America legacy banks made a profit from slavery," Heritage did confirm a direct connection to slavery by Southern predecessor banks.

U.S. Bank National Association's affidavit also confirmed the location of relevant records. Like the Bank of America, U.S. Bank, through mergers and acquisitions, acquired southern banks founded before the abolition of slavery in 1865. It identified records of founders or directors of predecessor banks who owned slaves. It also identified a record showing the use of a slave as collateral for a loan. (See Appendices)

RESEARCH

Companies with Confirmed Ties

In March 2002, a class action suit was filed in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York against three major corporations - Fleetboston Financial Corporation, insurer, Aetna Inc., and a railroad firm, CSX, accusing them of profiting from the slave trade before it was abolished. The plaintiffs lost the case but joined other reparation cases on appeal. The U.S. District Court of Appeals upheld the lower court's denial of the plaintiffs' standing. However, the publicity, along with the enactment of slavery era disclosure legislation throughout the nation, elicited formal apologies from major institutions as well as mitigations in the form of financial support for various African American causes.

In January 2005, J.P. Morgan Chase issued an apology to the descendants of slaves for its involvement in the slave trade and announced it was establishing a \$5 million scholarship program "Smart Start Louisiana" for African American students in Louisiana to attend college in their own state.

In a June 2005 press release, Wachovia issued an apology for its involvement with the slave trade. By the next month, Wachovia announced it would award \$10 million to the:

- Association for the Study of African-American Life and History
- National Humanities Center
- United Negro College Fund
- Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund
- NAACP
- National Urban League

In August 2005, Bank of America Chairman, Ken Lewis, announced that its predecessor banks were involved with the slave trade. "To acknowledge the importance of remembering this period in our nation's history," he pledged, "to expand [the Bank's] financial support, contributing \$5 million over a three-year period to institutions and programs involved in the preservation of African-American history."

In addition to the Bank of America, U.S. Bank, J.P Morgan and Wachovia, research revealed four other major companies that disclosed ties to the slave trade through slavery-disclosure laws in various jurisdictions: insurers Aetna, New York Life and AIG and financial-services companies ABN AMRO. The major corporations required to comply with slavery-disclosure laws commissioned historical-research companies such as the Winthrop Group, History Associates or Heritage Research, to research their history and prepare reports which were made public.

WORKING WITH THE AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL SOCIETY

The AAHCS served as a resource in the research and gathering of information for this report. The interns met with both the AAHCS and the Southeast Commission, as well as attended a series of lectures on the history of the reparations movement and slavery disclosure laws sponsored by the AAHCS.

DEVELOPMENT FUND

The provision of a fund to which contractors can make voluntary contributions is one of the innovative features of San Francisco's slavery-disclosure ordinance. The Controller has established the Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance Fund. No contributions have been made at this writing. When a meaningful balance is achieved, the City Administrator will return to the Board of Supervisors for approval of disbursement standards. It is anticipated that the disbursements will be issued in the form of grants.

HISTORY AND SIMILAR LAWS

The Reparations Movement inspired slavery era disclosure legislation in cities throughout the nation. The attached spreadsheet summarizes the provisions of the laws and the differences between them; this section of the report provides narrative descriptions of the more noteworthy legislations.

CHICAGO: Chicago's slavery-disclosure ordinance was passed on October 2, 2002 and became effective on January 1, 2003. Any company seeking to do business with the City of Chicago must complete an Economic Disclosure Statement (EDS), which includes a slavery-disclosure affidavit. Wachovia, J. P. Morgan Chase, ABN AMRO, Lehman Brothers, LaSalle Bank, and UBS have all disclosed involvement in the slave trade.

OAKLAND: Oakland's slavery-disclosure ordinance is the only one, other than San Francisco's, to provide for a community-development fund. It operates much like San Francisco's: any party may make a voluntary contribution to the fund that is supervised by the City Administrator. The ordinance applies to a broad range of industries: insurance, finance, textiles, tobacco, railroads, shipping, rice and sugar. Non-compliant contractors are subject to contract termination.

MILWAUKEE: Milwaukee requires contractors to complete an affidavit confirming that they have researched all company and predecessor records in relation to investments or profits taken place during the slave era. The Department of Administration supervises the contractors. The penalty for non-compliance is contract termination.

Approximately 1,675 companies are listed in the slavery-disclosure affidavit log on the City of Milwaukee's website; affidavits are available by contacting the city. J. P. Morgan and U. S. Bank have both disclosed ties to the slave trade in documents that we have obtained.

LOS ANGELES: Los Angeles' slavery-disclosure ordinance took effect on October 15, 2003. The law applies to all contracts not exempted from the ordinance; exemptions include investment agreements, pension funds and emergency contracts. The Office of Contract Administration's Bureau of Contract Compliance is responsible for maintaining records and monitoring disclosures under the ordinance and lists the contractors that have filed affidavits under the ordinance on its website. There is no community development fund. So far, the only contractor who has disclosed ties to the slave trade is Aetna.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA: The California Slavery Era Insurance Registry law was the first statewide slavery-disclosure law applicable to insurance companies. It took effect on January 1, 2001. Only insurers are subject to the law - insurance brokers and agents are not. The Department of Insurance compiled the disclosures into a report in May of 2002 and continues to maintain files of the disclosures from both newly licensed and existing insurers.

The insurance commissions of Illinois and Iowa have prepared similar reports, both of which follow California's closely in both methods and results. The Illinois report was prepared pursuant to a law passed by the state legislature, whereas the Iowa report was compiled from voluntarily disclosed data.

DETROIT: Detroit's ordinance applies to "goods or services with which the City enters into a contract, whether or not the contract is subject to a competitive bid." The contract must be more than \$25,000. An affidavit is included in each contract package and is required to do business with the city. Vendors must complete an affidavit for each and every bid. Detroit does not have a database of affidavits. There is not a party, department, or group designated to issue a report. Detroit's ordinance affects the insurance, banking and finance, and textile industries.

Detroit's ordinance neither provides for a fund nor penalizes contractors who do not disclose in good faith. The Director of Finance may void the contract if it is later discovered that the contractor failed to comply with the terms of the ordinance. To date, Detroit has not had one company disclose any ties to or profits from the institution of slavery.

CLEVELAND: Cleveland does not have an ordinance. In December 2005, a resolution to enact a slavery disclosure ordinance was introduced but never passed.

PHILADELPHIA: Philadelphia's ordinance applies to insurance or financial institutions that enter into a contract, whether or not the contract is subject to a competitive bid. After execution of the contract, the contractor must complete an affidavit verifying that the contractor has searched all records. There is an annual report but no fund. Little has been done since the ordinance passed December 15, 2005. Philadelphia has just started sending out affidavits in the past eight months; therefore, no annual report is available.

BERKELEY: Council members Darryl Moore, Max Anderson, and Donna Spring introduced Berkeley's ordinance that passed in 2005. The insurance and finance industries are affected. The ordinance does not provide for a fund or require contractors to file affidavits. Any contractor providing insurance or financial services to the City of Berkeley must disclose any ties to slavery.

PENDING SLAVERY DISCLOSURE LAWS

New York City:

New York's Disclosure of Information Regarding Past Engagement in Slavery by City Contractors –0469-2006 has yet to be implemented. This Ordinance was introduced by NY's City Council November 15, 2006 and is currently pending. The local law, however, does state that a company doing business with the City of New York must search its past history to determine slavery ties.

North Carolina

North Carolina has yet to pass the State Contracts/Slavery Profits Bill. The bill was authored by Representative Larry Womble and passed the House in the 2005 General Assembly session. To become law, the bill must be passed by the state senate and be ratified. Although the Slavery Profits Bill has not been implemented, in 2007, North Carolina passed the House Joint Resolution 1311—General Assembly Regrets Slavery, which essentially apologizes for slavery.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

San Francisco's Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance is somewhat narrower than other jurisdictions' legislation as it exempts several large classes of contractors likely to have had ties to the slave trade. The drafters of the Ordinance made these exceptions because they judged that including them could harm the City's interests, for example, by making its securities less attractive to bond underwriters. Some members of the work group suggested that while *requiring* bond providers to disclose involvement may be problematic, requests for *voluntary* disclosure would probably be markedly less so. This was confirmed by the City Attorney's office. It is assumed that the providers who would be most likely to disclose involvement would be those who have done so elsewhere.

The City Administrator will continue to implement this ordinance by: requiring affidavits from proscribed City contractors; maintaining a collaborative relationship with the AAHCS; and encouraging contributions to the fund.

**Summary of City and State Slavery-Disclosure Laws
August 2007**

Jurisdiction	Berkeley	Chicago	Cleveland	Detroit	Los Angeles	Milwaukee	Oakland	Philadelphia	Richmond (CA)	San Francisco	Wayne County (MI)	California	Illinois	Iowa
Citation	Municipal Code Chapter 13.96	Municipal Code, Chapter 2-92, § 585	Res. 322-03	Detroit Ordinance No. 20-04 Chapter 18 Article V	LA Admin. Code §§ 10.41 et seq.	Milwaukee Code of Ordinances 310.14	Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 9.60	Philadelphia Code § 17-104(2)	Municipal Code, Article II, Chapter 2.29	San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 12W	Code of Ordinances, Article XI, § 120.192(f)	Cal. Ins. Code §§ 13810-13813	Ill. Ins. Code 155.39	House Res. 29
Date passed	14-Jul-05	2-Oct-02	Introduced March 2003; not passed	23-Jun-04	16-Aug-03	31-Oct-05	14-Jun-05	1-Dec-05	1-Mar-05	17-Nov-06		1-Sep-00	24-Jul-03	13-Mar-03
Date effective	13-Aug-05	1-Jan-03		19-Jul-04	15-Oct-03	1-Dec-05	1-Aug-05	15-Dec-05				1-Jan-01	1-Jan-04	
Industries affected	Insurance and finance	All		Insurance, Shipping, Railroads, Tobacco	All not exempted	All	Insurance, finance, textile, tobacco, railroad, shipping, rice, sugar	Insurance, finance	Insurance, finance	Insurance, financial services, textiles	All	Insurance	Insurance	Insurance
Mandatory?		Yes		Yes, for contracts >\$25,000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, for contracts larger than \$20,000	Yes	Yes	No
Fund?	No	No		No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Affidavits?	No	Yes		No	Yes			No	No			Report	Report	Report
Penalty provisions	Contract termination	Contract termination		No penalties enforced	Contract termination and withholding of payments	Contract termination	Contract termination	Contract voided		Liquidated damages equal to net profit on contract		Suspension or revocation of certificate or fine not exceeding \$55,000	None specified	Compliance is voluntary
Contact information	Darryl Moore 510-981-7120	Barbara Lumpkin, Chief Procurement Officer, 312-744-0851 Brian Caminer, General Council Of Procurement Services, 312-744-4900 http://egov.cityofchicago.org:80/city/vcsearch/home.do	Kimberly Moss, City of Cleveland Office of the Council, 216.664.3837 Jim Hardy, Commissioner of Cleveland, 216.664.2629	Carter Stevenson, Team Leader – Purchasing Ordinance, 313-224-4614, steven@cic.detroit.mi.us	Mario Interiano, Bureau of Contract Administration, Office of Contract Compliance, 1149 S. Broadway St. 3rd Floor, LA CA 90015, mario.interiano@lacity.org	Sharon Robinson, Director Department of Administration 200 E. Wells st Room 606 Milwaukee, WI (414) 286-3850	City Administrators Office, One City Hall Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 238 -3301	Ella Jackson, Dept of Contracts Supervisor, 215.686.4763 Pat Rasferde, Chief Clerks Office, 215.686.3411	Bruce Souble, City Attorney's Officer 510-620-6507	City Administrator's office	Madasur Tawakkul 313-224-8269 Victoria Edwards 313-224-5021	http://www.insurance.ca.gov/0100-consumers/0300-public-programs/0200-slavery-era-insur/	http://www.ins.state.il.us/Consumer/SlaveryReporting.nsf	http://www.iid.state.ia.us/educational_materials/slavery.asp


SLAVERY ERA DISCLOSURE AFFIDAVIT

I. I, GREGORY LOCHER, am the authorized representative and custodian of records of MARSH RISK & INSURANCE SERVICES (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

II. ☐ I have ~~located~~ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

III. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 11 day of APRIL, 2007 in SAN FRANCISCO (city), CALIFORNIA (state).


Signature 4/11/07

GREGORY LOCHER
Print Name

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
Title

MARSH RISK & INSURANCE SERVICES
Company Name



Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, Deborah Redmond, am the authorized representative and custodian of records of Aon Risk Services (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☐ I have ~~not~~ ^{could} I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 10 day of July, 2007, in Los Angeles (city), California (state).

Deborah Redmond
Signature

Deborah Redmond
Print name

VP - Human Resources
Title

Aon
Company name

Type of industry: ☐ financial services

☒ insurance

☐ textiles

City contract number (if known): _____

See reverse for definitions.



Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, VICTORIA BROOKS, am the authorized representative and custodian of records of THE CIMA COMPANIES (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☐ I have ☐ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 6TH day of JUNE, 2007, in ALEXANDRIA (city), VIRGINIA (state).

Victoria Brooks
Signature

VICTORIA BROOKS
Print name

Account Executive
Title

THE CIMA COMPANIES
Company name

Type of industry: ☐ financial services
☒ insurance
☐ textiles

City contract number (if known): _____

See reverse for definitions.



Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, Kenneth L. Edlow, am the authorized representative and custodian of records of The Bear Stearns Companies Inc. (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☐ I have ~~X~~ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 24 day of AUGUST, 2007, in New York (city), New York (state).

Kenneth L. Edlow
Signature

Kenneth L. Edlow
Print name

Secretary
Title

The Bear Stearns Companies Inc.
Company name

City contract number (if known): _____

Type of industry: ☒ financial services
☐ insurance
☐ textiles

Exhibit B: our Predecessor company was founded in 1923. There are no 19th century records. This is inapplicable.

See reverse for definitions.



Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, Raafat A. Sarkis, am the authorized representative and custodian of records of Deutsche Bank National Trust Company (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☐ I have ☒ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 23rd day of August, 2007, in San Francisco (city), California (state).

Signature

Raafat A. Sarkis
Print name

Vice President
Title

Deutsche Bank National trust Company
Company name

City contract number (if known): _____

Type of industry: ☒ financial services

☐ insurance

☐ textiles

See reverse for definitions.



Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, KATHRYNE DANIELS am the authorized representative and custodian of records of BANK of AMERICA (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☒ I have ☐ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 2 day of AUGUST, 2007, in SAN FRANCISCO (city), CALIFORNIA (state).

Kathryn A Daniels
Signature

KATHRYNE DANIELS
Print name

Sr. Vice President
Title

BANK of AMERICA
Company name

Type of industry: ☒ financial services

☐ insurance

☐ textiles

City contract number (if known): _____

See reverse for definitions.




Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, DAVID KEPPEL am the authorized representative and custodian of records of U.S. BANK N.A. (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☒ I have ☐ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 31 day of AUGUST, 2007, in SAN FRANCISCO(city), CALIFORNIA (state).


Signature

DAVID O. KEPPEL
Print name

VICE PRESIDENT
Title

U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
Company name

Type of industry: ☒ financial services

☐ insurance

☐ textiles

City contract number (if known): N/A

See reverse for definitions.



Slavery Era Disclosure Affidavit
(San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12Y)

1. I, KERI KOEHLER, am the authorized representative and custodian of records of WELLS FARGO + Co. (Contractor). I have searched, or caused to be searched under my direction, any and all records in the Contractor's possession or control, including records of any parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company, and have made a good faith effort to search any relevant records that are within the Contractor's knowledge but not within its possession or control, for evidence that the Contractor, its parent or subsidiary entity, or its Predecessor Company Participated in the Slave Trade or received Profits from the Slave Trade.

2. ☐ I have ☒ I have not located relevant records. If I have located relevant records, I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit A: (1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and, (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records. If I have not located relevant records, then I am attaching to this affidavit as Exhibit B the names of each parent or subsidiary entity or Predecessor Company whose records I searched or caused to be searched. This information is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

3. I understand that this affidavit shall be subject to public disclosure pursuant to state, local or federal law.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 25 day of SEPTEMBER, 20 08, in SAN FRANCISCO (city), CALIFORNIA (state).

Keri Koehler
Signature

Type of industry: ☒ financial services

KERI KOEHLER
Print name

☐ insurance

☐ textiles

ARCHIVE MANAGER
Title

WELLS FARGO + Co.
Company name

City contract number (if known): _____

See reverse for definitions.

Exhibit B

Bank of Southern Minnesota

Banking House of Tallant & Wilde

Barrows, Millard & Co.

Central Overland California & Pike's Peak Express Company

F. Groos & Co.

First National Bank of Denver

First National Bank of Galesburg

First National Bank of Houghton

First National Bank of Marion

First National Bank of Marquette

First National Bank of Portland

First National Bank of Red Wing

First National Bank of Winona

Millard, Caldwell & Co.

Overland Mail Company

Pioneer Stage Company

San Francisco Accumulating Fund Association

San Francisco Savings Union

Savings and Loan Society of San Francisco

Tallant & Company

United National Bank

Wells Fargo & Co. Bank (San Francisco)

Wells Fargo & Co. Bank (Carson City)

Wells Fargo & Co. Bank (Virginia City)

Wells, Fargo & Company

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORIES

Please visit the City Administrator's website at <http://www.sfgov.org/site/cao>, under "Programs and Projects" to view copies of institutional histories for:

- U.S. Bank
- Bank of America

SUMMER 2007 STUDENT INTERNS

Amanda Clincy graduated from Howard University in Washington D.C, where she studied psychology. Ms. Clincy is currently in a Ph.D. program in psychology at the University of North Carolina.

Tiffany Cook graduated from San Francisco State University in 2007 with majors in political science and criminal justice. Ms. Cook is presently enrolled in a master's program in public policy at Mills College.

Cometria Cooper attended the University of California at Berkeley and majored in history and rhetoric. Ms. Cooper is currently attending the University of San Francisco's School of Law where she is co-president of the Black Law Student Association.

Adam Engelhart holds a bachelor's degree with comprehensive honors from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, with majors in computer science and mathematics. He is currently enrolled in his third year at UC Hastings College of the Law.

Autumn Mays is currently in her last semester at the University of San Francisco, studying sociology. After she graduates, Ms. Mays plans to pursue advanced degrees in criminology and law.

From: [Bullock, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: D8 Mandelman - Request for Excusal - BAC 6.10.2026, 6.11.2026, 6.12.2026
Date: Monday, June 8, 2026 1:22:28 PM
Attachments: [Excusal BAC 6.8.26.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below excusal notice from President Mandelman from the Budget and Appropriations Committee meetings on June 10, June 11, and June 12, 2026.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

***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: Marie, Sophie (BOS) <sophie.marie@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2026 12:32 PM
To: Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: D8 Mandelman - Request for Excusal - BAC 6.10.2026, 6.11.2026, 6.12.2026

Good afternoon clerks,

Please find the attached memo requesting that President Mandelman is excused from Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday's BAC meetings. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Sophie Marie

Chief of Staff

Office of Board President Mandelman, District 8

415-554-6987

President, Board of Supervisors
District 8



City and County of San Francisco

RAFAEL MANDELMAN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair of the Budget and Appropriations Committee

FROM: President Rafael Mandelman, District 8 Supervisor

DATE: June 8, 2026

SUBJECT: Request for Excusal from Budget and Appropriations Committee Meeting, June 10th, 11th, and 12th, 2026

Dear Madam Clerk,

I will be absent from the Budget and Appropriations Committee meetings on June 10th, 11th, and 12th, 2026. I respectfully request to be excused from the meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RfM", written in a cursive style.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Submission by COIT: SF Controller - CSA Surveillance Technology Report (Rec. #6)
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 11:36:00 AM
Attachments: [CSA Audit of 19B - Rec 6 - COIT Risk Analysis \(6.1.26\).pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached report from COIT.

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.sf.gov/bos

From: McCaffrey, Edward (ADM) <Edward.Mccaffrey@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2026 10:58 AM
To: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Petrucione, Katharine (ADM) <katharine.petrucione@sfgov.org>; Chrusciel, Julia (ADM) <julia.chrusciel@sfgov.org>; Skelly, Maeve (BOS) <maeve.skelly@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; BOS Clerks Office (BOS) <clerksoffice@sfgov.org>; Yip, Angela (ADM) <angela.yip@sfgov.org>
Subject: Submission by COIT: SF Controller - CSA Surveillance Technology Report (Rec. #6)

Dear President Mandelman and Madam Clerk,

On behalf of the Committee on Information Technology (COIT), I am pleased to share the attached analysis of alternative surveillance technology risk frameworks, submitted in response to Recommendation #6 from the Office of the Controller's October 2025 audit of San Francisco's Chapter 19B Surveillance Technology Program. (The Controller's full report can be found by [clicking here](#).)

As outlined in the report titled *The City Should Consider Risk-Based Monitoring of*

Surveillance Technology, COIT was asked to analyze alternative approaches to surveillance technology oversight and present findings to the Board of Supervisors. The attached memo fulfills this requirement by examining three distinct risk-assessment frameworks adopted by jurisdictions nationwide, assessing their operational implications, and comparing them to San Francisco's current model. This analysis reinforces the effectiveness of San Francisco's existing approach while providing important context about the national landscape of surveillance technology governance.

In conducting this research, COIT identified lessons from peer cities that will inform how the City's program continues to evolve and strengthen over time.

Best,

Eddie

Edward J. McCaffrey
Director, Committee on Information Technology
City and County of San Francisco



To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Committee on Information Technology
Date: Monday, June 1, 2026
Subject: Analysis of Alternative Surveillance Technology Risk Frameworks

Executive Summary

In an effort to enhance the city's surveillance technology oversight program, Committee on Information Technology (COIT) staff has conducted an analysis of common approaches to surveillance technology oversight and risk-assessment frameworks. The analysis reviewed tools used by jurisdictions across the country with the goal to better understand best practices, recent policy developments, operational implications and transparency considerations. The work identified three alternative frameworks, summarized below, that municipalities deploy regularly and confirmed the effectiveness of San Francisco's current approach. COIT staff will utilize the research and findings from this effort to guide the ongoing evolution of the City's surveillance technology program.

Background on COIT's Surveillance Technology Program

Established by the passage of the 19B Ordinance in 2019, San Francisco's Surveillance Technology Program created a comprehensive oversight structure that requires all departments to obtain Board of Supervisors (BOS) approval before acquiring or using surveillance technologies. This work is supported by detailed surveillance technology policies and surveillance impact reports that specify authorized uses, privacy protections, data practices, and accountability requirements. COIT, supported by its Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB), serves as the central coordinating body for this oversight, providing technical review, policy guidance, and public forums for community input on surveillance technology proposals. COIT's oversight framework for surveillance technology has created significant transparency and accountability for use of surveillance technology in the City. The program's public inventory allows residents, advocates, and policymakers to track exactly what surveillance technologies City departments use, how they operate, and what safeguards govern their deployment. Through the biannual reporting requirement, departments regularly account for their surveillance technology use, report policy violations, assess cost-benefit ratios, and demonstrate whether technologies are achieving their stated purposes. This ongoing accountability mechanism has enabled the Board of Supervisors and the public to make informed decisions about whether surveillance technologies serve the public interest, whether additional protections are needed, and, in some cases, whether continued use is justified.

Alternative Risk Framework Research & Findings

After conducting a broad review and analysis of surveillance technology oversight approaches across the country, COIT identified three distinct frameworks that municipalities utilize most frequently. These frameworks represent different policy choices for evaluation and management of technology risks, and each presents distinct operational and transparency implications for oversight programs.

- **Framework 1: Jurisdictions Without Formal Risk Assessment Structures**

Many jurisdictions lack formal surveillance technology oversight frameworks or comprehensive data privacy protections. Without this structure in place, municipalities lack mechanisms to document or enforce consistent security practices, exposing them to multiple risks including privacy violations, unaccountable technology deployment, civil liberties concerns, and erosion of public trust in local government operations. Furthermore, without structured review processes, these jurisdictions may experience increased cybersecurity risks, reduced transparency in technology deployment decisions, and limited mechanisms for addressing privacy concerns. In recent years, major U.S. cities including Baltimore, Atlanta and Oakland have experienced significant cybersecurity attacks. Jurisdictions, such as San Francisco, with formal surveillance technology oversight frameworks require departments to document their data collection, storage, and security practices as part of the policy approval process. This mandatory documentation and accountability creates visibility into data vulnerabilities and ensures that security standards are applied consistently and reduce the likelihood of damaging cybersecurity incidents. Additionally, the absence of formal risk assessment makes it difficult for residents to understand how local government collects and protects their personal data and limits agencies and departments from implementing the necessary guidance on privacy-protective practices. San Francisco's surveillance technology framework provides clear accountability mechanisms and allows the public to track how City technologies are deployed. The City's framework reduces ambiguity about what technologies are in use and demonstrates commitment to transparent governance---factors that research on government trust suggests are important to public confidence in local institutions.

- **Framework 2: Department-Based Risk Categorization Models**

Some jurisdictions categorize surveillance technologies (high, medium, low risk) based on the type of department deploying them. Under this approach, certain technologies are presumed to be inherently high-risk and subject to rigorous oversight, for example law enforcement, while technologies deployed by departments other than public safety are presumed to be low or medium-risk and may face reduced review requirements. This system assigns oversight intensity based on departmental or service type rather than analyzing the actual sensitivity of the type of data collected and processed by each specific technology. While this approach offers administrative efficiency, it presents challenges for comprehensive privacy protection. Data sensitivity varies significantly across departments and technologies---departments such as the Department of Public Health and Human Services Agency routinely handle highly sensitive client information including medical records and benefit eligibility data. A department-based system may overlook these privacy risks and create inconsistent oversight standards for technologies with similar data sensitivity profiles. Additionally, department-based categorization can introduce ambiguity about which technologies require policy development leading to inconsistent application across the City. San Francisco's data-centric model addresses this challenge by

anchoring risk assessment to intrinsic properties of data rather than departmental assumptions, ensuring consistent treatment of similar privacy risks across the organization.

- **Framework 3: Comprehensive Systems Without Exemptions**

Some jurisdictions have adopted a strict approach, subjecting all technologies that collect personal data to formal surveillance technology review without exemptions for routine operational systems. While this maximizes the scope of oversight, it raises important questions about administrative feasibility and the most effective allocation of limited review resources. Technologies such as human resources systems, payroll databases, and emergency response tools necessarily process personal information but pose limited privacy risks if standard security and retention practices are applied. San Francisco's 19B Ordinance includes 17 exemptions for these types of operational systems. This exemption structure reflects national best practices---jurisdictions with comparable privacy laws similarly maintain exemptions to ensure that review resources focus on technologies with meaningful privacy implications. Applying oversight to technologies presenting actual privacy risks allows San Francisco to achieve more effective accountability while maintaining manageable administrative requirements for departments and oversight bodies.

Current Risk Framework

San Francisco administers surveillance technology oversight through a mature, objective risk assessment model grounded in the Citywide Data Classification Standard, which aligns with National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) guidance and reflects a broader national trend. Other large U.S. cities including New York City, Los Angeles, San Jose and Seattle have similarly grounded their surveillance technology governance in federal privacy standards and structured data classification systems, recognizing that assessing risk based on data sensitivity rather than departmental assumptions provides more consistent and equitable oversight. Under Chapter 19B, COIT evaluates every surveillance technology for both benefits and risks, with collected data classified according to a five-level sensitivity scale ranging from publicly available to highly restricted. This data-centric approach ensures that oversight is tied to the essential privacy risks of data collection and use, rather than assumptions about departmental functions.

COIT embeds risk evaluation throughout a technology's lifecycle---from initial procurement identification through policy development to ongoing biannual reporting. The framework includes continuous procurement monitoring, maintenance of the public Surveillance Technology Inventory, structured policy review processes, and standardized compliance reporting. Critically, this model is uniformly applied across all departments, while allowing operational flexibility for department-specific confidentiality needs and access controls.

Conclusions

Grounding oversight decisions in the sensitivity of the data and the use of the technology allows the City to ensure consistent privacy standards across all technologies and aligns with federal privacy frameworks. San Francisco's ongoing procurement monitoring, biannual reporting requirements, and public inventory provide mechanisms to identify emerging privacy risks and adjust policies as technologies and practices evolve. This allows the City to refine privacy protections based on operational experience and lessons learned rather than attempting to predict all risks at initial policy approval. While COIT remains committed to the Chapter 19B mandate to protect resident privacy and enable responsible technology use, this analysis will help to inform the ongoing evolution of the Surveillance Technology Program.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Update on SFPD Mandated Report under Chapter 96A.3
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 4:36:00 PM
Attachments: [2026_Q1_Letter_Extension_Signed.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached report extension notification from the Police Department.

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.sf.gov/bos

From: Lam, Terry (POL) <terry.lam@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2026 12:47 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Fountain, Chris (POL) <Christine.Fountain@sfgov.org>; Nicita, Carl (POL) <carl.nicita@sfgov.org>; Cunningham, Jason (POL) <jason.cunningham@sfgov.org>; Gorman, Patrick (POL) <patrick.gorman@sfgov.org>
Subject: Update on SFPD Mandated Report under Chapter 96A.3

Good Afternoon Madam Clerk,

Please see attached letter from Chief Derrick Lew. Your assistance is appreciated in the distribution to the members of the Board.

Thank you.

Very Respectfully,
Terry Lam, MSDA, PMP
Sr Analyst (Acting Supervisor)
Business Analysis Team (BAT), Crime Strategies Division
San Francisco Police Department

Email or MS Teams: terry.lam@sfgov.org (Preferred contact method)
Office: 415-837-7013



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEADQUARTERS
1245 3RD Street
San Francisco, California, 94158



DERRICK J. LEW
CHIEF OF POLICE

May 27, 2026

The Honorable Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable C. Don Clay
President, Police Commission
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

Director Mawuli Tugbenyoh
Executive Director, Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Mandelman, Commissioner Clay, and Director Tugbenyoh:

RE: First Quarter 2026 Report – Chapter 96A (Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements) and Chapter 96E (Domestic Violence Data Reporting)

The reporting requirements under Chapter 96A, including officer activity reporting (Sections 96A.3 and 96A.4), crime victim data (Section 96A.5), and Domestic Violence Reporting under Chapter 96E, for 2026 Quarter 1 (January, February, and March) will be delayed.

The San Francisco Police Department is transitioning its Quarterly Activity and Data Report to a series of publicly accessible online dashboards. These dashboards will replace a significant portion of the traditional “paper” QADR with interactive, explorable data that will be updated quarterly in alignment with submissions to the California Department of Justice. The Stop Dashboards are available at: [SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department](#).

Beginning with the Q1 2025 report, the Department incorporated three additional benchmark measures alongside the Census Population benchmark: the Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) index, the Suspect Adjusted Disparity (SAD) Index, and the Not-at-Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout (TAL) Index. Each utilizes a distinct methodology to provide enhanced context and more comprehensive benchmarking of departmental interactions.

We appreciate your patience as the Department completes this transition and continues its commitment to transparency, accountability, and public access to data. Should you have any questions, please contact Government Affairs Manager Carl Nicita at Carl.Nicita@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

DERRICK J. LEW
Chief of Police

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Issued: Revenue Letter for FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 4:51:28 PM
Attachments: [FY26-27_and_FY27-28_Revenue_Letter_-_6.9.26.pdf](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the Office of the Controller (CON), submitting Controller's Discussion of the Mayor's proposed Budget for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2026-2027 and 2027-2028.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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

From: San Francisco Controller's Office Reports <controller.reports@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 4:39 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Issued: Revenue Letter for FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28



The Charter requires that the Controller comment on revenue estimates assumed in the Mayor's FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 proposed budget. We find revenue assumptions to be reasonable, but caution they are highly dependent on conditions in the greater economy as well as administrative and legislative changes at the local, state, and federal levels. The proposed budget makes meaningful progress toward closing the structural deficit and grows reserves. However, there are continuing challenges ahead. The budget will require frequent monitoring and is subject to updates as conditions change.

[Download the Full Report](#)

Image



[Sign up to receive news and updates](#)

Search all Controller's Office reports



This is a send-only email address.

For questions about the report, please contact Michelle Allersma Director of Budget and Analysis at michelle.allersma@sfgov.org.

For press queries, please contact the Controller's Office at controller@sfgov.org.

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

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place | San Francisco, CA 94102 US

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 Revenue Letter


Controller's Discussion of the Mayor's Proposed Budget



Prepared by

**OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
BUDGET AND ANALYSIS DIVISION**

June 9, 2026



About the Controller's Office

The Controller is the chief financial officer and auditor for the City and County of San Francisco. We produce regular reports on the City's financial condition, economic condition, and the performance of City government. We are also responsible for key aspects of the City's financial operations — from processing payroll for City employees to processing and monitoring the City's budget.

Our team includes financial, tech, accounting, analytical and other professionals who work hard to secure the City's financial integrity and promote efficient, effective, and accountable government. We strive to be a model for good government and to make the City a better place to live and work.

About Budget & Analysis Division

The Budget and Analysis Division (BAD) manages the technical development of the City's annual budget, including forecasting tax revenues, costing and budgeting labor and benefit costs, and assisting the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with costing and budgeting of policy initiatives. The group manages the City's adherence to voter-approved spending requirements and financial policies and produces a variety of reports, including quarterly budget status updates and various fee-related reports. Additionally, the division manages property tax apportionment, rate setting, and reporting to the state, places special assessments on property tax bills, and processes the Assessor's changes to prior and current year property tax rolls.

For more information, please contact:

Michelle Allersma, Director
Office of the Controller
City and County of San Francisco
michelle.allersma@sfgov.org

Carol Lu, Citywide Revenue Manager
Office of the Controller
City and County of San Francisco
carol.lu@sfgov.org

Media inquiries:
con.media@sfgov.org

 [sfgov/controller](https://www.sfgov.org/controller)

 [@sfcontroller](https://twitter.com/sfcontroller)

 [Controller's Office LinkedIn](#)

Executive Summary

The Charter and other local laws require the Controller to comment on the reasonableness of the revenues assumed in the Mayor's proposed budget, as well as whether various other financial requirements are met. **We find revenue assumptions to be reasonable**, but caution they are highly dependent on conditions in the greater economy as well as administrative and legislative changes at the local, state and federal levels. The proposed budget makes important progress toward closing the structural deficit with approximately \$300 million in ongoing savings, makes prudent use of reserves to address known risks, and establishes reserves to address anticipated risks in funding for programs affecting housing and people experiencing homelessness.

However, significant risks to the adopted budget and longer-term financial forecast remain. The outcome of several potential measures proposed for the November 2026 ballot could result in the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars assumed as sources in the proposed budget and Five-Year Financial Plan, affecting service levels and adding significantly to the structural deficit. In addition, the second year of the proposed budget relies on an assumption of nearly \$80 million in unspecified position reductions that will need to be identified in the coming months, and it assumes that \$51.7 million in funding for new staffing to mitigate the impacts of H.R. 1 federal reductions will be required for only two years. Despite progress toward reducing the structural deficit, the proposed budget also relies on the use of one-time sources, particularly in FY 2027-28, when use of General Fund balance increases to \$462.5 million from \$42.4 million in FY 2026-27. Finally, the budget is subject to heightened uncertainty in its health department revenues and proposed state and local revenue measures. For all of these reasons, the budget will require active monitoring and potential corrective actions by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors as conditions change.

Findings

Key financial and economic highlights in the Mayor's proposed budget:

- **Tax revenue.** General Fund tax revenue grows by \$143.0 million (or 2.9%) in FY 2026-27 compared to the FY 2025-26 Nine Month Report and declines by \$50.4 million (or 1.0%) in FY 2027-28. Business tax revenue grows in the first year of the budget because of strength in technology and professional services as well as administrative changes related to Proposition M (2024) that shifted revenue that previously would have been received in FY 2025-26 into FY 2026-27. The forecast assumes the City's commercial real estate "reset" continues, resulting in sustained transfer tax revenue and a deposit to the Budget Stabilization Reserve. However, with commercial market values often below assessed values, property transactions may restrain growth in property tax revenue. The volume of commercial assessment appeals decisions and related refunds is expected to continue growing, putting downward pressure on revenues. Modest growth is expected for other economically sensitive taxes, such as sales and hotel taxes, which remain below pre-pandemic levels.
- **Public health revenue.** The Department of Public Health's (DPH) revenues are projected to grow by \$66.8 million in FY 2026-27 and decline by \$26.8 million in FY 2027-28. H.R. 1, the July 2025 federal budget reconciliation bill, and state Medi-Cal cuts are expected to reduce revenues by \$61.6 million and \$165.0 million in the budget years, as detailed below. Absent these federal and state cuts, revenues would have grown by \$128.4 million in FY 2026-27 and \$76.6 million in FY 2027-28. Strength in public

health revenue is primarily in Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG), Behavioral Health, Primary Care, and Jail Health. At ZSFG and the San Francisco Health Network, growth is largely due to increases in Medi-Cal managed care supplemental funding, Medi-Cal Graduate Medical Education (GME), and Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) payments. In Behavioral Health, revenue growth aligns with current year trends and is driven by sustained growth in behavioral health patient services and continued implementation of CalAIM revenue programs. Primary Care revenue growth is supported by improving timely access to care, increasing capacity, and increasing the percentage of visits paid. With the launch of the CalAIM Justice-Involved Initiative, Jail Health began billing Medi-Cal for eligible services. Its revenue increase is driven by better than anticipated Medi-Cal reimbursements for in-custody health services and discharge pharmacy programs.

- H.R. 1 impact.** The public-health related revenue changes above include estimated revenue losses of \$61.6 million in FY 2026-27 and \$165.0 million in FY 2027-28 due to federal and state policy changes related to H.R. 1. The March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan assumed revenue losses at DPH and the Human Services Agency (HSA) from H.R. 1 and related state policy changes of \$84.5 million in FY 2026-27 and \$221.8 million in FY 2027-28. Effective January 2027, over 100,000 HSA clients currently enrolled in Medi-Cal will be required to undergo semiannual, rather than annual, eligibility review, including income verification, work requirements, and documentation updates. The proposed budget includes one-time spending of \$22.5 million in FY 2026-27 and \$29.2 million in FY 2027-28 for HSA staffing, non-personnel, and grants to address this significant increase in workload, with the goal of maintaining eligibility for as many Medi-Cal and CalFresh clients as possible. The proposed budget assumes this new spending will maintain enrollment for 70 percent of affected clients, which will improve public health revenue by \$34.2 million over the two budget years compared to the March 2026 deficit assumptions, which did not assume any new spending to maintain eligibility.

Exhibit A. Impact of H.R. 1 and Related State Budget Changes

	March Deficit		Mayor's Budget	
	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
1. DPH - State MediCal Payments	(4.8)	(9.7)	-	(9.7)
2. DPH - Supplemental Payment Programs	(60.2)	(128.3)	(80.4)	(158.2)
3. DPH - MediCal Disenrollment	-	(57.8)	(16.9)	(98.4)
4. DPH - Uncompensated Care Claiming	-	-	35.6	101.2
5. HSA - CalFresh Administrative Cost Sharing	(19.5)	(26.0)	(5.1)	(6.7)
6. HSA - H.R.1 Implementation Initiative	-	-	(22.5)	(29.2)
Total of H.R.1 and Related State Budget Changes	(84.5)	(221.8)	(89.2)	(200.9)

Taking into account new spending in the proposed budget, the estimated revenue impact of federal H.R. 1 and state policy changes is \$66.7 million in FY 2026-27 and \$171.7 million in FY 2027-28, which is an improvement of \$67.9 million over the two years compared to the March 2026 financial forecast. The proposed budget assumes no impact in FY 2026-27 from State Medi-Cal payment reductions but reduces revenue by \$9.7 million in FY 2027-28. Supplemental payment program revenue losses of \$80.4 million in FY 2026-27 and \$158.2 million in FY 2027-28 represent the single largest contributor to the total revenue loss. Medi-Cal disenrollment adds a further loss of \$16.9 million in FY 2026-27 and \$98.4 million in FY 2027-28, reflecting reduced reimbursement as current Medi-Cal clients lose coverage. These losses are partially offset by uncompensated care claiming, a federal Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) reimbursement DPH can claim for care provided to uninsured individuals, which

provides estimated offsetting revenue of \$35.6 million in FY 2026-27 and \$101.2 million in FY 2027-28. Uncompensated care claiming is subject to a cap, which limits the extent to which costs for uncompensated care can be recovered. Higher levels of Medi-Cal disenrollment will increase unreimbursed uncompensated care costs. Additionally, H.R. 1 reduces the federal share of CalFresh administrative costs, which are shared across federal, state, and county governments, from 50 percent to 25 percent. The Governor's proposed budget partially backfills this shift, resulting in estimated revenue losses of \$5.1 million in FY 2026-27 and \$6.7 million in FY 2027-28, a \$33.7 million improvement from the March 2026 deficit assumption.

Revenue projections in the budget are subject to significant implementation risk. The budget assumes increased eligibility workers and employment services staffing in HSA will maintain benefits for 70 percent of affected clients enrolled, but the actual impact will depend on H.R. 1 implementation, which remains uncertain. Further, the budget does not assume increased costs in other parts of the healthcare system, such as higher emergency services utilization by individuals who lose Medi-Cal coverage. The net fiscal impact could be greater than assumed in the proposed budget and will require ongoing reporting and adjustments.

- **Ongoing solutions. The proposed budget makes progress toward closing the structural deficit, with approximately \$300 million in ongoing savings.** The March 2026 Five Year Plan Update forecasted a gap of \$741.7 million in FY 2028-29. Our preliminary review of proposed ongoing and one-time solutions indicates the shortfall is likely to be approximately \$450 million in FY 2028-29, growing in subsequent years. Roughly half of the ongoing solutions are comprised of increased tax and public health revenue while the remaining are driven by reductions in citywide personnel costs and other initiatives. Continued improvement in the structural deficit will require additional revenue increases or expenditure reductions in future years.
- **Position shifts.** Citywide, the Mayor's proposed budget reduces authorized and funded positions by 32 full-time equivalents (FTE) in FY 2026-27 and 249 FTE in FY 2027-28. Within General Fund-supported operations, however, funded positions increase by 129 FTE in FY 2026-27 then decrease by 324 FTE in FY 2027-28. FY 2026-27 increases include staffing at the newly expanded psychiatric emergency ward at Zuckerberg San Francisco General hospital and DPH behavioral health facilities and a (cost neutral) shift of staff from the Department of Building Inspection to the Planning Department. In addition, the budget includes project-funded positions in HSA (114 FTE in FY 2026-27 and an additional 34 FTE in FY 2027-28) to perform H.R. 1-related eligibility work. The decrease in funded positions in FY 2027-28 is driven primarily by attrition savings equal to 378 FTE positions across 22 departments. These unspecified position cuts include 113 FTE at DPH and 48 FTE at HSA, with the remainder spread among 22 other departments.

Despite position cuts, salary and fringe benefit costs are growing due to negotiated wage increases and health and retirement benefit obligations. Labor agreements with miscellaneous employees include a raise of 4.5% in FY 2026-27, including 2.5% effective June 30, 2027, the last day of the agreement. FY 2027-28 is an open contract year for which the budget assumes a 0.6% increase, though costs may change pending negotiations. Public safety employee raises are 3% in FY 2026-27 and 3% in FY 2027-28. Budgeted health rates increase by 9.5% in FY 2026-27 and 9.5% in FY 2027-28 and employer contributions to retirement grow from 16.5% in the current year to 16.7% in FY 2026-27 and 17.5% in FY 2027-28.

- **One-time solutions.** The proposed budget assumes the use of \$696.1 million of General Fund one-time sources over the two budget years, \$175.6 million more than assumed in the March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan. These sources include the draw down of \$505.0 million in prior year fund balance and \$191.1 million of reserves. Consistent with the March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan, the budget designates \$261.4 million of unappropriated fund balance for balancing future budget shortfalls in FY 2028-29 and after. **We find the budgeted use of reserves to be prudent and commensurate with known financial risks. The increase in the use of fund balance in the second year of the budget, from \$42.4 million in FY 2026-27 to \$462.5 million in FY 2027-28, represents a temporary budget solution that will need to be replaced by recurring revenue increases or expenditure reductions in future years.** Reserve uses include:

Federal & State Revenue Risk Reserve. The projected starting balance of this reserve to address funding shocks from federal and state policy making, including H.R. 1, is \$433.3 million. The budget proposes spending approximately 10% of this reserve in each budget year (\$41.4 million in FY 2026-27 and \$43.5 million in FY 2027-28), leaving \$350.7 million balance. Uses of the reserve include \$34 million to fund off-budget project-based positions (82 FTE in FY 2026-27 and an additional 44 FTE in FY 2027-28) and other costs at the Human Services Agency to help maintain Medi-Cal and CalFresh eligibility. Although budgeted as one-time cost, positions supporting core eligibility work are likely an ongoing expense. Policymakers will need to make choices about level of service going forward as the reserve is drawn down.

Business Tax Stabilization Reserve. The Mayor's proposed budget uses the \$29.5 million balance of the Business Tax Stabilization Reserve in FY 2027-28 to partially offset a business tax revenue timing shift related to Proposition M (2024) administrative changes.

In addition to withdrawals from the Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve, the budget also continues to appropriate \$70.9 million of reserves in FY 2026-27 that were previously appropriated in the prior budget cycle. This budget complies with the City's nonrecurring revenue policy in Administrative Code Section 10.61, which requires that one-time sources be spent on one-time uses such as capital, equipment, H.R. 1 investments, and information technology. Proposed spending in capital and equipment exceeds the amounts assumed in the March Update to the Five Year Financial Plan.

- **We find the proposed establishment of a Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Reserve to be prudent and commensurate with known financial risks.** The FY 2025-26 Nine-Month Budget Status Report projected Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax revenue of \$434.0 million, nearly \$100 million above budget. The proposed budget assumes revenues of \$465.2 million in FY 2026-27 and \$444.9 million in FY 2027-28. Section 32.3 of the administrative provisions of the Mayor's proposed budget assigns \$98.0 million of unappropriated fund balance from FY 2025-26 to the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Revenue Reserve, a contingency reserve to manage revenue risks related to potential reductions in federal and state funding. The proposed budget also appropriates \$8.25 million in both budget years from the Our City, Our Home fund to the new Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund set aside approved by voters in November 2024 (Proposition G).

- **The final adopted budget will require active monitoring and management by departments, the Mayor, and the Board of Supervisors, given economic and financial risks.** These include significant H.R. 1 related implementation risk, the possibility of a slowing local economic recovery or recession, and the unusually high potential financial impact of measures on the November 2026 ballot. Additionally, close monitoring and management of personnel spending will be required for departments to stay within budgets.

Other key local requirements and legislative proposals:

- **Reserve deposits.** The proposed budget makes required deposits of \$163.1 million to the Budget Stabilization and General Reserves. Budget Stabilization Reserve deposits in FY 2026-27 of \$35.9 million and in FY 2027-28 of \$68.8 million are triggered by the expectation that transfer tax will exceed the prior five-year average. The proposed budget also makes required General Reserve deposits of \$41.5 million and \$16.9 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively. These deposits are required by Financial Policies previously adopted by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The City is not eligible to withdraw from Economic Stabilization Reserves as General Fund revenues are rising.
- **The Mayor's proposed budget adheres to all voter-adopted spending mandates.** All voter-adopted spending requirements are met or exceeded at a direct General Fund cost of at least \$1.2 billion in each of the two fiscal years. The baselines include mandated spending on transit, libraries, schools, early childhood education, homelessness housing and services, street trees, and other programs. The budget also funds the new Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund adopted in November 2024 (Proposition G).
- **Minimum Compensation Ordinance.** The Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO), Article 111 of the Labor and Employment Code, sets a minimum compensation rate for employees at public entities and nonprofit organizations that have contracts with the City. The Code specifies that, if fully funded in the budget, the MCO rate for nonprofit organizations increases with the annual change in the Consumer Price Index for the San Francisco metropolitan area. Beginning July 1, 2026, the rate would be \$23.50. For public entities, the rate is legislatively set at \$25.00 on September 1, 2026 and \$25.50 on January 1, 2027. The Mayor's budget appropriates \$10.3 million and \$13.4 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively, to support the MCO, which exceeds the amount required to fully fund the direct wage impacts of the minimum compensation increases. The Mayor's Office intends to introduce a technical adjustment to increase the FY 2026-27 nonprofit contractor Cost of Doing Business and use FY 2027-28 savings to partially offset the loss of excess ERAF revenue due to the State budget.

Key risks to the budget

While the revenue assumptions in the Mayor's proposed budget are reasonable, the City faces financial risks in coming fiscal years, including the projected structural budget gap following depletion of one-time funds; state and local measures before the City and State legislatures and voters that could increase or decrease revenue and increase costs; federal budget risk and potential disallowance of claims for reimbursement of emergency response costs; state budget revenue risk; and wider economic risks that could derail revenue forecasts.

- State and Local Legislative Proposals** San Franciscans and Californians will vote on various proposals that would change local and state revenue streams in the November 2026 elections. Additionally, the City and state legislature are considering proposals that would change local tax revenue. The only revenue proposals assumed in this budget are the local parcel tax and regional sales tax measures on the November 2026 ballot that would generate operating funds for the MTA. The table and notes below lay out the various proposals and their associated fiscal impact to the City's General Fund. Note that the various proposals changing Real Property Transfer Tax would impact the same revenue stream. The table below shows the maximum possible impact to Transfer Tax revenue flowing to the General Fund in each year for illustrative purposes.

Exhibit B. Fiscal Impact of Selected November 2026 Proposals

Proposed Legislation (Nov 2026)	Ballot	Tax Impacted	Passage Assumed in Budget	Risk			
				FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30
MTA Parcel Tax	San Francisco	Parcel Tax	Yes	-	166.0	166.0	166.0
Connect Bay Area: Regional Sales Tax	Bay Area Counties	Sales Tax	Yes	17.0	155.0	155.0	155.0
Housing Trust Fund	San Francisco	N/A - General Fund Allocation	No	-	-	6.1	13.6
Risk - Subtotal				17.0	321.0	327.1	334.6
Transfer Tax Proposals							
BUILD Act	San Francisco	Real Property Transfer Tax	No	93.8	96.4	98.8	101.2
Affordable Housing Guarantee Act	San Francisco	Real Property Transfer Tax	No	114.1	117.3	120.4	123.6
Local Taxpayer Protection Act to Save Proposition 13	State	Real Property Transfer Tax	No	-	-	349.2	357.6
Maximum Transfer Tax Impact Per Year				114.1	117.3	349.2	357.6
Total Risk				131.1	438.3	676.3	692.2

June 2, 2026 Business Tax Measures

The budget does not assume the passage of either business tax measures on the local June 2 ballot, neither of which appears to have passed. These measures include Proposition C, which would reduce business tax revenue by \$30 million to \$40 million per year, and Proposition D, which would increase the overpaid executive tax revenue by approximately \$250 million to \$300 million annually beginning in FY 2028-29.

Transit Tax Measures

The proposed budget does assume that two revenue measures on the November 2026 ballot supporting the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) will pass. The budget includes \$166.0 million in local parcel tax revenue in FY 2027-28 and revenue from a regional sales tax measure of \$17.0 in FY 2026-27 and \$155.0 million in FY 2027-28. Should these measures fail, there will be significant pressure to use the General Fund to backfill some portion of the resulting \$338 million shortfall to avoid drastic

service cuts. The FY 2026-27 MTA budget assumes \$200 million in state loan proceeds from a total of \$590 million approved for Bay Area transit systems in SB117. Additional state funding beyond this loan appears unlikely.

Deep transit service cuts would significantly impact San Francisco, especially the downtown core that drives the City's economy. The City historically achieved its economic vitality by connecting skilled labor across the Bay Area to businesses concentrated in the City's central business district via mass transit. Full occupancy of this area is not possible without the Bay Area's network of light and heavy rail trains, buses, and streetcars. Potential reductions in transit operations could weaken the city's access to regional talent, pushing existing businesses to relocate and prospective businesses to expand in other cities instead of San Francisco. Combined, these factors could drive down office attendance and economic activity and reduce the tax revenues that depend on them, including sales, commercial rent, gross receipts, transfer, and other taxes.

Housing Trust Fund

The proposed budget does not assume a proposed Charter amendment to extend and increase the annual contribution to the Housing Trust Fund from approximately \$50.0 million in FY 2026-27 to \$125.0 million over the next ten fiscal years. The additional funding would support the creation, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable rental and ownership housing and other housing stabilization activities outlined in Charter Section 16.110. Should voters adopt the measure in November 2026, the General Fund impact would be \$6.1 million in FY 2028-29, \$13.6 million in FY 2029-30, and thereafter grow by an additional \$9.0 million each year until reaching nearly \$60 million by FY 20234-35, assuming no temporary freezes or reductions.

Real Property Transfer Tax Proposals

The proposed budget does not assume any changes to the City's real property transfer tax. Currently proposed measures that could potentially be adopted or submitted to voters include a local ordinance, Real Property Transfer Tax Rates and Penalties (File 260178), a statewide ballot initiative, the Local Taxpayer Protection Act to Save Proposition 13, and a local ballot initiative, the Affordable Housing Guarantee Act. Taken individually (not contemplating interaction effects if multiple measures are approved), we estimate the impact as follows.

- [Real Property Transfer Tax Rates and Penalties \(File 260178\)](#) (also known as the BUILD Act) – The budget does not assume approval of this ordinance, which is currently pending at the Board of Supervisors and would decrease revenue by an estimated \$93.8 million in FY 2026-27, \$96.4 million in FY 2027-28, \$98.8 million in FY 2028-29, and \$101.2 million in FY 2029-30. The budget also does not assume any changes to the way the City taxes trustee deeds and deeds in lieu of foreclosure transactions, although we are aware that a proposal may be put forward to voters on the November 2026 ballot to tax these transactions.
- [Affordable Housing Guarantee Act](#) – The current text of this potential November 2026 ballot initiative would not reduce total City revenue, but it would redirect the entirety of the revenue generated by the rate increases approved in November 2020 Proposition I from the General Fund to a special revenue fund for affordable housing, reducing fiscal flexibility and increasing the General Fund deficit. Revenue generated by Proposition I, which doubled the tax rate on transactions over \$10 million, is estimated to be \$114.1 million in FY 2026-27 and \$117.3 million in FY 2027-28.

- [Local Taxpayer Protection Act to Save Proposition 13](#) – The current text of this statewide ballot initiative, impacting local transfer taxes two years after enactment, would decrease revenue by an estimated \$349.2 million in FY 2028-29 and \$357.6 million in FY 2029-30, as described below.
- **State Constitutional Amendment** A state constitutional amendment, titled the California Two-Thirds Vote Requirement for Special Taxes and Charter City Real Estate Transfer Tax Prohibition Initiative, has qualified for the statewide November 3, 2026 ballot. The measure would amend the California Constitution to increase the vote requirement to pass citizen-initiated local special taxes from a simple majority (50%+1) to a two-thirds (66.67%) vote; prohibit charter cities from imposing their own real estate transfer taxes above the existing statutory rate; and invalidate any property-related special taxes previously adopted with an approval rate below two-thirds or real estate transfer taxes in charter cities. This would effectively eliminate the City's real property transfer tax revenue, worth over \$350 million annually. Additionally, it could also invalidate several other citizen-initiated measures on the November 2026 ballot if they do not secure two-thirds approval, including both transit measures, effective December 31, 2028. Proponents of this measure have until June 25 to withdraw it from the state ballot.
- **Federal Funding Risk** In addition to increased costs and reduced revenues resulting from H.R. 1, the City faces continued risks to funding for a wide variety of programs, for example, recent proposals to reduce funding for permanent and supportive housing programs such as Continuum of Care, Emergency Housing Vouchers, and Housing Choice Vouchers. While the budget assumes no revenue from the reimbursement of disaster response cost claims made to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Agency has disallowed over \$400 million of costs for shelter during the COVID-19 pandemic, of which \$148.0 million were already reimbursed in prior years. The City has filed appeals of some disallowed costs and is proceeding with an arbitration process to protect this funding. Going forward, the FEMA Review Council's Final Report issued in May 2026 recommends reducing the federal Public Assistance cost share from 75% to 50%, with the remaining 50% split among state and local governments, representing a significant increase in local costs for disaster response.

Overall, federal agencies have terminated, frozen, or conditioned grants and funding that City departments rely on for ongoing programming. While the City and other plaintiffs have filed litigation challenging these actions and have successfully obtained court orders blocking many of them, the federal government is appealing court losses and implementing new funding cuts and conditions, resulting in ongoing revenue risk.

- **State Budget Risk** The May Revised Budget funding increases for K-12 education would reduce the City's excess ERAF revenue by approximately \$30 million annually. These changes are not assumed in the Mayor's proposed budget. First, a 34% increase in special education funding, from \$999 to \$1,341 per unit of average daily attendance in FY 2026-27, adjusted by an inflator thereafter, would result in an annual reduction of excess ERAF revenue of \$14 million. Special education funding, or SELPA, which totals approximately \$42.6 million in FY 2025-26, is deducted from excess ERAF, with the remainder flowing to the City. Second, the May Revised Budget includes a statutory cost of living adjustment to the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) of 2.87% and a discretionary "super COLA" that results in a total COLA of 4.31% to help offset funding reductions related to declining enrollment. The Mayor's proposed budget assumes 2% annual growth in the LCFF. As educational entities' revenue limit increases, their draws from ERAF increase, reducing the amount of excess available to return to the

City's General Fund by approximately \$15 million annually. The State's budget must be finalized by June 15.

- **Economic Assumptions and Risks** Tax revenues in the budget assume relatively strong national and international economic growth, modest local growth, and stable interest rates. Some of the biggest revenue drivers in this budget come from growth in taxes more exposed to national and international trends. The City anticipates the portion of gross receipts business tax revenue coming from worldwide sales to stay strong after it grew 30% in 2025. Real property transfer tax revenue is similarly expected to benefit from large institutional investors re-entering San Francisco's commercial real estate market given low prices.

The revenue forecast is set amidst San Francisco's slowly improving economy. Office vacancy rates decreased from 35.4 percent in the first quarter of 2025 to 32.6 percent in the first quarter of 2026, though still well above the average 2019 vacancy rate of 5.4 percent. From April 2025 to April 2026, average weekday MUNI train boardings increased 13 percent to reach 74 percent of April 2019 ridership, and exits at downtown BART stations increased 12 percent to achieve a post-pandemic high of 43 percent of April 2019 levels. Employee foot traffic in downtown San Francisco increased 12 percent to 57 percent of pre-pandemic levels, while visitor foot traffic remained even at 65 percent.

Nationally, the inflationary effects of federal immigration, trade policy, and the war with Iran, among other forces, will continue to create risk of interest rates increases, reducing capital and business investments. Additionally, much of the bullish sentiment and returns in equity markets is concentrated in Artificial Intelligence (AI). Setbacks to the AI industry— semiconductor chip shortages, insufficient power and water supply, opposition to building new data centers, etc. —could lead to a correction in values, with large fiscal effects for state and local government, particularly state income taxes.

APPENDICES

1. General Fund Sources
2. General Fund Reserve Uses and Deposits
3. One-Time Sources and Nonrecurring Revenue Policy Compliance
4. Baselines, Set-Asides, Special Taxes and Other Requirements

Appendix 1. General Fund Sources

The Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2026-27 includes \$7.6 billion in General Fund sources and \$16.9 billion in All Funds sources, representing an increase from the FY 2025-26 original budget of 8.2 percent in the General Fund and 5.4 percent in All Funds. The Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2027-28 includes \$7.9 billion in General Fund sources and \$17.2 billion in All Funds sources, representing an increase from the FY 2026-27 proposed budget of 4.1 percent in the General Fund and 2.3 percent in All Funds.

Exhibit 1-1. Overview of Budget Sources (\$ million)

General Fund

	FY 2025-26 Budget	FY 2026-27 Proposed	FY 2027-28 Proposed
Fund Balance	\$ 152.7	\$ 42.4	\$ 462.5
Use of Reserves	34.4	117.6	73.5
Regular Revenues	6,575.4	7,140.4	7,109.6
Transfers into the General Fund	258.5	297.2	266.6
Total GF Sources	\$ 7,021.0	\$ 7,597.6	\$ 7,912.2
Change from Prior Year		\$ 576.6	\$ 314.6
Percentage Change		8.2%	4.1%

All Funds

	FY 2025-26 Budget	FY 2026-27 Proposed	FY 2027-28 Proposed
Fund Balance	\$ 515.7	\$ 616.3	\$ 816.4
Use of Reserves	46.4	120.4	75.9
Regular Revenues	15,428.8	16,115.4	16,346.5
Total All-Funds Sources	\$ 15,990.9	\$ 16,852.2	\$ 17,238.8
Change from Prior Year		\$ 861.3	\$ 386.6
Percentage Change		5.4%	2.3%

Exhibit 1-1 provides a summary of the General Fund sources in the Mayor's proposed budget.

Sources of Funds	FY 2025-26 Budget	FY 2026-27 Proposed	FY 2027-28 Proposed	Note
FUND BALANCE & RESERVES				
Prior Year Fund Balance	\$ 152.7	\$ 42.4	\$ 462.5	1
Use of Reserves	34.4	117.6	73.5	2
Subtotal	187.2	160.1	536.1	
REGULAR REVENUES				
Property Taxes	2,437.0	2,407.0	2,427.0	
Traditional Property Tax	2,164.0	2,105.0	2,135.0	3
Excess ERAF	273.0	302.0	292.0	3
Business Taxes	1,139.6	1,572.2	1,477.7	4
Sales Tax (Bradley Burns 1%)	189.6	201.8	207.8	5
Hotel Room Tax	265.2	289.4	291.6	6
Utility Users Tax	116.4	124.1	128.0	7
Parking Tax	88.8	83.5	83.5	8
Real Property Transfer Tax	267.6	358.8	370.4	9
Stadium Admissions Tax	8.6	9.9	9.9	10
Cannabis Tax	-	-	-	11
Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax	11.6	11.4	11.4	12
Access Line Tax	54.5	60.7	61.1	13
Licenses, Permits & Franchises	23.1	24.1	24.5	14
Fines and Forfeitures	6.0	3.6	3.6	15
Interest & Investment Income	151.9	164.8	153.5	16
Rents & Concessions	18.5	25.9	33.4	17
Intergovernmental - Federal	459.1	373.4	395.4	
Federal Emergency Management Agency	87.0	-	-	18
Other	372.1	373.4	395.4	18
Intergovernmental - State	910.3	921.2	949.3	
Public Safety Sales Tax	97.2	101.2	104.2	19
Health & Welfare Realignment (1991)	272.8	243.8	253.3	20
Public Safety Realignment (2011)	53.5	54.6	56.2	21
Other	486.8	521.6	535.4	22
Intergovernmental Revenues - Other	3.4	4.2	4.3	
Charges for Services	382.9	459.8	432.6	23
Recovery of General Government Costs	22.3	27.2	27.2	
Other Revenues	18.9	17.3	17.6	24
Subtotal Regular Revenues	\$ 6,575.4	\$ 7,140.4	\$ 7,109.6	
Transfers In to the General Fund	258.5	297.2	266.6	25
TOTAL SOURCES	\$ 7,021.0	\$ 7,597.6	\$ 7,912.2	

NOTES

1. Prior Year Fund Balance

As shown in Exhibit 1-2 below, a total of \$766.4 million of fund balance is available for appropriation. In May 2026, the Controller’s Nine-Month Report projected fund balance of \$728.2 million, \$53.9 million more than reported in the March 2026 Five-Year Financial Plan Update. In total, the proposed budget appropriates \$505.0 million of the \$766.4 million in available unassigned General Fund balance to support spending in the budget years. The remaining unappropriated fund balance of \$261.4 million is designated for balancing future budgets, as specified in section 32.1 of the administrative provisions of the Annual Appropriations Ordinance.

Exhibit 1-2. General Fund Use of Prior Year Fund Balance (\$ millions)

Projected Fund Balance, May 2026 Nine Month Report	728.2
(+) Additional Current Year De-Appropriations ("Project Closeouts")	38.1
Fund Balance Available for Appropriation	766.3
 Fund Balance Appropriated in Budget	 505.0
 Fund Balance Designated for Future Budgets	 261.3

A total of \$38.2 million of General Fund de-appropriations are assumed to support the FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 budget. Details of the de-appropriations are shown in Exhibit 1-3 below.

Exhibit 1-3. FY 2025-26 General Fund De-Appropriations

Dept	Authority Title	Project Title	Total	Dept	Authority Title	Project Title	Total
ADM	11 So Van Ness Hvac Improvemen	Red-Capital Improvements	19,599	ECN	Carnavale	EW 22-23 Board Addbacks	300,000
ADM	2017-Family Support - Lactatio	WA Fy 2016-2017	21,938	ECN	Carnavale	EW 22-23 Board Addbacks	60,001
ADM	950 Bryant Roof Replacement	ADFM Fleet Capital Improveme	28,664	ECN	Carnavale	EW 23-24 Board Addbacks	424,030
ADM	Animal Care Shelter Project	ADAC Animal Shelter Project	193,253	ECN	Carnavale	Non-Profit Sustainability	2,000,000
ADM	City Hall Interior Finishes	ADRE Capital Improvements	12,487	ECN	Dream Keeper Initiatives	Reinvestment Initiatives	2,400,000
ADM	Cultural Museums	Cultural Museums	2,246	ECN	OFA Operations	Opportunities for All	500,000
ADM	Debt Service	Crit Repair Recovry Stim COPs	7,100	FAM	Legion Chillers	Legion Chillers	10,095
ADM	DPW repair service	RP 11th Street And Natoma Parl	4,067	FAM	LH Boiler Refurbish	LH Boiler Refurbish	202
ADM	DSN Regulatory	PW 3rd St Bridge Struct Rpr	32,909	FIR	Nert Participatory Budget D10	FD NERT Participatory Budget	32,325
ADM	Elevator Refurbishment	AD Elevator Modernization Proj	6,365	GEN	Cultural Museums	Cultural Museums	80,000
ADM	Emergency Protective Measures	CoVid OPS Feeding	344	HOM	Emergency Protective Measures	CoVid HOM Response	44,477
ADM	E-Procurement	ADCA E-Procurement	29,710	HOM	HOM Global Payment Program	HOM Global Payment Program	5,000,000
ADM	IT System Replacement	ADCC IT System Replacement	40	HOM	HOM Trans Homelessness	HOM Trans Homelessness	1,000,000
ADM	Markets	ADRE Real Estate Operations	227,417	HOM	Programmatic Services	HO Shelter And Navigation Cent	1,200,000
ADM	Non-COP Funded Costs	ADRE 49SVN Project	23,033	HOM	Programmatic Services	Interim Housing Expansion	7,398,691
ADM	Non-COP Funded Costs	ADRE 49SVN Project	1,873,520	HOM	Programmatic Services	HO Homelessness Outreach and P	840,000
ADM	Non-COP Funded Costs	ADRE 49SVN Project	10,393	HRC	Dream Keeper Initiatives	Reinvestment Initiatives	1,800,000
ADM	Ocmc Case Management - Lims 2	Medical Examiner Project	877	HRC	Violence Prevention Pgm - Spa	HRC Add-backs FY24	36,513
ADM	Sewer Line Replacements	ADRE Capital Improvements	1,888,480	HRD	Dream Keeper Initiatives	Reinvestment Initiatives	370,300
ADM	Sewer Line Replacements	Red-Capital Improvements	10	HRD	Dream Keeper Initiatives	Reinvestment Initiatives	29,700
ADM	Visitor Management System	ADRE COIT Projects	43,007	HSA	Emergency Protective Measures	CoVid Congregate Shelters	11,946
ADP	Dream Keeper Initiatives	Reinvestment Initiatives	203,444	HSA	IHSS EVV 979/980 Split	HS AG IHSS EVV	153,448
ADP	Emergency Protective Measures	Drug Overdoses in Tenderloin	60,000	JUV	Culvert/Road Replace LCR	Fy13-14 Culvert/Road Replace A	42,491
ART	Art Move To Veterans Building	AR Art Move To Veterans Buildi	4,975	JUV	Security System Upgrade	PW LCR Roof Replace	1,286
ART	CEG General	Culture Equity Grants - Admin	2,717	MYR	ADIT Dig Equity Pilot Pgr	ADIT Digital Equity Pilot	(450)
CHF	BOS Children Citywide	Bos Allocations	619,854	MYR	BOS Children D10	Bos Allocations	1,544
CHF	BOS Children D10	Bos Allocations	381,425	MYR	Carnavale	EW 21-22 Board Addbacks	19,982
CHF	BOS Children D5	Bos Allocations	94,776	MYR	D8 Affordability Plan	CO Administration	1,500
CHF	BOS Children D5	Bos Allocations	1	MYR	FY22 GF Rent Relief	FY22 GF Rent Relief	541,041
CHF	BOS TAY D6	Bos Allocations	36,157	MYR	FY25 MOHCD Board Enhancements	Board Enhancements	1,177,868
CHF	BOS USD Children Citywide	Bos Allocations	772,094	MYR	HOM Trans Homelessness	HOM Housing	208
CHF	BOS USD Children D4	Bos Allocations	1	MYR	Rent Resolution and Relief Fun	Rent Resolution & Relief Fund	2,395
CHF	Children's Baseline Eligible	Bos Allocations	6,274	MYR	So Sunset Rec Ctr Clubhouse Ex	RP South Sunset Rec Center	840
CHF	TAY Baseline Eligible	CH Early College Initiative	45,686	MYR	Trans rental sub-not OCOH	GF Rent Subsidies	70,333
DAT	DA 54% Alloc Real Estate Rec	Dist Atty 54% Alloc Real Estat	1,700,000	REC	1291P-Proj Managment	RP 1291P-Ggp Senior Center	10,590
DAT	Peace Officer Std & Testing 01	DA Peace Officer Std & Testing	150,000	REC	1296p-project Management	RP Alvord Lake Security Camera	3,335
DAT	Phase II-Replacemen	Replacement Case Managemen	13	REC	1631J-W/A To Rec Park	WI 1631j-vl Guardrail Upgrade	10
DEC	Dream Keeper Initiatives	Reinvestment Initiatives	295,436	REC	Alta Plaza Retaining Wall-Rp P	PW GGP Bowling Greens Reno	4,447
DEC	Non-Capital Expenditure	HS CH CC IT	50,790	REC	Buenavista Park-Division Suppo	RP Open Space Urban Forestry	405
DEC	State Childcare Reserve Accoun	HS CH State Childcare Reserve	777,705	REC	Controlco	RP Randall Flood Prevention	29,225
DEM	Active Directory Migration	Active Directory Migration	1,155	REC	Erosion Control & Retaining Wa	RP Erosion Cntrl/Rtaining Wall	4,464
DEM	DEM Auto Fire Sta	DEM Automated Fire Station Di	32,374	REC	Field Rehabilitation-Budget	RP Field Rehabilitation	5,273
DEM	EM DEM Coordinated St Response	EM DEM Coordinated St Respor	600,000	REC	Gateways/Borders/Bollars/Fenci	RP Gateways/Borders/Bollards	3,120
DPW	0105G-Granite Rock	Yard Bulk Item Purchases	4,768	REC	Irrigation Systems	RP Irrigation Systems	750
DPW	0255F-Buf N.Labor	PW AB Sunset Blvd Median Mai	2,505	REC	J&J Southwest Contruction, Inc	RP Franklin Sq Par Course Equip	2,567
DPW	1456J-Construction	WI 1456j-cj1:cj2 Hvac Upgrade	9,274	REC	Lafayette Park-Construction Co	PW GGP Bowling Greens Reno	79
DPW	2050R-Bbr Labor	PW D2 AB Fillmore Bench Tree	7,159	REC	Mclaren Lodge Annex Renovation	RP McLaren Lodge Annex Renov	6,762
DPW	7235A-Boa Labor	WB Eser-awss System	656	REC	Movie Nights In The Park-Distr	RP Movie Nights In The Park	3,867
DPW	7235A-Boa Labor	PW Justice Fac Impr	26,227	REC	Paving	RP Paving	2,529
DPW	7235A-Boa Labor	PW Justice Fac Plan Update	583	REC	Paving	RP Paving	1,700
DPW	Asbestos Abatement Various Fy0	WR Asbestos Abatement Variou	80	REC	Project Management	RP CC Plaza Pavement Maint.Ph2	32,524
DPW	CON Work	PW AB Dist4 Cleaning	8,269	REC	Project Reserve	RP Rec Park Capital Projects	991
DPW	CON Work	PW AB Judah St Greening	10,933	REC	Project Reserve	RP Rec Park Capital Projects	902
DPW	CON Work	PW BUF D2 Tree Maintenance	157	REC	Project Reserve	RP Rec Park Capital Projects	285
DPW	District 10 Mendell Plaza Ligh	WR District 10 Mendell Plaza L	750	REC	RP2208 D8 Christopher Pk plant	RP Christopher Park plantings	1,172
DPW	PLN Work - General	PW Mid Market Impr Near Term	212	REC	RP2208 D8 Christopher Pk plant	RP Christopher Pk bench & tabl	1,045
DPW	PLN Work - General	PW HOJ Emerg Gen Replace	19,280	REC	RP2208 D8 Christopher Pk plant	RP Upper Noe music & rec renov	3,567
DPW	Reserves-Project	PW AB D02 Lombard St Improv	1,574	REC	Shared Schoolyards Projects	RP Shared Schoolyards Projects	1,731
DPW	Street Tree Establishment	PW Capital Budget FY19 & FY20	2,226	REC	Signage & Information System	RP Signage & Information Sys	8,123
ECN	Carnavale	City Economic Development Prc	1,500,000	REC	Signage & Information System	RP Signage & Information Sys	37
ECN	Carnavale	EW 20-21 Board Addbacks	235,113	REC	Signage & Information System	RP Signage & Information Sys	2,584
ECN	Carnavale	EW 20-21 Board Addbacks	60,000	TIS	Dig Once Implementation	Dig Once Implementation	19,062
ECN	Carnavale	EW 20-21 Board Addbacks	10,000	TIS	Front Gate/deputy Station	SH Front Gate/deputy Station	4
ECN	Carnavale	EW 21-22 Board Addbacks	217,998	TIS	Va Radio Request	Va Radio Request	50,938
Total General Fund De-Appropriations			38,130,951				

2. Use of Reserves

The Mayor's budget proposes uses of \$191.1 million in prior year reserves. See Appendix 2 for more details.

Exhibit 1-4. General Fund Use of Prior Year Reserves (\$ millions)

	FY 2026-27 Proposed Budget	FY 2027-28 Proposed Budget
General Fund - Use of Prior Year Reserves		
Budget Stabilization One Time Reserve	54.8	-
Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve	1.1	-
Fiscal Cliff Reserve	15.0	-
Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve	41.4	43.5
Business Tax Stabilization Reserve	-	29.5
Children's Baseline True-Up	5.3	0.6
Total Use of Prior Year Reserves	117.6	73.5

3. Property Tax

Commercial property valuations continue to fluctuate, driven by high vacancy rates in middle-tier office properties and interest costs that remain well above recent norms. While office transaction volumes are improving and institutional investors are re-engaging—supporting real property transfer-tax revenue—recent sale prices still tend to fall below existing assessed values. This trend signals potential tax refunds for properties with open assessment appeals and suggests continued high appeal activity in future years. Lower sale prices will also reset assessed values downward, limiting near-term growth in the commercial property tax base. The FY 2026-27 General Fund share of property tax revenue is budgeted at \$2,407.0 million, which is \$30.0 million, or 1.2 percent, less than the FY 2025-26 budget. The FY 2027-28 General Fund share of property tax revenue is budgeted at \$2,427.0 million, which is \$20.0 million, or 0.8 percent, more than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget.

The budget assumes secured roll growth of 2% in FY 2026-27 and 2% in FY 2027-28, representing the 2% inflation allowed under the state constitution, and unsecured values are projected to remain at current levels. Approximately \$118.3 million is assumed diverted from the General Fund to tax increment financing districts in FY 2026-27, increasing to \$157.5 million in FY 2027-28. Of these totals, approximately \$18.3 million per year is diverted to tax increment financing districts such as the Treasure Island and Mission Rock projects, and the remainder to projects of the former redevelopment agency.

The budget assumes \$2.5 billion of reductions in current year local assessment values in each of the two budget years, which translates to approximately \$14.0 million in General Fund property tax revenues refunded annually. Additionally, the budget assumes reserve deposits for future refunds of \$215.0 million in General Fund revenue from appeals of assessed values filed in FY 2026-27 and \$191.0 million from appeals filed in FY 2027-28, which will be paid at such time as the Assessment Appeals Board determines reductions.

Supplemental assessments capture changes in value for the portion of the tax year remaining after an assessable event—a change in ownership or new construction—results in a change in the base year assessed value of a property. Supplemental property taxes are estimated to be \$12.0 million in each of FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28. Escape assessments capture a full year’s increase in assessed value up to four years after the event trigger date and are estimated to generate \$25.0 million in FY 2026-27 and \$25.0 million in FY 2027-28.

Excess Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) revenue represents the amount of property tax revenues initially diverted from the City to help the state meet its funding obligations for K-14 education. The amount that exceeds these entities’ revenue limits is returned to the City. Excess ERAF revenues are budgeted at \$302.0 million in FY 2026-27 and \$292.0 million in FY 2027-28, based on current state law.

4. Business Tax

The FY 2026-27 budget projects General Fund business tax revenue to reach \$1,572.2 million, representing an increase of \$432.6 million, or 38.0 percent, from the FY 2025-26 budget. The FY 2027-28 budget anticipates a decrease of \$94.4 million, or 6.0 percent, in business tax revenue, bringing the projected total to \$1,477.7 million. General Fund business tax revenue is comprised of business registration fees, administrative office tax, gross receipts tax, and the overpaid executive tax.

Proposition M (2024) restructured business taxes by increasing the small business gross receipts tax exemption, reducing the overpaid executive tax by 80 percent, and generally increasing gross receipts tax rates. Because Proposition M took effect in tax year 2025, its actual impact on business tax revenue becomes apparent as taxpayers file their annual tax returns by the March 2, 2026 deadline, or by November 30, 2026 for those that received an extension.

Gross receipts taxes are largely based on a combination of sales in San Francisco and sales worldwide that are apportioned to San Francisco, generally by the share of a company’s total payroll located in San Francisco. Both San Francisco sales and worldwide sales have increased significantly for many taxpayers. Between 2024 and 2025, for those companies that have filed their 2025 tax returns, aggregate San Francisco sales increased more than 10 percent and aggregate worldwide sales increased more than 30 percent, leading to a proportionate increase in tax revenue. This growth in sales is the primary driver of the increase in budgeted revenue from FY 2025-26 to FY 2026-27.

Administrative factors are also important for budgeted revenue. Proposition M moved the extended deadline from April 30 to November 30 of the following fiscal year, so the revenue from the filings is now split across two fiscal years rather than falling within one. This has the effect of reducing the amount of tax year 2025 revenue received in FY 2025-26 and shifting it to FY 2026-27, creating a one-time revenue increase in FY 2026-27. The one-time nature of this increase is reflected in the decline in budgeted revenue in FY 2027-28.

Litigation continues to factor into budgeted business tax revenue. Although several large cases settled in FY 2025-26, including General Motors, Airbnb, and Microsoft, the City continues to receive new gross receipts tax claims, and taxpayers in ongoing matters have expanded their claims to include additional tax years. The City currently holds \$389 million in reserve for General Fund business tax claims, down from \$414 million at the end of FY 2025-26. The available revenue from the decrease in reserve was recognized in FY 2025-26. The FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 budgets assume approximately \$75 million in anticipation of new and expanded claims.

5. Sales Tax

In FY 2026-27, the City budgeted local sales tax revenue at \$201.8 million, which is \$12.3 million (6.5 percent) higher than what was budgeted in FY 2025-26. FY 2027-28 local sales tax revenue is budgeted at \$207.8 million, which is \$6.0 million (2.9 percent) higher than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget.

Sales tax revenue dropped significantly during the COVID-19 public health emergency closures. With the ongoing “re-opening” of the City, revenue rebounded through FY 2022-23, slid in both FY 2023-24 and FY 2024-25, and FY 2025-26 collections to date are on track to start growing again. The budget assumes sales tax revenues will remain even with the current year in FY 2026-27 and then grow modestly in FY 2027-28, finally reaching pre-pandemic levels in FY 2028-29. However, economic headwinds of the pandemic era continue to impact local sales tax recovery: current population is still below the pre-pandemic population; office vacancy rates remain above 30% with fewer employees going into the offices that are occupied; and tourism and business travel have not yet recovered. These factors are expected to improve over the coming years. Exhibit 1-5 below shows actual and projected rates of change in the budget.

Exhibit 1-5. Actual and Projected Change in Sales Tax Revenues for San Francisco, FY 2000-01 to FY 2026-27



6. Hotel Tax

The FY 2026-27 General Fund share of hotel tax revenue is budgeted at \$289.4 million, which is \$24.2 million, or 9.1 percent, more than what was budgeted in FY 2025-26. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$291.6 million, an increase of \$2.2 million, or 0.8 percent, from the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. Hotel tax revenues are projected to improve year over year but will not reach pre-pandemic levels until after FY 2029-30.

The \$24.2 million increase in budgeted General Fund hotel tax revenue for FY 2026-27 over FY 2025-26 reflects the recent rebound in Moscone Center event attendance and optimism about domestic tourism trends. Strong Moscone Center event attendance drives tax revenue up through compression pricing, and the return of major conferences to San Francisco, in addition to World Cup games held near the first week of FY 2026-27, is expected to boost hotel tax performance. The second budget year assumes more modest growth to reflect a weaker Moscone Center event calendar and uncertainty about trends in international tourism.

November 2018 Proposition E allocated 1.5 percentage points of the 14 percent hotel tax rate (or approximately 10.7 percent of the total hotel tax revenue) to arts programs outside of the General Fund. These allocations are budgeted at \$36.0 million in FY 2026-27 and \$36.3 million in FY 2027-28, meeting Proposition E requirements. See Appendix 4 for more detail.

Hotel tax is highly correlated with the hotel industry indicator revenue per available room (RevPAR), which is the combined effect of occupancy and average daily room rates. RevPAR in the first three quarters of FY 2025-26 averaged \$183.86, an increase of 25.7 percent versus the same period in FY 2024-25. This bump reflects strong Moscone Center event attendance, including Super Bowl LX events that drew over 100,000 attendees to Moscone Center events during the first week of February 2026. RevPAR is projected to grow modestly in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, up to 5 percent. This is slower than FY 2025-26 growth, reflecting the drop in large one-time events like the Super Bowl and less certainty in future Moscone Center event calendars.

7. Utility Users Tax

Utility user tax revenue is budgeted at \$124.1 million in FY 2026-27, which is \$7.7 million (6.6 percent) higher than what was budgeted in FY 2025-26. The increase is due to higher overall utility tax collections in the current year. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$128.0 million, which is \$3.9 million (3.1 percent) higher than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget.

8. Parking Tax

The proposed budget projects parking tax revenue in both FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 at \$83.5 million, \$5.3 million (6.0 percent) less than the FY 2025-26 approved budget. Although there are fewer commuters coming into the City now than before the pandemic, a higher percentage of them travel by car rather than public transportation, and projected revenue is approaching pre-pandemic levels. According to American Community Survey data, the percentage of workers still coming into an office or worksite who drove to work rose from 37.8% in 2019 to 46.2% in 2024, or approximately 265,000 cars in 2019 and 247,000 cars in 2024. The budgeted amount for FY 2026-27 is just below pre-pandemic levels. Parking tax revenues are deposited into the General Fund, from which an amount equivalent to 80 percent is transferred to the Municipal Transportation Agency for public transit as mandated by Charter Section 8A.105.

9. Real Property Transfer Tax

The City budgeted real property transfer tax (RPTT) revenue at \$358.8 million in FY 2026-27, \$91.2 million (34.1 percent) higher than FY 2025-26. This growth continues in FY 2027-28 where the revenue budget rises by another \$11.6 million (3.2 percent) to \$370.4 million. The effect of November 2020 Proposition I, which doubled the tax rate on transactions over \$10 million, is estimated to be \$114.1 million and \$117.3 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively.

Growth is driven by a combination of factors. The rise of remote and hybrid work arrangements in San Francisco brought on by the pandemic caused demand for office space in the City to fall, office vacancies to soar, and building sales to slow. This paradigm drove revenue down in FY 2022-23 (\$186.2 million) and FY 2023-24 (\$177.7 million) to levels not seen since the recessionary lows of FY 2003-04 and FY 2009-10, even without adjusting for rate increases. From this low base, revenues roared back with a “reset” in the City’s real estate market. The Federal Reserve lowered the Federal Funds Effective Rate from 5.33% in August 2024 to 3.64% in January 2026, making it cheaper to borrow to acquire buildings. Additionally, building owners, landlords, and their creditors have increasingly accepted the post-pandemic reality that with office vacancy rates stubbornly exceeding 30%, many commercial buildings are not worth what they paid for them in the 2010’s. This combination helped bring many properties, including lucrative high-value properties, back to the market, albeit sometimes at significant discounts.

Not all of this revenue increase is available to policy makers. Deposits to the Budget Stabilization Reserve are funded with a portion of volatile revenues, including 75 percent of RPTT revenue in excess of the prior five-year average adjusted for any rate increases during the period. The strong growth projected over the next few years, combined with low revenue in FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24, triggers required deposits of \$35.9 million in FY 2026-27 and \$68.8 million in FY 2027-28. For more detail on the Budget Stabilization Reserve, see Appendix 2.

Exhibit 1-6 shows revenue collections not adjusted for rate changes, beginning in FY 1997-98. As the City’s most volatile revenue source, collections can see large year-over-year changes that have exceeded 60 percent. The volatility is seen with month-to-month revenue as well: in the past ten years, the lowest monthly revenue total was in January 2024 (\$5.4 million) and the highest was in September 2021 (\$95.7 million). The main factors creating volatility are sales of high-value properties, availability and cost of financing, and the relative attractiveness of San Francisco real estate compared to global investment options, all of which track well with economic cycles. Voter-approved rate changes, which occurred in 2008, 2010, 2016 and 2020, have also resulted in fluctuations.

**Exhibit 1-6. Historical Real Property Transfer Tax Revenue
FY 1997-98 through FY 2027-28, (\$ millions)**





Exhibit 1-7 shows historical RPTT revenue by transaction size after being adjusted to reflect rate changes from Proposition I (November 2020), Proposition W (November 2016), Proposition N (November 2010), and Proposition N (November 2008), and illustrates how this revenue is driven by the sale of high-value (largely commercial) properties over \$10 million. The drastic revenue reduction in FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 was driven by high interest rates and the lack of large transactions. In the past 18 months, with somewhat lowered interest rates and high-value commercial properties like the Transamerica Pyramid re-entering the market, the number of high value transfers has increased, leading to improved revenue over the past two fiscal years.

**Exhibit 1-7. Real Property Transfer Tax Rate-Adjusted Revenue by Transaction Size,
FY 2000-01 through FY 2027-28 Projected (\$ millions)**



Finally, the proposed budget assumes current tax rates remain in effect, including the 5.5 percent and 6 percent rates on Tiers 5 and 6. It does not assume that the proposed local ordinance [Real Property Transfer Tax Rates and Penalties \(File 260178\)](#), the statewide ballot initiative [Local Taxpayer Protection Act to Save Proposition 13](#), the local ballot initiative [Affordable Housing Guarantee Act](#), or any other changes to the City's transfer tax rate or structure will go into effect.

10. Stadium Admissions Tax

The City budgeted stadium admissions tax revenue at \$9.9 million in both FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, \$1.3 million (15.3 percent) more than the FY 2025-26 budget. The increase is due to strong attendance at Warriors, Giants, and now Valkyries games, which are a newer inclusion to the City's forecast for this tax revenue. The budget assumes that event attendance and revenue will remain stable across both budget years. Under Proposition M, businesses are given a credit toward their gross receipts taxes worth 50% of their stadium admissions tax.

11. Cannabis Tax

The local Cannabis Business Tax, approved by voters in 2018 via Proposition D, continues to be suspended. The tax was originally scheduled to take effect in 2019, but was postponed several times, first to the end of 2021 and then again to the end of 2022. In December 2022, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors extended the suspension of the tax to January 1, 2026. In December 2025, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors extended the suspension of the local cannabis excise tax another 10 years, through December 31, 2035.

12. Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax

Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax revenue is budgeted at \$11.4 million in each fiscal year, FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, \$0.2 million (2.2 percent) less than FY 2025-26 budget. The City's one cent per ounce tax on sugar sweetened beverages became effective January 1, 2018. After reduced collections during the pandemic when restaurants had restricted operations, revenue increased through FY 2022-23, though not to pre-pandemic levels. The City expects the source to plateau in the current and future years.

13. Access Line Tax

FY 2026-27 access line tax revenue is budgeted at \$60.7 million, or \$6.2 million (11.4 percent) more than the FY 2025-26 budget. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$61.1 million, or \$0.4 million (0.7 percent) higher than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. Budgets in both years incorporate anticipated settlement payments from an access line tax liability dispute with several major payers and projected CPI increases to the access line tax rate as described in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 784.

14. Licenses, Permits and Franchises

License, permit, and franchise fee revenue for FY 2026-27 is budgeted at \$24.1 million, an increase of \$0.9 million (4.1 percent) from the FY 2025-26 budget. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$24.5 million, or \$0.4 million (1.6 percent) higher than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget.

15. Fines, Forfeitures, and Penalties

The City budgeted fines, forfeiture, and penalty revenue for FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 at \$3.6 million, a \$2.4 million (40.2 percent) decrease from the FY 2025-26 budget. The change is related to one-time escheatment revenue of \$2.4 million from unclaimed payments at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, San Francisco International Airport, Public Utilities Commissions, and other city departments in FY 2025-26. With no additional escheatment revenue projected, the City expects this revenue source to return to a steady state.

16. Interest & Investment Income

Interest and investment income for FY 2026-27 is budgeted at \$164.8 million, an increase of \$12.9 million (8.5 percent) from the FY 2025-26 budget. For FY 2027-28, revenue is projected at \$153.5 million, or \$11.4 million (6.9 percent) lower than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. The budget assumes earned income yields of 3.86 and 3.78 percent in the two budget years. The budget also assumes additional interest earnings of \$3.8 million in each of the two budget years from the allocation of projected negative interest earnings from the General Fund to other funds related to the General Fund's annual prepayment of citywide employee retirement contribution costs.

17. Rents and Concessions

FY 2026-27 rent and concession revenue is budgeted at \$25.9 million, or \$7.4 million (39.9 percent) more than the FY 2025-26 budget. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$33.4 million, or \$7.5 million (29.0 percent) higher than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. Changes in rents and concessions are primarily driven by parking revenue in Golden Gate Park.

Effective January 1, 2027, Resolution No. 327-25 authorizes SFMTA to set parking rates in Golden Gate Park. The Mayor's proposed budget assumes \$6.8 million for paid Golden Gate Park street parking revenue in FY 2026-27 and \$13.7 million in FY 2027-28.

18. Intergovernmental – Federal

Federal support in the General Fund is budgeted at \$373.4 million for FY 2026-27, which represents a decrease of \$85.7 million (18.7 percent) from the FY 2025-26 budget. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$395.4 million, which is \$21.9 million (5.9 percent) less than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. The FY 2026-27 reduction is driven by the loss of \$87.0 of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) reimbursements for COVID-19 and 2023 winter storm emergency response costs, as the City expects no further recoveries.

19. Intergovernmental – State – Public Safety Sales Tax

The City budgeted public safety sales tax revenue at \$101.2 million in FY 2026-27, a \$4.0 million (4.1 percent) increase over the FY 2025-26 budget, and FY 2026-27 revenue at \$104.2 million, a \$3.0 million (3.0 percent) increase over the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. Public safety sales tax revenue is based on two factors: statewide public-safety sales tax revenue and the County's portion of that statewide public-safety sales tax in the most recent calendar year. San Francisco's county allocation factor is anticipated to increase by 2.8% in FY 2026-27 and then stay flat in FY 2027-28. Additionally, statewide public-safety sales tax revenue is projected to grow by 2.3% and 3.0% in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively. Although San Francisco County public-safety sales tax revenue has stabilized, and even started to recover, the City and County still make up a significantly reduced proportion of statewide taxes compared to pre-pandemic levels.

20. Intergovernmental – State – 1991 Health & Welfare Realignment

In prior years, 1991 Health and Welfare Realignment payments were distributed between the General Fund and Hospital Fund based on historical allocations to public health, mental health, and social service programs within the Department of Public Health and the Human Services Agency. The budget adopts a more streamlined allocation method that means a greater share of realignment payments is budgeted in the Zuckerberg General Hospital (ZSFG) Fund, with a corresponding reduction in the General Fund. Because the Department of Public Health receives substantial General Fund support, this shift has no net effect on the General Fund or the types of programs that are funded.

Across all funds, revenue is budgeted at \$348.7 million in FY 2026-27, which is \$11.5 million (3.4 percent) more than the FY 2025-26 budget. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$359.7 million, which is \$11.0 million (3.2 percent) more than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. The changes follow anticipated growth in statewide sales tax.

In the General Fund, FY 2026-27 revenue is budgeted at \$243.8 million, or \$29.0 million (10.6 percent) less than the FY 2025-26 budget. FY 2027-28 revenue is budgeted at \$253.3 million, which is \$9.6 million (3.9 percent) more than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget.

21. Intergovernmental – State – Public Safety Realignment

Public Safety Realignment (AB 109), enacted in early 2011, transfers responsibility for supervising certain kinds of felony offenders and state prison parolees from state prisons and parole agents to county jails and probation officers. This revenue is budgeted at \$54.6 million in FY 2026-27, a \$1.1 million (2.0 percent) increase from the FY 2025-26 budget. The FY 2027-28 proposed budget is \$56.2 million, a \$1.7 million (3.1 percent) increase from the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. Similar to 1991 Health and Welfare Realignment, changes follow anticipated growth in statewide sales tax.

22. Intergovernmental – State – Other

Other state intergovernmental revenue is budgeted at \$921.2 million in FY 2026-27, a \$10.8 million (1.2 percent) increase from the FY 2025-26 budget. The FY 2027-28 proposed budget is \$949.3 million, a \$28.1 million (3.0

percent) increase from the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. Mayor's budget includes \$14.4 million in FY 2026-27 and \$19.3 million in FY 2027-28 related to the State of California's support of CalFresh Administration to backfill anticipated losses of federal funding due to H.R. 1.

23. Charges for Services

Revenue from charges for services is budgeted at \$487.1 million in FY 2026-27, an increase of \$81.8 million (20.2 percent) from the FY 2025-26 budget. In FY 2027-28, charges for services revenue is budgeted at \$459.9 million, a decrease of \$27.2 million (5.6 percent) from the FY 2026-27 budget. The increase in FY 2026-27 is primarily due to increases in behavioral and jail health revenue within the Department of Public Health (DPH).

Additionally, many fee budgets are authorized to be adjusted for inflation without further approval by the Board of Supervisors, or 2.18 percent in FY 2026-27 based on information published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in January 2026. There are also several new and modified fees that have been introduced this fiscal year or that are assumed in the budget, with trailing legislation where required.

24. Other Revenues

Other revenues are budgeted at \$17.3 million in FY 2026-27, a decrease of \$1.6 million (8.3 percent) from the FY 2025-26 budget. FY 2027-28 revenues are budgeted at \$17.6 million, an increase of \$0.2 million (1.2 percent). The decrease in FY 2026-27 is largely driven by a reduction in the Fire Department's non-operating revenue from FY 2025-26 levels.

25. Operating Transfers Ins

Transfers into the General Fund are budgeted at \$297.2 million in FY 2026-27, which is \$38.7 million, or 15.0 percent, more than what was budgeted in FY 2025-26. In FY 2027-28, transfers-in are budgeted at \$266.6 million, which is \$30.6 million, or 10.3 percent, less than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget. These transfers include a portion of Airport concessions revenue, 15.0 percent of commercial rent tax collections authorized by June 2018 Proposition C, and transfers from the General Hospital Fund to support increased General Fund-backed intergovernmental payments required to draw down increased state and federal funding.

Appendix 2. Reserve Uses and Deposits

The City maintains reserves to help manage various types of risks, including **Economic Stabilization Reserves** to help to bridge multi-year budget losses resulting from recessions, the **General Reserve** to address current year issues not anticipated in the budget, **One-Time Reserves** for one-time needs, and other reserves mitigate specific risks identified by the Mayor and the Board.

The Mayor's proposed budget includes the use of \$117.6 million and \$73.5 million from non-operating reserves in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively, as well as \$5.3 million and \$0.6 million, respectively, in Children's Baseline True-Up funds from FY 2024-25. Budgeted reserve deposits include \$41.5 million and \$16.9 million deposits to the General Reserve and \$35.9 million and \$68.8 million to the Budget Stabilization Reserve.

Exhibit 2-1. Proposed Reserve Uses and Deposits (\$ millions)

	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27			FY 2027-28			Note
	Projected Balance	Deposit	Use	Projected Balance	Deposit	Use	Projected Balance	
General Reserve	\$ 154.9	\$ 41.5	-	\$ 196.4	\$ 16.9	-	\$ 213.3	1
Economic Stabilization Reserves								
City Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Reserve	114.5	-	-	114.5	-	-	114.5	2
Budget Stabilization Reserve	429.0	35.9	-	464.8	68.8	-	533.7	3
Economic Stabilization Reserves - Total	543.5	35.9	-	579.4	68.8	-	648.2	
Percent of General Fund Revenues	7.7%			8.1%			9.1%	
Reserves for One-Time Uses and Specific Risks								
Budget Stabilization One Time Reserve	54.8	-	(54.8)	-	-	-	-	3
SFUSD Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Reserve	1.0	-	-	1.0	-	-	1.0	2
Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve	1.1	-	(1.1)	-	-	-	-	4
Fiscal Cliff Reserve	15.0	-	(15.0)	-	-	-	-	5
Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve	433.3	2.2	(41.4)	394.2	-	(43.5)	350.7	6
Business Tax Stabilization Reserve	29.5	-	-	29.5	-	(29.5)	-	7
Public Health Revenue Management Reserve	174.2	-	-	174.2	-	-	174.2	8
Free City College Reserve	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Children's Baseline True-Up	7.9	-	(5.3)	2.6	-	(0.6)	2.0	10
One-Time and Specific Risks - Total	716.8	2.2	(117.6)	601.4	-	(73.5)	527.9	
Additional Appropriated Reserves								
Technical Adjustment Reserve	-	5.0	(5.0)	-	5.0	(5.0)	-	11
Litigation Reserve	-	11.0	(11.0)	-	11.0	(11.0)	-	12
Salary and Benefits Reserve	13.1	25.8	(38.9)	-	26.6	(26.6)	-	13
Appropriated Reserves - Total	13.1	36.8	(49.9)	-	37.6	(37.6)	-	
TOTAL, General Fund Reserves*	1,428.3	116.4	(167.5)	1,377.2	123.3	(111.1)	1,389.4	
Selected Non-General Fund Reserves								
Student Success Fund Reserve	18.1	-	-	18.1	-	-	18.1	14
Our City, Our Home Fund Reserve*	98.0	-	-	98.0	-	-	98.0	15

NOTES

1. General Reserve

- **Purpose** – Address revenue and expenditure issues not anticipated during budget development.
- **Withdrawals** – The City can make a supplemental appropriation to spend the General Reserve on any purpose. However, any appropriation will need to be fully offset in the subsequent budget to meet reserve requirements. No withdrawal assumed in the budget.
- **Deposits** – The Administrative Code requires the City to keep the General Reserve at 3.0 percent of General Fund revenue in any given year. However, in any given year where the City withdraws from the Rainy Day Reserve, as it did in FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22, the required balance of the General Reserve is reset to 1.5 percent of General Fund revenue, growing to 3.0 percent of General Fund revenues in 0.25 percent annual increments thereafter. In FY 2026-27, the General Reserve required funding level is 2.75 percent of General Fund revenue, growing to the full 3.0 percent in FY 2027-28.
- **Changes in the Proposed Budget** – To meet the requirements above, the budget proposes depositing \$41.5 million and \$16.9 million for FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively. These deposits add to \$154.9 million in projected ending balance in FY 2025-26.
- **Authority** – Administrative Code Section 10.60

2. Rainy Day Reserves

- **Purpose** – Capture above-average revenue growth to smooth shortfalls during economic downturns. The Rainy Day Reserves consist of three separate reserves:
 1. City Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Reserve
 2. SFUSD Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Reserve
 3. City's Rainy Day One-Time Reserve
- **Withdrawals** – The City can withdraw from its Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Reserve when General Fund revenues are projected to fall versus prior year. During such a recession or shock, the maximum allowable withdrawal is 50 percent of the balance in each year. This cap allows the reserve to be used over the duration of a typical recession. No withdrawal assumed in the budget.
- **Deposits** – The Charter requires the City to deposit to the Rainy Day Reserves when total General Fund revenue grows by 5% or more versus the prior year.
- **Changes in the Proposed Budget** – Because revenue is growing modestly (by less than 5 percent), the City is not required to make deposits to and is also ineligible to make withdrawals from the Rainy Day Reserves in either budget year. As a result, the proposed budget maintains balances in the City Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Reserve of \$114.5 million, \$0 in the City Rainy Day One-Time Reserve, and \$1.0 million in the SFUSD's Rainy Day Economic Stabilization Reserve.
- **Authority** – Charter Section 9.113.5

3. Budget Stabilization Reserve

- **Purpose** – Augment the Rainy Day Reserves and help further mitigate effects of significant economic downturns.
- **Withdrawals** – The City can withdraw from the Budget Stabilization Reserve when General Fund revenues are projected to fall versus prior year, up to the amount of the shortfall in those revenues. The City can only draw upon the Budget Stabilization Reserve after withdrawing the maximum allowable amount from the Rainy Day Reserves. No withdrawal assumed in the budget.

When the combined balance of the Budget Stabilization Reserve and Rainy Day Reserve exceeds 10 percent of General Fund revenues as it did in FY 2018-19, the excess is deposited in the Budget Stabilization One-Time Reserve. The City may withdraw from the one-time reserve for to support one-time expenses. This budget proposes spending the entire \$54.8 million balance of this reserve in FY 2026-27.

- **Deposits** – For certain volatile or one-time General Fund sources, the City deposits and amount equal to 75% of the following:
 1. Real property transfer tax revenue above the prior five-year average,
 2. Ending unassigned fund balance above what was assumed in the budget, and
 3. The proceeds from the sale of certain City-owned assets.
- **Changes in the Proposed Budget** – Because of strong real property transfer tax revenue (above the five year average), the City must make deposits of \$35.9 million and \$68.8 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively. As a result, the proposed budget grows this reserve's balance to \$464.8 million in FY 2026-27 and then \$533.7 million in FY 2027-28.
- **Authority** – Administrative Code Section 10.60(c)

4. Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve

Section 32 of the administrative provisions of the FY 2021-22 Annual Appropriation Ordinance established a Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve for the purpose of managing revenue shortfalls related to reimbursement disallowances from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and other state and federal agencies.

The FY 2024-25 budget spent \$38.2 million of this reserve and moved \$40.1 million into the new Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve authorized by Section 32.3 of the administrative provisions of the FY 2025-26 Annual Appropriations Ordinance, as described in note 6 below. The Mayor's budget proposes spending the final \$1.1 million of this reserve in FY 2026-27, as approved in the previous budget cycle.

5. Fiscal Cliff Reserve

Section 32.1 of the administrative provisions of the FY 2021-22 Annual Appropriation Ordinance established a Fiscal Cliff Reserve for the purpose of managing projected budget shortfalls following the spend down of federal and state stimulus funds and other one-time sources used to balance the FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23 budget. The Mayor's FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 proposed budget amended this reserve to include managing business tax revenue shortfalls as an additional eligible use. The City moved \$142.4 million of this reserve into a newly created Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve. This budget proposes spending the final \$15.0 million of this reserve in FY 2026-27, as approved in the previous budget cycle.

6. Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve

Section 32.3 of the administrative provisions of the FY 2025-26 Annual Appropriation Ordinance established the Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve for the purpose of managing revenue shortfalls related to changes in federal and state funding. This reserve is funded by combining \$40.1 million from the Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve, \$142.4 million from the Fiscal Cliff Reserve, and revenue escheated to the General Fund from City Option Medical Reimbursement Accounts, which is estimated to be \$220.8 million.

The budget proposes reserve uses of \$41.4 million in FY 2026-27 and \$43.5 million in FY 2027-28, including \$22.5 million in FY 2026-27 and \$29.2 million in FY 2027-28 for HSA staffing, non-personnel, and grants to maintain eligibility for as many Medi-Cal and CalFresh clients as possible, and the remainder for capital and equipment. This use is slightly offset by a \$2.2 million deposit budgeted in FY 2026-27 from unspent FY 2025-26 funds that were appropriated to provide supplemental food benefits during the federal government shutdown in the fall of 2025.

7. Business Tax Stabilization Reserve

Section 35 of the administrative provisions of the FY 2020-21 Annual Appropriations Ordinance created the Business Tax Stabilization Reserve to equalize the benefit of large one-time advance repayments associated with Commercial Rent Tax (June 2018 Proposition C) and Homeless Gross Receipts Tax (November 2018 Proposition C). The proposed budget spends the \$29.5 million balance of the reserve in FY 2027-28 to smooth revenue between the two budget years.

8. Public Health Revenue Management Reserve

Authorized under Section 12.6 of the administrative provisions of the FY 2013-14 Annual Appropriation Ordinance, the Public Health Management Reserve allows the Controller to defer surplus transfer payments, indigent health revenues, and realignment funding to offset future reductions of audit adjustments associated with the Affordable Care Act and funding allocations for indigent health services. This provision was adopted by the Board of Supervisors after the passage of the Affordable Care Act to smooth volatile state and federal revenues.

In July 2022, the Department of Public Health established a methodology to set targeted reserve levels at 10% of budgeted net patient revenue in each two-year budget, as well as specific deposit and withdrawal rules. The FY 2025-26 ending balance of the reserve is projected to be the maximum allowable level of \$174.2 million. There are no anticipated deposits to or withdrawals from this reserve assumed in the budget.

9. Free City College Reserve

The Free City College Reserve was authorized by Administrative Code Section 10.100-288 in November 2016 to provide a degree of funding stability to the Free City College Program. An initial deposit of \$1.0 million was made in FY 2017-18. By the end of FY 2018-19, the ending balance of this reserve was \$2.0 million. In September 2019, Ordinance 175-19 revised the funding mechanism for this reserve. From FY 2019-20 to FY 2022-23, any unspent funds for the Free City College Program for that year shall be deposited in the reserve. From FY 2023-24 to FY 2028-29, 50 percent of unspent funds shall be deposited in the reserve. As reported in the Controller's Office FY 2025-26 Nine-Month Report, the reserve is anticipated to be fully drawn down in FY 2025-26. This budget does not anticipate any withdrawals or deposits to this reserve over the next two years.

10. Children's Baseline True-Up

Charter Section 16.108 requires the City to make a minimum level of appropriations in each fiscal year towards the Children's Baseline (discussed further in Appendix 4) tracking growth in the City's aggregate discretionary revenue (ADR).

The City exceeded its initial FY 2024-25 Children's Baseline obligation of \$218.9 million by budgeting \$220.4 million of eligible expenditures as of the publication of the June 2024 Revenue Letter (for the Mayor's Proposed FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budget). By August 2025, the City's FY 2024-25 General Fund revenue closed

higher than budgeted in June 2024, resulting in higher aggregate discretionary revenue. The final FY 2024-25 Children's Baseline obligation was \$228.3 million, resulting in a \$7.9 million appropriations gap from the \$220.4 million originally budgeted. To ensure the City complied with the FY 2024-25 appropriations requirement, the City deposited \$7.9 million into a reserve for the purpose of supporting Children's Baseline-eligible spending in future years. This budget withdraws \$5.3 million in FY 2026-27 and another \$0.6 million in FY 2027-28 to support Children's Baseline eligible expenditures above the annual FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 Children's Baseline requirements.

11. Reserve for Technical Adjustments

Reserves of \$5.0 million in each budget year allow for technical adjustments during the budget review process. The Mayor's Office will inform the Budget and Finance Committee prior to the final Committee vote on the budget as to the amount required for technical adjustments and any balance that may be available for other uses.

12. Litigation Reserve

The Mayor's proposed budget includes \$11.0 million for the litigation reserve in each budget year. The reserve provides funding for judgments and claims paid out during the budget period based on historical experience and consistent with the level adopted in the Five-Year Financial Plan. The City also maintains a separate reserve funded from prior year appropriations for large cases pending against the City.

13. Salary & Benefits Reserve

The Mayor's proposed budget includes \$25.8 million and \$26.6 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively, to cover costs of adopted MOUs with labor organizations not directly tied to job class rates in departmental budgets, as well as other salaries and benefits-related costs not budgeted elsewhere.

14. Student Success Fund Reserve

Charter Section 16.131 requires deposits to the Student Success Fund reserve for any monies appropriated to the Student Success Fund but not committed. The City deposited \$1.5 million in FY 2023-24 and \$16.6 million in FY 2024-25. The Mayor's proposed budget makes no withdrawals or deposits.

15. Our City, Our Home Fund Reserve

Section 32.2 of the Administrative Provisions of the FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 AAO authorizes the deposit of up to \$98.0 million of unappropriated Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax revenue into a newly created contingency reserve to manage federal and state funding volatility. Deposits will depend on the actual surplus of Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax revenue and expenditures within the Our City, Our Home Fund.

Appendix 3. Nonrecurring Revenue Policy

The use of one-time or nonrecurring sources to support ongoing operations creates a future budget shortfall, requiring expenditures to be reduced or replacement resources identified. In December 2011, the Board approved a Nonrecurring Revenue Policy, codified in Administrative Code Section 10.61, which requires selected nonrecurring revenues to be used only for identified nonrecurring expenditures. The Controller is required to certify compliance with this policy. The selected revenues include:

- General Fund prior year-end unassigned fund balance, before reserve deposits, above the prior five-year average;
- The General Fund share of revenues from prepayments provided under long-term leases, concessions, or contracts after accounting for any Charter-mandated revenue transfers, set-asides, or deposits to reserves;
- Otherwise unrestricted revenues from legal judgments and settlements; and
- Otherwise unrestricted revenues from the sale of land or other fixed assets.

Controller's Certification

General Fund use of prior year-end unassigned fund balance is budgeted at \$42.4 million for FY 2026-27 and \$462.5 million for FY 2027-28 for a total of \$505.0 million in the two budget years. This amount is \$80.6 million above the prior five-year (FY 2020-21 through FY 2024-25) average of year-end fund balance of \$424.4 million. As shown in Exhibit 3-1, the budget contains \$271.8 million of budgeted nonrecurring sources and at least \$360.0 million in nonrecurring, capital, information technology, equipment, and H.R. 1 backfill expenditures. The Controller's Office certifies compliance with the policy, with one caution. Costs for increased eligibility work at the Human Services Agency have been budgeted as a one-time expense and funded by a use of reserve, however, this core eligibility work is likely ongoing.

Exhibit 3-1. General Fund Nonrecurring Sources & Uses (\$ millions)

	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	
One-Time Sources	Proposed	Proposed	Total
General Fund PY Unassigned Fund Balance in Excess of Five Year Average	-	80.6	80.6
Use of Prior Year Reserves			
Budget Stabilization One Time Reserve	54.8	-	54.8
Federal and State Emergency Disallowance Reserve	1.1	-	1.1
Fiscal Cliff Reserve	15.0	-	15.0
Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve	41.4	43.5	84.9
Business Tax Stabilization Reserve	-	29.5	29.5
Children's Baseline True-Up	5.3	0.6	5.9
Total One-Time Sources	117.6	154.2	271.8
One-Time Uses			
Capital	129.3	133.5	262.8
Information Technology	17.2	12.5	29.7
HR 1 Investment in Human Services Agency	22.5	29.2	51.7
Equipment	15.8	-	15.8
Total One-Time Uses	\$ 184.8	\$ 175.2	\$ 360.0

Appendix 4. Baselines, Set-Asides, Special Taxes, and Other Mandates

Voter-approved levels of funding for baselines, set-asides, special taxes and other spending mandates are summarized below in Exhibit 4-1.

Exhibit 4-1. Baselines, Set-Asides, Special Taxes, and Other Mandated Funding Requirements (\$ millions)

	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28	
	Original Budget	Proposed Budget	Proposed Budget	
General Fund Aggregate Discretionary Revenue (ADR)	4,660.0	5,280.6	5,230.3	
1 MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY (SFMTA)				
Municipal Railway Baseline - 7.0675% ADR - GF Transfer	329.4	373.2	369.7	a
Parking & Traffic Baseline - 2.5070% ADR - GF Transfer	116.8	132.4	131.1	a
Population Adjustment - GF Transfer	90.5	89.8	90.2	a
Parking Tax In-Lieu - 80% Parking Tax - GF Transfer	71.0	66.8	66.8	a
Traffic Congestion Mitigation Fund - Special Tax (50%)	9.9	9.9	9.9	c
Subtotal Municipal Transportation Agency	617.6	672.1	667.6	
2 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND				
Library Preservation Fund Baseline - 2.2858% ADR - GF Transfer	106.5	120.7	119.6	a
Library Preservation Fund Property Tax - \$0.025 per \$100 NAV	79.3	76.6	77.6	c
Subtotal Library	185.9	197.3	197.1	
3 RECREATION & PARKS				
Open Space Property Tax - \$0.025 per \$100 NAV	79.3	76.6	77.6	c
Recreation & Parks Baseline MOE - Budgeted Amount	90.1	91.5	89.8	a
<i>(Recreation & Parks Baseline MOE - Required GF Support)</i>	<i>88.2</i>	<i>90.6</i>	<i>89.3</i>	
Subtotal Recreation and Parks	169.4	168.1	167.4	
CHILDREN'S SERVICES				
4 Children & Youth Fund				
Children and Youth Fund Property Tax Set-Aside: \$0.4 per \$100 NAV	126.9	122.5	124.1	c
Children's Services Baseline - Budgeted Amount	275.2	293.6	299.2	b
<i>(Children's Services Baseline - Requirement: 4.830% ADR)</i>	<i>225.1</i>	<i>260.4</i>	<i>253.2</i>	
Transitional Aged Youth Baseline - Budgeted Amount	52.5	60.3	66.0	b
<i>(Transitional Aged Youth Baseline - Requirement: 0.580% ADR)</i>	<i>27.0</i>	<i>30.6</i>	<i>30.3</i>	
5 Babies & Families First Fund				
Commercial Rents Tax (85%)	156.7	147.5	143.3	c
Early Care and Education Baseline - Budgeted Amount	77.5	87.0	86.8	b
<i>(Early Care and Education Baseline - Requirement: 2.212% ADR)</i>	<i>76.9</i>	<i>79.5</i>	<i>78.8</i>	
6 Public Education Enrichment Fund - 3.0567% ADR				
Public Education Enrichment Fund Total - GF Transfer	142.5	161.4	159.9	a
1/3 Annual Contribution to Preschool for All	47.5	53.8	53.3	
2/3 Annual Contribution to SF Unified School District	95.0	107.6	106.6	
Public Education Enrichment Fund Baseline: 0.290% ADR (50% GF, 50% CYF)	13.5	15.3	15.2	a
7 Student Success Fund (SFUSD) - GF Transfer	35.0	45.0	60.0	a
8 Fair Wages for Educators Fund (SFUSD) - Parcel Tax	54.0	57.3	59.0	c
Subtotal Childrens Services (Required)	933.8	989.9	1,013.5	

	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
	Original Budget	Proposed Budget	Proposed Budget
HOMELESSNESS & HOUSING			
9 Our City, Our Home Fund			
Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax	335.9	465.2	444.9 ^c
Our City, Our Home Baseline - Budgeted Amount	365.4	374.6	397.7 ^b
(Our City, Our Home Baseline Requirement)	200.8	200.8	200.8
10 Housing Trust Fund - GF Transfer (net of loan repayment)	48.8	53.8	53.3 ^a
11 Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund	-	8.3	8.3 ^c
12 Housing Activation Fund - Empty Homes Tax	-	-	- ^c
Subtotal Homelessness and Housing	750.1	901.9	904.1
ARTS			
13 Hotel Tax for Arts Fund - Hotel Tax	33.0	36.0	36.3 ^c
14 Property Tax - Municipal Symphony - \$0.00125 per \$100 NAV	4.5	4.6	4.6 ^c
Subtotal Arts	37.5	40.6	40.9
OTHER			
15 Small Business Assistance Fund - Commercial Vacancy Tax	2.0	1.4	1.4 ^c
16 Dignity Fund - GF Transfer	59.1	62.1	61.5 ^a
17 Street Tree Maintenance Fund - GF Transfer	23.0	23.6	23.4 ^a
18 City Services Auditor: 0.2% of Citywide Budget	27.6	28.8	29.2 ^b
Subtotal Other	111.6	116.0	115.5
Total Baselines, Set Asides and Special Taxes	2,806.0	3,085.8	3,106.1
^a General Fund Supported Spending Mandate	1,126.2	1,235.7	1,240.3
^b Expenditure Requirement	798.2	844.3	878.9
^c Special Tax or Tax Dedication	881.6	1,005.8	986.9

NOTES

1. Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)

The Mayor's proposed budget includes funding for MTA baselines and special purpose taxes at the required levels of \$672.1 million in FY 2026-27 and \$667.6 million in FY 2027-28.

Municipal Railway Baseline. In 1999, voters adopted Proposition E, which created the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), combining the Municipal Railway (Muni) and the Department of Parking and Traffic. Charter section 8A.105 establishes a Municipal Transportation Fund to provide a predictable, stable and adequate level of funding for the MTA. In FY 2000-01, a base amount of funding was established, known as the "Municipal Railway Baseline." Charter subsection (c) (1) requires the Controller's Office to adjust the base amount from year to year by the percent increase or decrease in General Fund Aggregate Discretionary Revenues (ADR). The City is also required to adjust the baseline for significant service increases. Beginning in FY 2021-22, the City adjusted the Municipal Railway Baseline due to the opening of the Central Subway, increasing the baseline from 6.6856% to 7.0675% of ADR.

Parking & Traffic Baseline. For FY 2002-03 and beyond, this Charter section also establishes a minimum level of funding equivalent to 2.5070% of ADR, for the Parking and Traffic Commission based upon FY 2001-02 appropriations, known as the "Parking & Traffic Baseline."

Population Adjustment to Baselines. November 2014 Proposition B requires that in addition to adjusting annually for the change in ADR, the Municipal Railway and Parking & Traffic baselines' amounts increase to account for 10 years of population growth in the City in FY 2015-16 and annual population growth thereafter.

The budgeted amount for FY 2025-26 of \$90.5 million was based on a population growth estimate of 0.35 percent. However, when data for 2024 became available in the fall of 2025, the actual daytime population growth was 0.13 percent. The lower population growth rate decreased the transfer in FY 2025-26 to \$89.4 million, a decrease of \$1.1 million. The budgeted baseline amounts assume negligible population growth of 0.07 percent in FY 2026-27 and 0.06 percent in FY 2027-28.

Parking Tax In-Lieu. November 2007 Proposition A, amended Charter section 8A.105(f) to require 80 percent of parking tax revenue to be allocated to the MTA, an increase from the prior 40 percent established in 1999 Proposition E.

Traffic Congestion Mitigation Fund and Tax. In November 2019, voters adopted Proposition D, a traffic congestion mitigation tax on rides facilitated by commercial ride-share companies, autonomous vehicles, or private transit services to support spending on transit and infrastructure improvements. Proceeds are deposited in the Traffic Congestion Mitigation Fund and allocated primarily between MTA and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA). A lower tax rate for electric vehicles expired on January 1, 2025, leading to increases in the forecasts that stabilize in future fiscal years. The Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax is expected to be \$20.0 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28.

Exhibit 4-2. Traffic Congestion Mitigation Fund Sources and Uses (\$ millions)

	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
	Budget	Proposed	Proposed
Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax	\$ 20.0	\$ 20.0	\$ 20.0
USES			
County Transportation Agency	9.9	9.9	9.9
Municipal Transportation Agency	9.9	9.9	9.9
Interdepartmental Services	0.3	0.3	0.3
Total Uses	20.0	20.0	20.0

2. Library Preservation Fund

The Mayor’s proposed budget includes funding for the Library Preservation Fund baseline and property tax set aside at the required levels of \$197.3 million in FY 2026-27 and \$197.1 million in FY 2027-28.

Library Baseline. Charter Section 16.109 establishes a Library Preservation Fund to provide library services and to construct, maintain, and operate library facilities. In FY 2006-07, a base amount of funding was established, equivalent to 2.2858% of ADR. The City adjusts the funding amount for the Library Preservation Fund baseline annually by the percent increase or decrease in ADR. The Library Preservation Fund was renewed by voters in November 2022. The City may suspend growth in baseline funding when it forecasts a budget exceeding an annually calculated threshold. The March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan forecasted a deficit of \$168.5 million in FY 2026-27, which is lower than the threshold of \$357.4 million for FY 2026-27, resulting in no pause to growth in baseline funding.

Property Tax Set-Aside. Charter Section 16.109 dedicates property tax of \$0.025 for each \$100 valuation of taxable property to the Library Preservation Fund.

3. Recreation and Parks

The Mayor's proposed budget includes funding to the Recreation and Park Department for the Open Space Fund property tax set aside and the General Fund Baseline Maintenance of Effort at the level of \$168.1 million in FY 2026-27 and \$167.4 million in FY 2027-28.

Property Tax Set-Aside. Charter Section 16.107 dedicates property tax of \$0.025 for each \$100 valuation of taxable property to the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Fund.

General Fund Baseline Maintenance of Effort. June 2016 Proposition B amends Charter Section 16.107 to require baseline levels of General Fund support to the Recreation and Park Department, increasing by \$3.0 million per year from FY 2015-16 through FY 2025-26 and adjusting by changes in ADR thereafter. The City may suspend growth in baseline funding when it forecasts a budget deficit exceeding an annually calculated threshold. The March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan forecasted a deficit of \$168.5 million in FY 2026-27, which is lower than the threshold of \$313.2 million for that year, resulting in no pause to growth in baseline funding. The baseline requirement is \$90.6 million and \$89.3 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively. The Mayor's proposed budget includes General Fund appropriations of \$91.5 million and \$89.8 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively, exceeding the minimum requirement in each fiscal year. Note that the baseline requirement in FY 2027-28 is reduced by \$0.4 million to account for a half year of the [San Francisco Zoo's loan repayment to the department](#). In FY 2028-29 and the next nine years thereafter, the offsetting amount for a full year of debt service will be \$0.8 million.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

4. Children and Youth Fund

Charter Section 16.108 governs the Children and Youth Fund and dedicates \$0.04 for each \$100 valuation of taxable property to this fund. The Mayor's proposed budget includes funding at the required level of \$122.5 million in FY 2026-27 and \$124.1 million in FY 2027-28.

In addition to the Children and Youth Fund, Charter Section 16.108 also governs the Children and Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) baselines. These are minimum appropriation requirements that ensure the Children and Youth Fund (property tax set-aside) supplements – instead of supplants – previously existing funding for children and TAY.

Children's Baseline. November 2000 Proposition D set FY 2000-01 as the base year and budget as the minimum floor for appropriations on children's services. This base budget is adjusted annually by the percentage increase or decrease in ADR. November 2014 Proposition C amended the Charter to exclude medical health services as an eligible service and established the Disconnected Transitional-Aged Youth Baseline. The Controller recalculated City appropriations as a percentage of ADR to arrive at an adjusted baseline rate of 4.8296% of ADR.

The required Children's Baseline amounts for FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 are \$255.0 million and \$252.6 million, respectively. Including the appropriation of the Children's Baseline True-Up Reserve of \$5.3 million in FY 2026-27 and \$0.6 million in FY 2027-28 (described in Appendix 2 above), the total Children's Baseline requirement is \$260.4 million in FY 2026-27 and \$253.2 million in FY2027-28. The Mayor's proposed budget includes Children's Baseline appropriations of \$293.6 million and \$299.2 million, exceeding the minimum requirement.

Transitional Aged Youth Baseline. November 2014 Proposition C amended Charter Section 16.108 to increase the Children’s Baseline to include services for Disconnected Transitional-Aged Youth (TAY), known as the TAY Baseline. While the Charter combines the TAY and Children’s baselines, the City tracks them separately for reporting purposes. The TAY Baseline was established in FY 2013-14 as 0.5800% of ADR. Like the Children’s Baseline, the amount is adjusted annually by the percent increase or decrease in ADR. The required amounts for FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 are \$30.6 million and \$30.3 million, respectively. The Mayor’s proposed budget includes TAY eligible baseline appropriations of \$60.3 million and \$66.0 million, exceeding the minimum requirement in both years.

5. Babies and Families First Fund

June 2018 Proposition C established the Babies and Families First Fund. The ordinance imposes a special purpose tax on businesses leasing commercial space in the City, the commercial rents tax. The tax rate is one percent on the amounts a business receives from the lease or sublease of warehouse space and 3.5 percent on amounts a business receives from the lease or sublease of other commercial spaces. Uses of these funds are restricted to early care and education for children under six years old.

The proposed budget includes tax proceeds of \$173.6 million and \$168.6 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively. Eighty-five percent of tax proceeds, or \$147.5 million and \$143.3 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively, are dedicated to the Babies and Families First Fund. Fifteen percent is transferred to the General Fund. Office vacancies in San Francisco are expected to remain high. As more and more long-term commercial leases turn over and renew at lower rent levels or become vacant, the City expects revenue to fall slowly over the next several years.

Early Care and Education Baseline. In addition to a new funding source, June 2018 Proposition C established a requirement to maintain prior appropriation levels on early childhood care and education at FY 2017-18 budgeted levels, adjusted annually by the percent increase or decrease in ADR. The City may suspend growth in baseline funding when it forecasts a budget deficit exceeding an annually calculated threshold. The March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan forecasted a deficit of \$168.5 million in FY 2026-27, which is lower than the threshold of \$239.5 million for FY 2026-27. Therefore, this baseline will continue to grow. Additionally, an ordinance submitted as part of trailing legislation to modify the baseline funding requirements for early care and education programs in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28 enables the City to temporarily use interest earned from the Babies and Families First Fund as credit toward the baseline amount. The credited amount is \$16.9 million in FY 2026-27 and \$16.7 million in FY 2027-28, resulting in an adjusted baseline requirement of \$79.5 million in FY 2026-27 and \$78.8 million in FY 2027-28. The proposed budget appropriates \$87.0 million in FY 2026-27 and \$86.8 million in FY 2027-28 of baseline-eligible spending, exceeding the minimum requirement, assuming passage of trailing legislation.

Exhibit 4-3. Adjustments to Early Care and Education Baseline Requirements (\$ millions)

	FY2026-27	FY2027-28
	Proposed Budget	Proposed Budget
Baseline Requirement	96.4	95.4
(-) Credit Against Requirement From Interest	(16.9)	(16.7)
Final Baseline Requirement Amount	79.5	78.8

6. Public Education Enrichment Fund

Charter Section 16.123-2 created the Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF), which requires the City to support education initiatives with annual contributions equal to the City's total contribution in the prior year, adjusted for the change in ADR. The proposed budget includes \$161.4 million and \$159.9 million for the PEEF Annual Contribution in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively. One-third of the contribution supports the Preschool for All program at the Department of Early Childhood and two-thirds of the contribution supports programming at the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD).

Public Education Services Baseline. In addition to an annual dedication of funding, Charter Section 16.123-2 establishes a baseline to ensure that prior funding for SFUSD is not displaced by new funding to SFUSD. In FY 2001-02, a base amount of funding was established, which is adjusted annually by the percent increase or decrease in ADR. The Mayor's proposed budget includes the required \$15.3 million in FY 2026-27 and \$15.2 million in FY 2027-28 for this baseline.

7. Student Success Fund

November 2022 Proposition G added Charter Section 16.131, which established a Student Success Fund to provide grants to the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) and schools in the District to implement programs that improve academic achievement and social/emotional wellness. The measure requires an annual appropriation in a designated amount to the Fund for 15 years. The City may suspend growth in baseline funding when it forecasts a budget deficit exceeding an annually calculated threshold. The March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan forecasted a deficit of \$168.5 million in FY 2025-26, which is lower than the threshold of \$220.0 million for FY 2025-26, resulting in no pause of growth in baseline funding. The required contribution amounts of \$45.0 million in FY 2026-27 and \$60.0 million in FY 2027-28 are appropriated in the proposed budget.

8. Fair Wages for Educators Fund

In November 2020, voters adopted a City parcel tax to support the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). Although there are two other parcel taxes supporting SFUSD, they are levied under the District's taxing authority. This tax is reported in the Revenue Letter as it uses the City and County of San Francisco's taxing authority and requires appropriation by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The proposed budget appropriates \$57.3 million in FY 2026-27 and \$59.0 million in FY 2027-28.

HOMELESSNESS & HOUSING

9. Our City, Our Home Fund

In November 2018, voters adopted Proposition C, which created the Our City, Our Home Fund (OCOH). The ordinance imposes a special purpose tax of varying rates by industry, on businesses with gross receipts of more than \$25.0 million. Uses of these funds are restricted by formula to four major categories: permanent housing, mental health, homelessness prevention, and shelter and hygiene. The allocation methodology among the permanent housing, prevention, and shelter categories was temporarily altered in the prior two budgets by ordinance. Additional budget trailing legislation allows expenditures on short-term rental subsidies to exceed the 12 percent limit specified in the Business and Tax regulations Code.

The City budgeted \$465.2 million in FY 2026-27 for homelessness gross receipts tax revenue, which is \$129.3 million (38.5 percent) more than the FY 2025-26 budget. The FY 2025-26 Nine-Month Report forecast of homelessness gross receipts tax is \$434.0, which is \$98.1 million more than budget, resulting in an estimated \$98 million of fund balance available for appropriation. As discussed in Appendix 2 above, up to \$98 million is

authorized to be deposited to an Our City, Our Home revenue contingency reserve. The City budgeted \$444.9 million in FY 2027-28 for homelessness gross receipts tax revenue, which is \$20.3 million (4.4 percent) less than the proposed FY 2026-27 budget.

The original homelessness gross receipts tax was highly progressive and only applied to gross receipts above \$50 million. This structure resulted in highly volatile revenue dependent on a few large payers. In 2024, the top ten payers accounted for 46.7% of total revenue. Furthermore, unlike the General Fund, the OCOH Fund's primary revenue source is homelessness gross receipts tax, making it highly susceptible to revenue volatility. To address this, Proposition M (2024) reduced the exemption from \$50 million to \$25 million and restructured tax rates to lower the degree of concentration. Overall, Proposition M was expected to be revenue neutral for the homelessness gross receipts tax. The homelessness gross receipts tax forecast largely shares the same underlying economic assumptions as the General Fund business tax forecast discussed in Appendix 1.

Our City, Our Home Baseline. In addition to imposing the homelessness gross receipts tax, November 2018 Proposition C also established a requirement to maintain homelessness spending at FY 2017-18 budgeted levels to ensure that the new homelessness gross receipts tax did not displace existing funding for homelessness services. The base amount of funding is calculated to be \$200.8 million, including expenditures in the General Fund and other funds. The proposed budget appropriates \$374.6 million in FY 2026-27 and \$397.7 million in FY 2027-28 of baseline-eligible spending, exceeding the requirement.

10. Housing Trust Fund

Charter section 16.110 establishes the Housing Trust Fund, which required an annual contribution from the General Fund of \$20.0 million beginning in FY 2013-14, increasing annually by \$2.8 million through FY 2024-25, and changing with ADR in FY 2025-26 and thereafter. In FY 2021-22, the City transferred \$60.0 million to the Housing Trust Fund, \$17.6 million more than the required amount. FY 2021-22 Administrative provision Section 11.25 of the Annual Appropriations Ordinance directs the Controller to credit the \$17.6 million as an advance against required appropriations of the Housing Trust Fund, with a required annual repayment to the General Fund of \$3.52 million beginning in FY 2023-24 for five years. This has the effect of lowering the required funding amount by \$3.52 million in each year, from FY 2023-24 through FY 2027-28. The Mayor's proposed budget meets required funding levels, net of the annual repayment, of \$53.8 million and \$53.3 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively.

11. Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund

In November 2024, voters adopted Proposition G, which created the Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund. The proposed budget makes the required deposit of \$8.25 million in FY 2026-27. Thereafter, the City's annual deposits to the fund will be no less than the prior year's appropriation and increase by the annual percentage change in ADR or 3.0%, whichever is smaller. The City may temporarily suspend increases in any year in which a General Fund deficit of \$250 million is forecasted. The proposed budget appropriates \$8.25 million in both FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28.

12. Housing Activation Fund

In November 2022, voters adopted Proposition M, which imposed a tax on vacant homes. The tax was scheduled to take effect in tax year 2024, with revenues first impacting FY 2024-25. The City budgeted \$20.0 million of tax revenue in FY 2024-25, balanced with \$20.0 million of housing-related expenditures. However, a lawsuit filed in 2023 challenged the validity of the tax on the grounds that it violates state law and the federal and state constitutions. In late 2024, a trial court struck down the tax in its entirety and prohibited the City

from collecting it. The City has appealed the trial court’s ruling. Ordinance 41-25 was passed by the Board of Supervisors in March 2025 and signed by the Mayor in April 2025 to suspend the tax until the year after a final court ruling in the City’s favor, should it occur. Consistent with the legal status and policy direction, no appropriations of this source are in the Mayor’s proposed budget.

ARTS

13. Hotel Room Tax Fund

In November 2018, voters adopted an ordinance to dedicate a portion of hotel tax to support arts organizations. Revenue is deposited in the Culture and Recreation Hotel Tax Fund and allocated to the Arts and Culture department and the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development. In previous budgets, Grants for the Arts was budgeted under the City Administrator’s Office. In the Mayor’s proposed budget, Grants for the Arts is now budgeted under Arts Commission. This updated allocation reflects the consolidation of the Grants for the Arts and the Film Commission with the Arts Commission in the proposed budget.

Exhibit 4-4. Hotel Tax Dedication to Arts (\$ millions)

Dept	Allocation	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
ART	Grants For the Arts	18.3	18.5
	Arts Impact Endowment	2.8	2.8
	Cultural Centers	4.3	4.3
	Cultural Equity Endowment	7.2	7.3
MYR	Cultural Districts	3.4	3.4
Total, Hotel Tax for Arts		36.0	36.3

14. Municipal Symphony Baseline

Charter Section 16.106(1) mandates that the City provide an appropriation equivalent to 1/8 of \$0.01 of each \$100 of assessed valuation of property tax for the San Francisco Municipal Symphony Orchestra. The required funding for the Municipal Symphony Baseline is \$4.6 million in FY 2026-27 and \$4.6 million in FY 2027-28.

OTHER

15. Small Business Assistance Fund

In March 2020, voters adopted a tax on keeping certain commercial spaces vacant for more than 182 days in a calendar year. Proceeds from the commercial vacancy tax are deposited in the Small Business Assistance Fund and allocated primarily to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. The tax took effect in tax year 2022. Commercial vacancy tax is budgeted at \$1.4 million in each of FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28.

16. Dignity Fund

In November 2016, voters approved Proposition I, establishing the Dignity Fund to support programming for seniors and adults with disabilities. Charter section 16.128-3 establishes a baseline contribution from the General Fund to the Dignity Fund of \$38.1 million beginning in FY 2016-17, increasing by \$6.0 million in FY 2017-18 and by \$3.0 million per year from FY 2018-19 through FY 2026-27. In FY 2027-28 and beyond, the

baseline is adjusted by the percentage increase or decrease in ADR. The City may suspend growth in baseline funding when it forecasts a budget deficit exceeding an annually calculated threshold. The March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan forecasted a deficit of \$168.5 million in FY 2026-27, which is lower than the threshold of \$278.9 million for FY 2026-27, resulting in no pause in baseline funding increases. The Mayor's proposed budget includes the required General Fund appropriations of \$62.1 million and \$61.5 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively.

17. Street Tree Maintenance Fund

In November 2016, voters approved Proposition E, establishing the Street Tree Maintenance Fund to maintain the City's street trees. Charter section 16.129 establishes a baseline contribution from the General Fund to the Street Tree Maintenance Fund of \$19.0 million in FY 2017-18 and adjusted by the percentage increase or decrease in ADR every year thereafter. The City may suspend growth in baseline funding when it forecasts a budget deficit exceeding an annually calculated threshold. The March 2026 Update to the Five-Year Financial Plan forecasted a deficit of \$168.5 million in FY 2026-27, which is lower than the threshold of \$230.8 million for FY 2026-27, resulting in no pause in street tree baseline funding increases. The Mayor's proposed budget includes the required General Fund appropriations of \$23.6 million and \$23.4 million in FY 2026-27 and FY 2027-28, respectively.

18. City Services Auditor Baseline

Charter Section F1.113, approved by voters through Proposition C in November 2003, established the Controller's Audit Fund with a baseline funding amount of 0.2 percent of the City budget to fund audits of City services. The Mayor's proposed budget includes the required \$28.8 million in FY 2026-27 and \$29.2 million in FY 2027-28 for the City Services Auditor baseline.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Fire Commission Amended Rules of Order
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:11:31 PM
Attachments: [Amended Rules of Order June 10, 2026.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), submitting the San Francisco Fire Commission's Amended Rules of Order.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

***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: Aguas-Aclan, Kathy (FIR) <kathy.aguas-aclan@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 2:33 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Docs, SF (LIB) <sfdocs@sfpl.org>
Subject: Fire Commission Amended Rules of Order

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

At the regular Fire Commission meeting today, June 10, 2026, the Commissioners approved amending the Amended Rules of Order. It has been posted according to the requirements, and I have attached it to this email. Please let me know if there is anything else required.

Regards,

Kathy Aguas-Aclan (she/her/hers)
Executive Assistant to the Fire Commission
San Francisco Fire Department
698 Second Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
Phone: 415-558-3451

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION

AMENDED RULES OF ORDER

CHAPTER I – DEFINITIONS

- A. "Brown Act" shall mean the Ralph M. Brown Act, California Government Code §54590 et seq.
- B. "Charter" shall mean the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.
- C. "Chief" shall mean the Chief of the San Francisco Fire Department.
- D. "Commission" shall mean the San Francisco Fire Commission.
- E. "President" shall mean the President of the Commission.
- F. "Presiding Officer" shall mean the President of the Commission, or in the absence of the President, the Vice President of the Commission. In the absence of both the President and Vice President, the Presiding Officer shall be the longest-serving member of the Commission present.
- G. "Secretary" shall mean the Fire Commission Secretary.
- H. "Sunshine Ordinance" shall mean the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 67.

CHAPTER II – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Rule 1. Open Meeting Policy

It is the policy of the Commission to conduct all official business through open and public meetings consistent with the Brown Act and the Sunshine Ordinance.

Rule 2. Public Participation Policy

It is the policy of the Commission to encourage and permit public comment on matters within the Commission's jurisdiction.

Rule 3. Public Comment

3.1. General Public Comment. The Commission shall include general public comment as an agenda item at each regular meeting of the Commission. During general public comment, each member of the public may address the Commission on matters within the Commission's jurisdiction that are not specifically agendized for that meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission once during general public comment, for up to three minutes. The Commission will apply this time limit uniformly to members of the public, although the Commission will extend additional time as an accommodation to a member of the public with a disability that impairs his or her

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION

ability to speak or to a non-English speaker with a translator. The Presiding Officer may limit general public comment to less than three minutes per speaker, depending on the number of speakers during general public comment and the number and anticipated duration of other agenda items.

The Commission will not discuss or take action on a matter raised during general public comment, but may ask questions for clarification, ask staff for factual information on the matter, or request staff to report back to the Commission at a later meeting. The Commission will calendar a matter raised during general public comment for a future meeting before engaging in substantive discussion or taking action on that matter.

3.2. Public Comment on Agenda Items. The Commission will provide for public comment on each item on the agenda, whether scheduled for discussion or action. Public comment on a discussion item may take place at any time during consideration of the item, at the discretion of the Presiding Officer. Public comment on an action item will take place before the Commission takes action. Persons addressing the Commission during public comment on an agenda item shall confine their remarks to the particular agenda item. For each agenda item, each member of the public may address the Commission once, for up to three minutes. The Commission will apply this time limit uniformly to members of the public, although the Commission will extend additional time as an accommodation to a member of the public with a disability that impairs his or her ability to speak or to a non-English speaker with a translator. The Presiding Officer may limit the public comment on an agenda item to less than three minutes per speaker, based on the nature of the agenda item, the number of anticipated speakers for that item, and the number and anticipated duration of other agenda items.

3.3. Speaker Identification. Individuals making public comment may be requested, but not required, to identify themselves.

3.4. Designated Public Comment Area. Members of the public wishing to address the Commission must speak from the public comment area designated by the Secretary. This area is near the front of the Commission Room on the Commission's right side and the audience's left. A microphone is located in the designated public comment area.

3.5. Addressing the Commission. Individuals wishing to speak during public comment must approach the public comment area on the side of the room where the designated public comment area is located. Speakers should form a line starting at the second row of chairs next to the designated public comment area. No one may interfere with another person who is addressing the Commission or in line to address the Commission. Individuals in line to address the Commission must remain behind the second row of chairs until it is their turn to make public comment, and only then may they approach the microphone to speak. Individuals should speak clearly into the microphone.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION

3.6. Speaker Conduct During Public Comment. The Commission will not tolerate disruptive or inappropriate conduct during public comment. Speakers who use profanity or who engage in yelling, name-calling, or other disruptive or inappropriate behavior will be directed to cease any such conduct and may be asked to leave the meeting room.

3.7. Audience Activity During Public Comment. Although the Commission welcomes public comment, persons in the audience shall not express support or opposition to statements by Commissioners or persons testifying through their words or actions. Applause and booing are prohibited. The Presiding Officer may request that audience members refrain from any conduct that causes unreasonable distractions or disruptions during the meeting.

3.8. Policy Prohibiting Discriminatory or Harassing Remarks Made at Public Meetings. The Commission follows the City and County of San Francisco Policy on Discriminatory or Harassing Remarks Made at Public Meetings of City Boards and Commissions. If any person makes discriminatory or harassing remarks at a Commission meeting that violates City policy prohibiting discrimination and harassment on the basis of specified protected characteristics, the Presiding Officer shall read the City's policy against discrimination and harassment into the record and state that comments in violation of City policy will not be condoned and will play no role in the Commission's decisions. The Presiding Officer shall further state that any City employee in the room who is offended by the discriminatory or harassing remarks is excused from attendance at the meeting, and that no City employee is compelled to remain in attendance where it appears likely that speakers will make further discriminatory or harassing comments. If speakers continue to make discriminatory or harassing remarks that violate City policy, the Presiding Officer shall remind the speaker of City policy, and then may recess the meeting temporarily. After this temporary interruption, speakers engaged in public comment shall be permitted to finish their allotted time.

3.9. Comment, Not Debate. During public comment, speakers shall address their remarks to the Commission as a whole and not to individual Commissioners, Fire Department personnel, or the audience. Commissioners, Fire Department personnel, and other speakers are not required to respond to questions from a speaker. Commissioners shall not enter into debate or discussion with speakers during public comment, although they may question speakers to obtain clarification. The Presiding Officer or the Commission may ask staff to investigate an issue raised during public comment and later report to a committee or to the Commission. The lack of a response by the Commissioners to public comment does not necessarily constitute agreement with or support of comments made during public comment.

3.10. Approaching Commissioners or the Chief During Proceedings. Members of the public may not approach the Commissioners or the Chief during Commission proceedings, unless invited to approach by the Presiding Officer or Chief. If a member

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION

of the public wishes to make an inquiry or provide correspondence or other materials to the Commission or the Chief, he or she shall present the inquiry or materials to the Secretary before or after the meeting, during a break in the meeting, or after requesting and receiving permission to do so during public comment.

3.11. Recording Commission Proceedings. Members of the public may record Commission meetings with an audio or video recorder or still or motion picture camera. Members of the public wishing to record Commission proceedings should position their equipment so that any noise or light from the equipment does not disrupt the Commission proceedings, and so the equipment does not obstruct any member of the public's view of or ability to participate in the proceedings. Generally, members of the public should keep recording equipment and cameras on the sides of the Commission Room, behind the second row of audience seating. Audio recorders may be placed on the Commission table before the meeting starts. The Presiding Officer may request that members of the public reposition their equipment to minimize disruption or obstruction of the meeting. No person may intentionally block or impede a member of the public's recording of Commission proceedings.

Rule 4. Written Communications

The Commission encourages members of the public to write to the Commission concerning issues within the Commission's jurisdiction. The Secretary shall list the following written communications in the next agenda: (1) written communications from members of the public addressed directly to the Commission; and (2) commendations and letters of recognition received by the Chief, if the Commission becomes aware of such communications. Communications shall also be kept and made available pursuant to the requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance.

CHAPTER III – MEETINGS AND ORGANIZATION

Rule 5. Regular Meeting Location and Times

The Fire Commission will meet regularly on the 2nd Wednesday of each month at San Francisco City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102. The meeting will take place in Room 416 at 9:00 a.m.

Rule 6. Special Meetings

The Commission may hold a special meeting at any time at the call of the President or a majority of the members. Special meetings may be held at City Hall with 72 hours'

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION

notice or at an alternate location other than at Fire Department headquarters with 15 days' notice.

Rule 7. Closed Session

The Fire Commission may meet in closed session during a regular or special meeting, as authorized under the Brown Act and the Sunshine Ordinance. The Secretary shall post any action required to be reported after a closed session pursuant to the requirements of Administrative Code Section 67.12.

Rule 8. Meeting Procedures

The Commission shall conduct all meetings in conformance with the Charter, Brown Act and Sunshine Ordinance. The Commission will act by motion or resolution.

Rule 9. Commission Agenda

Before each meeting, the Secretary shall prepare an agenda that satisfies the requirements of the Brown Act and the Sunshine Ordinance. Each agenda shall specify the time and place of the meeting and contain a meaningful description of each item of business to be discussed and transacted. The Secretary shall post all agenda in compliance with the requirements and timelines of the Brown Act and Sunshine Ordinance.

For discipline cases heard by the Commission, both appeals from Chief's discipline and charges filed by the Chief, neither the agenda nor the minutes shall identify the accused member by name but shall list the Commission's File Number for the matter, the rank of the member, and the Rules allegedly violated.

Rule 10. Order of Business

Commission meetings shall proceed as set forth in the agenda, except that the Presiding Officer may call items out of order for any reasonable purpose. The Presiding Officer shall announce any change in the order of business as soon as possible.

Rule 11. Commission Action

The Commission will not discuss or take action on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, except as permitted under the Brown Act and Sunshine Ordinance.

Rule 12. Voting

Commission business shall be conducted only when a quorum is present (three Commissioners). Every official act of the Commission shall be adopted by majority vote of the Commission (three or more Commissioners), except that matters of procedure may be adopted by majority vote of the members present at a meeting, so long as the members present constitute a quorum.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION



Rule 13. Minutes

The Secretary shall prepare draft minutes of each meeting in conformance with the requirements and timelines in the Brown Act and Sunshine Ordinance. The Secretary shall present the draft minutes for approval at the next regular meeting to the extent practicable. Once approved by the Commission, the Secretary shall post the minutes on the Commission website.

Rule 14. Officers

The Commission shall nominate and elect a President and Vice President at the second meeting in January of each year. The term of those officers shall commence on the first meeting in February. They shall serve a one-year term, or until a successor is elected.

Rule 15. Commission President

The President shall set the agenda for Commission meetings, call Commission meetings to order and preside at those meetings, and perform all other duties necessary or incidental to the office. The President may create committees to perform such advisory functions as the President shall determine and may appoint and remove members from such committees at his or her pleasure.

Rule 16. Commission Vice-President

In the absence or inability of the President to act, the Vice-President shall take the place and perform the duties of the President.

Rule 17. Secretary

The Secretary shall prepare and post agenda for all regular and special Commission meetings, attend all meetings, call the roll and agenda items at each meeting, and call and record all Commission votes. The Secretary shall keep a true and accurate record of all Commission proceedings and shall prepare draft minutes of the meetings. The Secretary shall assist the Presiding Officer as necessary to assure that meetings are orderly. The Secretary shall maintain a file of all written communications received by the Commission, and perform other duties as assigned.

Amended at the Regular Meeting on June 10, 2026.

Ayes: 4
Nays: 0

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: June 15, 2026 SFAC Civic Design Review Agenda Posted
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 2:34:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[June_15_2026_Civic_Design_Review_Agenda.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART) Civic Design Review committee meeting agenda for June 15, 2026.

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: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 12:51 PM
Subject: June 15, 2026 SFAC Civic Design Review Agenda Posted

Hello,

The agenda for the Monday, June 15, 2026, Civic Design Review meeting has been posted:

[Civic Design Review Meeting | San Francisco \(sf.gov\)](#)

[Agenda](#)

Thank you,
Manraj



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

San Francisco Arts Commission

401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org

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

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

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



City and County of San Francisco

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Agenda for Civic Design Review, June 15, 2026



Commissioners

- Patrick Carney, Chair; Seth Brenzel, Chuck Collins, Al Perez, McKenna Quint, Jessica Rothschild, Janine Shiota.

Date and Time

Monday, June 15, 2026

2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Location

City Hall, Room 416,

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place.

Members of the committee will attend this meeting in-person at the location listed above. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in person at the physical meeting location listed above or remotely online.

Members of the public attending the meeting in-person will have an opportunity to provide up to three minutes of public comment on every agenda item.

- Watch on SFGovTV (captioned) [Live Stream – Civic Design Review Meeting](#)

Agenda items

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Changes, Land Acknowledgment

1. Call to order
2. Roll call / Confirmation of quorum
3. Agenda Changes
4. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples. As a department dedicated to promoting a diverse and equitable Arts and Culture environment in San Francisco, we are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community.

2. General Public Comment

Discussion

(This item is to allow members of the public to comment generally on matters within the Commission's purview as well as to suggest new agenda items for the Commission's consideration.)

3. SFFD Division of Training – Phase 3 Review

Discussion and possible action

Discussion and possible action for Phase 3 Review for SFFD Division of Training

Presentation time: Approximately 10 minutes

Project team:

Project Designer(s): DLR Group/RossDrulisCusenbery Architects

Project Manager(s): Scott Moran

Architect: Matt Jasmin

Landscape Architect: Public Works Bureau of Landscape Architecture

[This project was previously reviewed on April 21, 2025](#)

[SFFD Division of Training: Phase 3 Review, Request for Review](#)

[SFFD Division of Training: Phase 3 Review, Presentation](#)

[SFFD Division of Training: Phase 3 Review, Construction Documents](#)

4. Signature Aviation SFO Facility – Conceptual Review

Discussion and possible action

Discussion and possible action for Conceptual Review for Signature Aviation SFO Facility.

Presentation time: Approximately 15 minutes

Project team:

Project Designer: Nicholas Acevedo

Project Manager(s): Nika Imani

Architect: Nicholas Acevedo

Landscape Architect: Petersen Studio

[Signature Aviation SFO Facility: Conceptual Review, Request for Review](#)

[Signature Aviation SFO Facility: Conceptual Review, Presentation](#)

5. New Business and Announcements

Discussion

(This item is to allow the Commissioners to introduce without discussion new agenda items for consideration, to report on recent arts activities and to make announcements in accordance with [Prop D.](#))

6. Adjournment

Action

Agenda posted 06/10/2026, 12:40 pm, mscd

Policies

Accessibility Meeting Policy

Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or

a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Late requests will be honored if possible. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible.

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料，和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少 48 小時致電 415-252-2247 向 Manraj Dhaliwal, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Commission Secretary, Manraj Dhaliwal, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign

Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gamit upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa.

Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon.

Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal sa 415-252-

2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin. Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

Agenda Item Information/Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;
- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Archives Available

A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting.

Cell Phone Or other Electronic Device Use at Hearings

Please silence all cell phones, pagers, and other sound-producing devices before the meeting begins.

If a device does go off during the meeting, please note that the Chair or President may ask the person responsible to step out of the room.

Disability Access

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

- Wheelchair accessible entrance is at Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street.
- There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Lobbyist Ordinance

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity.

For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, contact the [Ethics Commission](#).

- 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 252-3100
- Ethics.Commission@sfgov.org

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of

order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.

2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.

3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.

5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. The Commission Secretary will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Public Comment

Public comment in regard to specific agenda items will be taken before or during consideration of the item. Each speaker may speak for up to three minutes per agenda item, unless the Chair has announced a different length

of time at the beginning of the meeting. Speakers may not transfer their time to another person. Any person speaking during a public comment period may supply a written summary of their comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less.

NOTE: The San Francisco Arts Commission is discontinuing remote public comment for all public meetings starting in December 2023. Public comment will be taken in-person, with remote access provided for those who require an ADA accommodation. Requests for accommodation must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 97.7. Late requests will be honored if possible. Please reach out to art-info@sfgov.org or by calling 415-252-2255 with any questions or to make an accommodation request

Sensitivity to chemical-based products

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

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.

Citizens interested in obtaining a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance can request a copy from by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine/>

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- 1 Dr. Carlton b. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 554-7724
- By fax at 415-554 7854
- sotf@sfgov.org

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Bellaire Tower
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:25:58 AM
Attachments: [0679_001.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached notice of nomination of Bellaire Tower to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register).

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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.*



DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Armando Quintero, Director

Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer

1725 23rd Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95816-7100

Telephone: (916) 445-7000

FAX: (916) 445-7053

calshpo.ohp@parks.ca.gov

www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

June 8, 2026

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

RE: National Register of Historic Places Nomination for Bellaire Tower

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Federal Regulations 36 CFR Part 60.6(c) I am notifying you that the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC) at its next meeting intends to consider and take action on the nomination of the above-named property to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). Details of that meeting are on the enclosed notice. The National Register is the federal government's official list of historic buildings and other cultural resources worthy of preservation. Listing in the National Register provides recognition and assists in preserving California's cultural heritage. If the item is removed from the scheduled agenda, you will be notified by mail.

Local government comments regarding the National Register eligibility of this property are welcomed. Written comments regarding the nomination may be submitted to California State Parks, Attn: Office of Historic Preservation, Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer, P.O. Box 94296, Sacramento, California 94296-0001 OR via email to calshpo.shrc@parks.ca.gov. To allow the SHRC adequate time to consider the comments, it is requested that written comments be received by the Office of Historic Preservation seven (7) days in advance of the SHRC's meeting. Written comments received within seven days of the meeting will still be included in the nomination file as sent to the Keeper of the National Register. Interested parties are encouraged to attend the SHRC meeting and present oral testimony.

As of January 1, 1993, all National Register properties are automatically included in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) and afforded consideration in accordance with state and local environmental review procedures.

The federal requirements covering the National Register program are to be found in the National Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and in Federal Regulations 36 CFR Part 60. State law regarding the California Register is in the Public Resources Code, Section 5024. Should you have questions regarding this nomination, or would like a copy of the nomination, please contact the Registration Unit at calshpo.shrc@parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer

Enclosure: Meeting Notice

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUN 11 AM 08:39
Jr Bos-11

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations for Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine)
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:40:13 AM
Attachments: [1.62_SportFish2026_Notice_REV_2.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a notice of proposed changes in regulations related to Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine).

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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

From: California Fish and Game Commission <fgc@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 10:49 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations for Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine)

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

[View as a webpage / share](#)

LittleMcKee



California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposed changes in regulations related to Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine) has been posted to the Commission's website. The notices and associated documents can be accessed at <https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2026-New-and-Proposed> under "Fishing".

Sincerely,

David Haug
California Fish and Game Commission

[Click here to visit our regulations page](#)

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

[Sign Up](#)

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

[California Fish and Game Commission](#)
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Help](#)

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

TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Sections **110, 200, 205, 219, 255, 265, 270, 275, 315, 316.5, 399, 713, 1050, 1053.1, 1055.1, 2003, 2084, 7149.8, 7380, 7701, 7708** of the California Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific Sections **37, 67, 110, 200, 205, 219, 255, 265, 270, 275, 316.5, 711, 713, 1050, 1053.1, 1055.1, 2084, 7060, 7149.8, 7380, 7381, 7382** of said Code, proposes to **amend** Sections **1.62, 1.73, 1.74, 2.10, 2.11, 4.20, 5.00, 5.65, 5.85, 5.88, 6.34, 6.35, 7.00, 7.40, 7.50, 8.00, 8.10, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, 28.35, 230, and 701**, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to **Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine)**

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

This regulatory proposal combines California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) and public requests for changes to California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, sections 1.62, 1.73, 1.74, 2.10, 2.11, 4.20, 5.00, 5.65, 5.85, 5.88, 6.34, 6.35, 7.00, 7.40, 7.50, 8.00, 8.10, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, 28.35, 230, and 701, for the 2026 sport fishing regulatory cycle. This proposal contains multiple amendments that would clarify sport fishing regulations, increase angler opportunities, change gear requirements, change fish measurement and sampling protocols, improve the steelhead report card and low-flow regulations, and protect vulnerable fish populations. These proposed regulatory changes are needed to effectively manage California's sport fisheries, and correct errors and inaccuracies in the existing regulations to reduce public confusion and improve regulatory enforcement.

The Department is proposing changes to the following regulations in Title 14, CCR:

Regulation Language Clarifications:

The proposed changes are necessary in order to enhance clarity or fix errors, and do not alter the application or enforcement of these regulations:

- **Section 2.11, Special Fishing Methods – Lake County:** In 2014, Clear Lake Hitch were listed under California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as threatened and can no longer be taken without a CESA incidental take permit or MOU. The language in Section 2.11 conflicts with the take prohibitions for Clear Lake Hitch and needs to be removed from Title 14 CCR.
- **Section 5.65, Shad, American:** In 2025 there was a regulation change to allow spearfishing as a method of take for American Shad in the Valley District in Section 2.30. The proposed change would add spearfishing as a method of take allowable for American Shad in the Valley District in Section 5.65. This would make Section 5.65 consistent with Section 2.30.
- **Section 5.85, subsection (a)(2), Trout:** This proposal would add Section 7.00, which lists general regulations in each District, to the list of sections excepted from general statewide trout regulations. This proposal would remove ambiguities associated with wardens enforcing fishing regulation violations.

- **Section 6.34, Southern District Definition:** The current regulations definition of the “Southern District” in Section 6.34 erroneously copies the Sierra District definition. This change would correct the language to the as-intended definition of the Southern District.
- **Section 7.50, subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries:** This proposal would clean up, reorganize, and group streams with similar regulations in subsection 7.50(b)(90) for the McCloud River and tributaries. This would simplify the regulation, making it easier to understand by grouping waters with similar regulations.
- **Section 7.50(b)(145), Sq. Valley Creek:** The name of Sq. Valley Creek was changed by federal legislation through the Department of Interior’s Order 3404 on September 8, 2022 to Yét Atwam Creek. This proposal would make the regulation text consistent with federal legislation.
- **Section 230, subsection (g)(2), Issuance of Permits for Contests Offering Prize for the Taking of Game Fish:** There is a minor grammar error in subsection 230(g)(2) which has an ungrammatical ‘s’ that would be removed from the word “changes”.
- **Section 7.40, subsection (b):** Updates to other regulations sections have been made in this proposal to update or remove unnecessary references to subsections 7.40(b) and 7.50(b) due to the continual changes in the numbering of these sections when waters are added or removed. There are minor edits to text to align subsection 7.40(b) and 7.50(b) language with the updated Section 8.00 language that is part of this proposal which will clarify boundaries in both sections where descriptions are unclear, provide consistent placement of text, and update subsection references between Section 8.00 and subsection 7.40(b) where needed.

Changes To Increase Fishing Opportunities

The proposed changes described below would increase fishing opportunities in the effected regulation sections.

- **Section 4.20, subsection (d) Bait Fish Use in the Sacramento River (Shasta and Tehama Co.):** This proposed change would move the upper limit of the Sacramento River upstream from Highway 32 Bridge to Deschutes Bridge for bait fish use. Generally, declining fish populations associated with drought and climate change have limited many fishing opportunities. At the same time Striped Bass populations have expanded into more areas of the Sacramento River, especially after the Red Bluff Diversion Dam was permanently opened. This proposed change would allow live fin fish to be used further up the Sacramento River which would increase fishing opportunities for striped bass and other non-native fishes that are currently limited use of lures and other methods. It may also increase harvest of these non-native species which could have a potential benefit on vulnerable salmonid populations.
- **Section 5.00, subsection (b), Black Bass (Lassen and Modoc Co.):** This proposed change would remove the black bass minimum size requirement from waters in Lassen

and Modoc counties, except for Mountain Meadows Reservoir where the minimum size would remain at 12 inches. Growth rates of largemouth bass are typically slow within Lassen and Modoc counties due shorter growing season attributable to the high elevation. Additionally, reservoirs containing large bass populations are often overrun with stunted bass and few bass are able to reach the 12-inch minimum size requirement for harvest. The 12-inch minimum size requirement reduces the number of harvested bass, which could affect the bass populations by further stunting their growth. Removing the minimum size requirement in these locations would increase the harvest of smaller bass and improve the size class structure within the bass populations. Mountain Meadows Reservoir is still recovering from being drained in 2015 and has the potential to grow trophy class bass as it has in the past. The 12-inch minimum size requirement at Mountain Meadows Reservoir would be maintained under the General Statewide Restrictions regulations allowing the bass population to grow and allow more small young bass to grow to the 12-inch size minimum and larger.

- **Section 7.00, subsection (b)(2), District General Regulations—Sierra District (Shasta and Tehama Co.):** This proposed change would increase fishing opportunity by allowing the use of bait during summer months within anadromous streams in Shasta and Tehama counties when anadromous fish are not present. Declining fish populations associated with drought and climate change have limited many fishing opportunities. At the same time, striped bass populations have expanded into more areas of the Sacramento River, especially after the Red Bluff Diversion Dam was permanently opened. The proposed split season with June 16 to September 30 dropped the artificial lure requirement for allowable use of live fin fish as bait during this period when bass.
- **Section 7.40, subsection (b)(11), Battle Creek (Shasta and Tehama Co.):** This proposed change would re-open lower Battle Creek from 1,250 feet below Coleman Fish Hatchery weir to its confluence with the Sacramento River from June 30 to December 31, with the restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. This change would provide recreational angling opportunities for native and non-native warmwater fish species and hatchery-origin trout and steelhead.
 - Lower Battle Creek from the mouth to Coleman Fish Hatchery weir is currently closed to angling year-round. Allowing angler access to lower Battle Creek beginning June 30 will increase fishing opportunities on Striped and Black Bass. Battle Creek was historically a popular steelhead fishery but was closed to angling in the early 1990's to ensure that Coleman National Fish Hatchery would annually secure sufficient adult steelhead broodstock.
 - Returns of hatchery-origin steelhead to Coleman National Fish Hatchery are now routinely in excess of broodstock collection targets. Presently these fish are only available to recreational anglers in the mainstem Sacramento River. However, due to a variety of factors, contact with these fish in the mainstem Sacramento River is extremely low. Furthermore, the mainstem Sacramento River steelhead

fishery is primarily boat-based. Shore-based steelhead fishing on lower Battle Creek would provide opportunity to much broader angling interest groups.

- **Section 7.40, subsection (b)(50), Klamath River Basin Regulations:** This proposed change would increase fishing opportunity in the Klamath River by allowing catch and release fishing within anadromous sections of the mainstem Klamath River from the Copco Road bridge at Copco to Lakeview Road bridge near Iron Gate (Siskiyou County). The open season would be a summer season from the fourth Saturday in May through August 31, with a restriction that only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. Additional restrictions include a zero harvest limit for hatchery trout and steelhead as well as being closed to the take and possession of Chinook Salmon. This change would provide a recreational angling opportunity for freshwater fish during the summer months within the Klamath Dam Removal project area. The proposed summer season regulations would provide consistency with currently open waters adjacent to and upstream of this subsection.
- **Section 7.50, subsection (b)(47), Fall River Complex (Shasta and Siskiyou Co.):** This proposed change would remove subsections (47)(L) Fall River Pond and (47)(M) Fall River Lake from 7.50(b)(47) Fall River Complex (Shasta and Siskiyou Co.). If removed from 7.50(b) Fall River Pond and Fall River Lake would then fall under regulation Section 5.85(a)(1) statewide general trout regulations for take allowances.
- **Section 7.50, subsection (b)(149), Susan River (Lassen Co.) and Section 8.10, Susan River Youth Derby:** This proposed change would revert fishing regulations to the previous trout opener (Last Saturday in April through Nov. 15). The proposed change would also update language to include a special open season for youth participating in the Youth Fishing Derby in Section 8.10 to start prior to the proposed earlier season start. Reverting to the traditional trout season will increase angler opportunity by lengthening the season in the spring and shortening the winter season. During much of the winter the river is typically unfishable (due to ice and snow), so the winter provides little to no opportunity. Water in the Susan River can warm significantly in the late spring and early summer, as releases from McCoy Flat and Hog Flat reservoirs increase. Having the season open earlier will provide more opportunity while angling conditions are good, while not impacting spawning.

Changes to Fishing Gear, Measuring, and Sampling

The following proposed changes are related to fishing gear, measuring and sampling regulation restrictions:

- **Sections 1.62, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, and 28.35, Minimum and Maximum Size and Alternate Length:**

This proposed change would amend Section 1.62 to more clearly define the method to determine total length of finfish. The proposal would clarify that total length is measured with the fish's mouth closed, lying flat on a horizontal surface, and that the tail may be

pinched, fanned, or naturally swung. Fanning and swinging of a fish's tail is expressly allowed for salmon and halibut but not specified in the general maximum length in Section 1.62. It has been a long-time practice for our law enforcement officers to allow this technique, but it is not consistently understood by anglers. Importantly, crew onboard Commercial Passenger Fishing vessels have requested clarification, to ensure they are measuring passenger's fish correctly.

The proposed change also includes changing the phrase "fish, mollusks or crustaceans" to "finfish or invertebrates" and clarifies that measurement of invertebrate species is specified within the individual invertebrate regulations. The proposal also changes existing language that refers to "mollusks, or crustaceans" to the term "invertebrates" which is more inclusive and encompasses other groups like echinoderms. It clarifies that methods to determine length for invertebrates are found in the individual sub sections for those species.

The proposed change additionally removes alternate length measurements from Section 1.62, and from the sections for barracuda, kelp and sand basses, and white sea bass, sections 28.25, 28.30, and 28.35 respectively. Alternate length is proposed to be removed as it causes unnecessary confusion and concerns with law enforcement. The allowance of retaining filleted fish, with associated minimum fillet lengths provided for these species, makes the use of an alternate length unnecessary. A provision to use either total length or a 5-pound minimum weight limit for bonito, found in section 28.32, was established to make recreational catch limits consistent with commercial catch limits.

- **Section 1.73, Salmon:** This proposed change would require any person in possession of a recreationally taken salmon in which an adipose fin is present to provide the Department a tissue sample upon request. This includes the additional requirement of all persons fishing for salmon to provide a tissue sample from unmarked (i.e., adipose fin present) salmon upon request by an authorized agent or employee of the Department. Amending biological sample collection requirements to allow for use of Parentage-Based Tagging (PBT) in fisheries surveys advances fisheries monitoring in a number of ways. PBT is highly efficient, as the tagging process requires only genotyping the parents to produce a 100% tag rate of offspring, which can lead to higher tag recovery rates and improved statistical precision of estimates. Additionally, there is no physical tag loss or handling mortality associated with PBT, parentage assignments can be obtained non-lethally via a small tissue sample, and large-scale tagging can occur at a much lower cost compared to physical marking and tagging methods. This proposal would allow the Department to integrate PBT recovery data into the current salmon management framework, allowing tissue samples to be collected from unmarked salmon contacted in monitoring programs.

- **Section 2.10(b)(3) and (b)(4), Hook and Weight Restrictions:**

This proposed change would allow for the usage of a small lightweight weight directly attached below a hook and expansion of fishable waters with treble hooks on non-buoyant lures. The amendment of subsections 2.10(b)(3) and (4) would clarify regulations for the

public and wildlife officers. The change to weights being allowed below a hook would not apply to lakes and reservoirs, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or the Colorado River as outlined in subsection 2.10(b). The change to the use of treble hooks on non-buoyant lures would have an expanded boundary within the Valley District. The use of treble hooks on non-buoyant lures would be permissive in portions of the mainstem Sacramento, American, Feather, and Yuba rivers. The gear type allowed in the newly permissive sections would be limited to lures made of soft or hard plastics, or wood, which would reduce snagging risk to salmonid species while creating more opportunity for non-salmonid angling.

In the angling community there is confusion about the legality of techniques and tackle. This confusion stems from the popularity of the techniques that utilize this configuration in other states, similar fisheries occurring here in California, and because the method is permissible in lakes, reservoirs, and the Delta. This change would improve law enforcement's ability to enforce these regulations consistently across the state and reduce the need to intervene as frequently.

- **Section 7.40(b)(40)(A)1. and 2., Eel River:** This proposed change would update the gear restriction boundary to align with more recognizable features providing clarity for both anglers and law enforcement. The boundary line would change from the mouth of the Eel River to Fulmor Road, and instead be the mouth to Cock Robin Island, resulting in a slight shift downstream (~.5 miles).

Protective Changes for Vulnerable Populations

The following proposed changes are recommended to protect vulnerable populations while preserving fishing opportunities:

- **Sections 6.35 and subsection 7.00(b)(2), Sierra District Definition and District General Regulations:** This proposed change would modify the Sierra district boundary in Section 6.35 to include a small section of Yuba County ("Yuba County east of New Bullards Bar Dam;") to protect experimentally reintroduced Chinook fish. This change would also close Chinook Salmon fishing in the North Fork Feather River (NFFR) above Chester Diversion Dam, and on the North Yuba River (NYR) above New Bullards Bar Dam all year in Section 7.00(b)(2). This proposal will also add two specific subsections in Section 7.00, the Sierra District (adding (b)(3) and (b)(4), the NFFR above Chester Diversion Dam, and on the NYR above New Bullards Bar Dam, which will be closed to Chinook Salmon fishing all year. This closure does not include New Bullards Bar, just the tributaries. Scientific studies are currently being implemented within the NFFR, led by the California Department of Water Resources, and in the NYR, led by the Department, evaluating Spring-Run Chinook Salmon reintroduction to these historical habitats. Changing the regulation to close fishing of Chinook Salmon at all times of the year in these waterways will allow for study fish through various developmental stages (eggs, alevin, fry, parr, smolt, adult) to remain in the study area informing study results and reintroduction efforts.

- **Section 7.40, subsection (b) addition of Creeks with Special Regulations:** This proposed change would recommend adding new special regulation sections for Clear Creek (added as subsection (b)(28)), Cow Creek (added as subsection (b)(36)), Cottonwood Creek (added as subsection (b)(35)), and Paynes Creek (added as subsection (b)(74)). This proposal would also change the Antelope Creek boundary from the confluence with the North Fork downstream to Ponderosa Way crossing on the North Fork and South Fork to make angling more protective for Central Valley steelhead in this subsection. Local fishing opportunities are currently very limited due to a variety of overlapping regulations, some of which are not necessary. Allowing the public, especially children to catch warm water fish with bait in anadromous streams in the middle of the summer when anadromous fish species are not present would be very beneficial to the public and the Department's Recruit, Retain, Reactivate (R3) goals. With the exception of Clear Creek, Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek, the majority anadromous tributaries have specific protective regulations already present in 7.40; adding Clear Creek, Cow Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and Paynes Creek will complete this protective set of regulations. These additions will result in renumbering most of subsection 7.40(b) bodies of water to maintain alphabetical listing.
- **Section 7.50(b)(6), Arroyo Seco River (Monterey Co.):** On the Arroyo Seco River (Monterey Co.), above the waterfall located approximately 3.5 miles above the U.S. Forest Service Ranger Station, change the trout bag limit from 5 trout to 5 Brown Trout and 0 Rainbow Trout, and add a Special Restriction of "only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used". The upper Arroyo Seco River contains a population of native Coastal Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), offering a unique sport fishing opportunity in the Salinas River watershed in Monterey County. Like other trout populations throughout California, this population of native Coastal Rainbow Trout has likely been negatively impacted by increasingly severe drought conditions. The population has also likely been impacted by degradation of instream habitat conditions due to recent wildfires, such as the Dolan fire. The current fishing regulations allow for the harvest of 5 trout per person per day above the waterfall on the Arroyo Seco River. The upper Arroyo Seco River is in relatively close proximity to urban areas; thus, with the current 5 trout bag limit, there is the potential for high angler harvest of Coastal Rainbow Trout. The lack of a gear restriction for trout currently allows the potential for high deep-hooking and catch and release mortality rates that can be associated with the use of bait and barbed hooks when angling non-anadromous salmonids. Additionally, the upper Arroyo Seco contains a non-native population of Brown Trout (*Salmo trutta*) which offers sport fishing opportunities, though they may negatively impact native Coastal Rainbow Trout through competition and predation. Changing trout regulations in the upper Arroyo Seco to a 5 Brown Trout and 0 Rainbow Trout bag limit with an artificial lures with barbless hooks only special restriction will ensure that this recreational Rainbow Trout fishery is protected and sustainable, while allowing recreational anglers the option of harvesting non-native brown trout.
- **Section 7.50, subsection (b)(90), McCloud River and Tributaries (Shasta and Siskiyou Cos):** This proposed change would add Trout Creek into subsection 7.50(b)(90), McCloud

River and Tributaries under proposed paragraph (G), to provide angling regulation protections for McCloud River Redband Trout (MRRT), consistent with other streams in the MRRT Refugium. Trout Creek has been identified as a high priority conservation stream, but not included as a “Core Conservation Stream” in MRRT Conservation Agreement (CA) (2017). Confounding genetic results prior to the completion of the CA was the justification for Trout Creek to be excluded as a core conservation stream. However, since the genetics results, the Department has identified a “95% barrier” where MRRT collected upstream of the barrier were shown to be genetically distinct, and Rainbow Trout collected downstream of the barrier were shown to be slightly introgressed (Rainbow Trout cross with MRRT). Additionally, non-native Brown Trout are found downstream of the barrier but not upstream. The Department is currently working with the private landowner to improve the 95% barrier to ensure introgressed and non-native trout are unable to pass upstream at all flows, thence protecting the genetically distinct population upstream. In addition to improving the barrier, angling regulation changes are necessary to provide further protection for this population. The proposed angling regulations are consistent with Swamp Creek in the Refugium which provides a stable MRRT population where catch and release recreational angling will have no population level impacts.

Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card Changes, Sections 1.74, 5.88, and 701

To better align with seasonal adult steelhead run timing, improve data management, and assess non-compliant reporting, the Steelhead Fishing Report and Restoration Card (Card; steelhead report card) reporting period is proposed to be changed from a 12-month calendar period to a 9-month reporting period. The adjusted Card reporting period would be August 1st through April 30th the following year and required to be returned or reported to the Department by May 31st. The Card would be required for anglers targeting any steelhead or Rainbow Trout in anadromous waters during this 9-month period. Anglers would be able to obtain the subsequent season Card starting July 1st to allow time for the Department to process the previous season’s Cards returned by May 31st. Any Card holder who fails to return or report by the May 31st deadline shall be subject to a non-refundable non-return fee and will not be able to obtain the subsequent season Card until that fee is paid. From May 1st through July 31st of each year, anglers would not need a Card to fish for steelhead or Rainbow Trout in anadromous waters.

Shifting the reporting months to mirror the 9-month period run timing of steelhead would allow the Department to process Cards more efficiently and have data readily available to inform management strategies for the steelhead fishery statewide. By shifting the reporting period to 9 months, the Department will have time between seasons to assess non-compliance and can implement penalties prior to the subsequent year’s Card is issues, including fees and prohibitions for non-compliant report card holders.

Shifting the reporting period to mirror the seasonal run timing of returning and spawning steelhead between August to April will increase the ability to more accurately analyze data and manage steelhead runs. Adult steelhead are generally not present in most anadromous waters from May through July, so there is not a need to collect angler data during these months.

Anglers will still be able to fish for Rainbow Trout/steelhead during these months in waters open to angling, however a Card will not be required. Anglers will also be able to continue to harvest a hatchery steelhead if caught during these months and not have to report on the Card.

Additionally, the proposal would clarify that the Card is required when targeting Rainbow Trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, in anadromous waters. There is currently a loophole in the language that allows an angler to state they are not fishing for steelhead, only Rainbow Trout, which technically does not require a Card. For improved enforcement, the language would be updated to include both terms and would require anglers to have a report card and fill it out when targeting either Rainbow Trout or steelhead in anadromous waters

Low-Flow Regulation Changes, Sections 7.00, 7.40 subsection (b), 7.50 subsection (b), and 8.00

This proposed change would reorganize, condense, and clean up the language in the low-flow regulations, standardize the identification of stream gauges, and remove streams from 8.00 that lack low-flow criteria.

- **Section 7.00, District General Regulations:** This proposal would add Section 8.00, which lists low-flow restrictions to the paragraph about existing restrictions (such as methods, gear, fishing hours, and use of bait) when angling in District waters. This proposal would remove ambiguities associated with anglers following regulations for low flow conditions, as well as wardens enforcing fishing regulation violations.
- **Section 7.40, subsection (b) and 7.50, subsection (b), Updates to Special Water Bodies regarding Low-Flow:** Proposed changes throughout the special waters tables in subsections 7.40(b) and 7.50(b) serve to better align subsection 7.40(b) language with the updated Section 8.00 language that is part of this proposal. Organizational changes, improves consistency informing the angler to be aware of low-flow considerations for the re-organized subsections 8.00(a), (b), or (c). These changes are necessary to clarify boundaries in both sections where descriptions are unclear, provide consistent placement of text, and update subsection references between 8.00, 7.40(b), and 7.50(b) as needed. In subsection (b) for Arroyo Seco Corralitos Creek, Llagas Creek, Pajaro River, Salinas River and tributaries, Uvas or Carnadero Creek references to Section 8.00 are removed, as these waters are proposed as being removed from the Low Flow restrictions due to lack of low flow threshold.
- **Section 8.00, Low-Flow Restrictions:** This proposed change would rewrite, reorganize, and simplify the low-flow regulations. A new website for low-flow fishing restrictions was launched in early 2025, which brought more attention to the language and content in Section 8.00. Subsections 8.00(a) and (b), which previously directed anglers to different regional phone lines, may now be combined and condensed into the revised subsection 8.00(a) now that there is an online platform during the time period of September 1 through April 30. Subsection 8.00(c) for the San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Monterey

county water bodies is restructured to the revised subsection 8.00(b). This effort began as an initiative to remove redundancies and improve stylistic inconsistencies in the regulation (i.e. standardized identification of stream gauges with USGS gauging station number, stream, and nearest town), and turned into a more expansive effort to improve Section 8.00 in its entirety for conciseness, clarity, and consistency in language, after input from Department regional staff. These changes will make the regulations easier to understand, thereby reducing angler confusion.

- The proposed changes described in subsections 8.00(a)(1) through (3) and (b)(1) through (3), would allow the ability to make split block decisions instead of solid block decisions. Allowing split block decisions has the potential to provide additional opportunity by adding angling days and reduce angler frustration. The current regulations specify the days when Department staff will determine low-flow fishing closures, and fishing on all days between Department updates shall either be opened or closed (solid block decision). Now with the new website, it is easier to display and update information, and the Department could provide more flexibility in determining low-flow fishing closures. Instead of closing or opening fishing for an entire two-to-four-day period, the Department could choose to close fishing for only part of the two-to-four-day period (split block decision). Split block decisions will allow the Department to be more flexible and precise in applying closures only to days when flows are predicted to fall below minimum thresholds.
 - o New subsection 8.00(a): consolidate and update the low-flow conditions for river and stream closures including those water bodies listed from north to south within Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Napa, and Marin counties.

New subsection 8.00(b): consolidate and update the low-flow conditions for river and stream closures including those water bodies listed from north to south within San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Monterey counties.

Benefits of the Proposed Regulations

As stated in Fish and Game Code Section 1700, Conservation of Aquatic Resources, it is the policy of this state to encourage the conservation, maintenance, and utilization of the living resources of the ocean and other waters under the jurisdiction and influence of the state for the benefit of all the citizens of the state and to promote the development of local fisheries and distant water fisheries based in California in harmony with international law, respecting fishing and the conservation of the living resources of the ocean and other waters under the jurisdiction and influence of the state. The objectives of this policy include, but are not limited to, the maintenance of sufficient populations of all species of aquatic organisms to ensure their continued existence, and the maintenance of a sufficient resource to support a reasonable sport use. Adoption of scientifically-based sport fish seasons, size limits, and bag and possession limits provides for the maintenance of sufficient populations sport fish to ensure their continued existence.

The benefits of the proposed regulations are consistent with the sustainable management of California's sport fisheries, general health and welfare of California residents, and promotion of businesses that rely on sport fishing throughout California.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

Article IV, Section 20 of the State Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Fish and Game Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate recreational fishing in waters of the state (Fish and Game Code sections 200, 205, 315, and 316.5). The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the California Code of Regulations and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to sport fishing seasons, bag, gear and possession limits

Public Participation

Comments Submitted by Mail or Email

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before **5:00 p.m. on July 30, 2026** at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before **12:00 noon on August 7, 2026**. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Meetings

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the **California Natural Resources Headquarters Building, Second Floor, 715 P Street, Sacramento, California**, which will commence at **8:00 a.m. on June 17, 2026**, and may continue at **8:00 a.m. on June 18, 2026**. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the **webinar/teleconference** hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling (916) 653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the **California Natural Resources Headquarters Building, Second Floor, 715 P Street, Sacramento, California**, which will commence at **8:00 a.m. on August 12, 2026** and may continue at **8:00 a.m. on August 13, 2026**. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone

connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the **webinar/teleconference** hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling (916) 653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or **David Haug** at FGC@fgc.ca.gov or at the preceding address or phone number. **Maggie McCann, Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist), Fisheries Branch, Department of Fish and Wildlife, (fisheries@wildlife.ca.gov)** has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 265 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in sections 11343.4, 11346.4, 11346.8 and 11347.1 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed changes provide clarification of existing regulations that are necessary for the continued preservation of fisheries resources, while providing sport fishing opportunities and thus, the prevention of adverse economic impacts.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The Commission does not anticipate adverse impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs within the state. The Commission does not anticipate adverse impacts on the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California. The proposed changes are to provide clarification of existing regulations or that provide minor increases in fishing opportunities. These changes are not anticipated to change the level of fishing activity enough to affect the demand for goods and services related to sport fishing enough to impact the demand for labor, nor induce the creation of new businesses, the elimination, nor the expansion of businesses in California.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the environment by the sustainable management of fishery resources throughout the state. The Commission anticipates general benefits to the health and welfare of Californians through expanded outdoor recreational opportunities and responsible management of public resources. The Commission does not anticipate any benefits to the health and welfare of California residents or to worker safety.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action. The proposed non-reporting fee for steelhead report cards introduces a \$20 fee to any card holder failing to return/report by the May 31st deadline. Any angler who doesn't pay the non-reporting fee after the deadline will not be able to obtain any subsequent season's card until that fee is paid. This fee can be entirely avoided if the angler returns the card in compliance with the regulation, or if anglers choose to fish in anadromous waters from May 1st through July 31st of each year, as they would not need a card to fish for steelhead or Rainbow Trout during that period.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None. No changes to costs or savings to federal funding are anticipated by the proposed clarification of existing regulations. The Department program implementation and enforcement are projected to remain the same with a stable volume of fishing activity.

Department staff estimate that currently 30-35% of anglers return their steelhead report card,

with an average of approximately 43,500 cards sold over the last six years¹, for an average of 30,450 to 28,275 non-returned cards. The proposed \$20 non-return fee would mean a maximum potential of \$609,000-\$565,500 would be accrued in fines, representing additional revenue for the Department. However, this does not take into account a likely increase in return rates or the fact that not everyone will pay the fine, as suggested by the exact same changes from the lobster report card, which had an approximate 16% return rate from 2008-2011 without a non-return fee and increased reporting to 39%-54% from 2014 to 2025.²

If the steelhead report card increased reporting rates similarly by 20-30%, the Department would have a projected 50-65% return rate and could potentially see 21,750 to 13,050 unreturned cards with a maximum revenue potential of \$435,000 to \$261,000 in accrued fines (average of \$348,000). See STD 399 addendum for further details.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

(f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

(g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

(i) Business Reporting Requirements:

The proposed action does not impose a business reporting requirement.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

¹ <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=178047&inline>

² <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/Invertebrates/Lobster>

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: **May 26, 2026**

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: RM244-Operation Scanned Files
Date: Monday, June 8, 2026 4:07:19 PM
Attachments: [0421_001.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached PG&E's Notice of Rate Change Request.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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.*

DATE: June 1, 2026

TO: STATE, CITY AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

**NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RATE CHANGE REQUEST
FOR ITS 2027 ENERGY RESOURCE RECOVERY ACCOUNT (ERRA) FORECAST
APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)
A.26-05-007**

What is Being Requested?

PG&E is requesting \$3,176 million in revenue for 2027 to recover costs related to fuel needed to produce electricity as well as buying energy from third parties to serve bundled customers' loads that are included in ERRA. The application also includes costs associated with renewable resources to further the state's energy policy goals such as the California Climate Credit and Emission-Intensive and Trade-Exposed (EITE) credit.

CPUC Rulemaking 25-02-005 is considering the appropriate valuation of renewable energy credits (REC) generated prior to January 1, 2019, and a decision may impact PG&E's updated rate proposal. Further, market prices may be higher or lower than at the time the application was filed. These factors may result in PG&E updating its rate proposal later in the year and higher or lower rates and bill impacts than those initially presented.

How Would This Impact the Typical Residential Customer?

If the request is approved, a typical bundled residential customer using 500kWh per month would see a rate increase of approximately \$10.55 per month. The actual impact will vary based on usage, baseline territory, and the applicable Base Service Charge, if eligible.

PG&E provides Direct Access (DA) and Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) customers with transmission, distribution, and Commission-ordered services. On average, rates for PG&E-provided services decrease by 7.3% in the initial application and are subject to change. Final rate impacts may be higher or lower. DA providers and CCAs set their own generation rates. Check with your DA provider or CCA to learn how this may affect your bill.

Additional Info

An administrative law judge may hold hearings and will consider evidence, testimony, and public comments before drafting a proposed decision. CPUC Commissioners will then vote on a final decision at a public meeting.

You can read more about the utility's request and make public comment by visiting apps.cpuc.ca.gov/c/A2605007. For questions about participating in CPUC matters, you can contact the Public Advisor's Office at Public.Advisor@cpuc.ca.gov, 1-866-849-8390, or 505 Van Ness Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102. Please reference A.26-05-007 in any communication with the CPUC.

Questions?

Detailed rate information will be sent directly to customers in a bill insert in June 2026.

If you have questions about PG&E's request, please contact PG&E at **1-800-743-5000**. For TTY, call **711**. Para obtener más información sobre cómo este cambio podría afectar su pago mensual, llame al 1-800-660-6789 • 詳情請致電 1-800-893-9555.

If you would like an electronic copy of the filing and exhibits, please write to the address below:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2027 ERRR Forecast Application (A.26-05-007)
P.O. Box 1018
Oakland, CA 94604-1018

Message paid for by customers.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Employee Parking Access for Golden Gate Park Cultural Institution Workers
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 3:47:01 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding parking in Golden Gate Park.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

***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: Alexandra Pickolick <apickolick@calacademy.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 3:38 PM
To: MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Employee Parking Access for Golden Gate Park Cultural Institution Workers

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

Dear Supervisor Mahmood and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

My name is Alexandra Pickolick and I am a part-time employee at the California Academy of Sciences in Golden Gate Park, where I have worked for the past three years. I am writing to ask that the Board consider establishing an employee parking permit program for workers at the cultural institutions within Golden Gate Park, including the California Academy of Sciences, the de Young Museum, the Japanese Tea Garden, and the San Francisco Botanical Garden.

These institutions employ hundreds of San Francisco workers, many of us part-time and hourly, who have no employer-provided parking and no practical alternative to driving to work. Public transit options to this area are limited, particularly for employees working early morning, late evening, or weekend shifts. Workers are regularly cited for overtime parking violations simply because there is no authorized place for us to park while doing our jobs serving the public.

An active employee petition at CAS requesting a parking solution is currently in progress, which shows that this is a recognized and ongoing problem among staff. We are not visitors to the park. We are the people who make these institutions run.

I respectfully ask the Board to work with SFMTA and the Recreation and Parks Department to explore a designated employee parking permit or exemption for workers at Golden Gate Park cultural institutions. This would be a meaningful step toward supporting the working people who serve this city every day.

Thank you sincerely for your time and consideration.

--

Alexandra

Guest Experience

Pronouns: she/her/hers

California Academy of Sciences

T 415.379.8000

info@calacademy.org

www.calacademy.org

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

We regenerate the natural world through science, learning, and collaboration. Learn more at calacademy.org.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [McHugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [No, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment: District 10 I-280 state right-of-way maintenance gap
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 12:23:43 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding I-280.

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.sfgov.org/sfbo

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

-----Original Message-----

From: barkleesanders@gmail.com <barkleesanders@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 12:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment: District 10 I-280 state right-of-way maintenance gap

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

Board of Supervisors / Clerk of the Board,

Please accept this as written public comment and forward it to the Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Walton's office, and any appropriate committee or staff handling Public Works, Caltrans coordination, homelessness/encampment response, or District 10 right-of-way conditions.

Public Works records released in NextRequest 26-4869 appear to show a serious maintenance-responsibility gap for I-280 right-of-way locations in District 10.

The City/Caltrans Delegated Maintenance Agreement II produced by Public Works states that City maintenance in Caltrans right-of-way is limited to locations listed in Exhibit A. The produced Exhibit A appears to list certain Route 101 and Route 80 locations, but not the I-280 District 10 sites I raised, including Mariposa St ramps/under-structure, Waterville St dead-end, Thomas Ave/Selby St, and San Jose Ave/I-280 ramp and overpass areas.

At the same time, the same production contains records showing recurring operational problems at these locations, including:

- a SEE report listing "NB-SB 280 Mariposa St Ofc/Onr under structure" as a pending removal location;
- a BSES daily sheet describing discarded items, human waste, repeated open fires, fire/biohazard conditions, and needed cleaning under the I-280 overpass at Mariposa St in Dogpatch; • records concerning San Jose Ave/I-280 overpass drainage and maintenance uncertainty; and • internal Public Works email stating that where a location is not on the City responsibility map, Public Works would exclude it from the schedule and forward encampment findings to Caltrans.

I am asking the Board to request a written explanation from Public Works and Caltrans District 4 identifying:

1. which District 10 I-280 locations are covered by DMA II or any amended Exhibit A; 2. which locations are not covered and must be referred to Caltrans; 3. the responsible contact/team for each site; 4. the process to add omitted I-280 District 10 locations to the City/Caltrans maintenance framework; and 5. whether a hearing or written departmental update is needed to address state right-of-way maintenance gaps in District 10.

This is not a request for the City to act outside its legal authority.

It is a request that the Board require the responsible agencies to identify who owns these sites, close the referral gap, and prevent District 10 I-280 locations from falling between Public Works and Caltrans.

Sources:

- NextRequest 26-4869, accessed June 9, 2026: <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> / <https://sanfrancisco.nextrequest.com/requests/26-4869> ____YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzphNThmZTc0NmNmZmJmDE0NjM5NzQ3Mjc5Mzk3ZWQ0ZDc0OjgzOjUyYThmMDNlMDIwZGlxZGE2MWFOTAzN2UyZDM0ZDY4ODc4NDI4YzZkY2QxMzFkNzI0MjY5N2NlNGM4OWRhYTA3MTpwOiQ6TG
- SF Board public comment instructions, accessed June 9, 2026: <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> / <https://sfbos.org/participate-and-submit-public-comments> ____YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzphNThmZTc0NmNmZmJmDE0NjM5NzQ3Mjc5Mzk3ZWQ0ZDc0OjgzOjUyYThmMDNlMDIwZGlxZGE2MWFOTAzN2UyZDM0ZDY4ODc4NDI4YzZkY2QxMzFkNzI0MjY5N2NlNGM4OWRhYTA3MTpwOiQ6TG
- SF Board roster, accessed June 9, 2026: <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> / <https://sfbos.org/roster-members> ____YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzphNThmZTc0NmNmZmJmDE0NjM5NzQ3Mjc5Mzk3ZWQ0ZDc0OjgzOjUyYThmMDNlMDIwZGlxZGE2MWFOTAzN2UyZDM0ZDY4ODc4NDI4YzZkY2QxMzFkNzI0MjY5N2NlNGM4OWRhYTA3MTpwOiQ6TG

Respectfully,
Barklee Sanders

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Legacy Business Program Under Threat
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:07:10 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding San Francisco's Legacy Business Program.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

***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: Raphael Mauro <ramauro91@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:03 PM
To: Mayor, MYR (MYR) <mayor@sfgov.org>; OEWD (ECN) <oewd@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (ECN) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Legacy Business Program Under Threat

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Members of the Board of Supervisors, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and Office of Small Business,

I am writing as I am concerned for the future of the City's Legacy Business Program [upon learning of the removal of the program's one and only dedicated employee.](#)

When it was created by the Board of Supervisors unanimously and reaffirmed by us voters, it proved that San Franciscans want to protect parts of our city's soul. The Legacy Business Program is not just a line item. It supports hundreds of small businesses and beloved institutions that have shaped the character of our neighborhoods for generations.

Eliminating the program's only employee doesn't quietly restructure the program. It effectively dismantles it. Without any dedicated staff, applications can't be processed, grants can't be approved, outreach can't happen, and businesses cannot receive the recognition and support they were promised and deserve, putting them at risk of eviction or rent hikes at a time when both are surging here. All of this compounds damage at a time when small businesses are already struggling.

I understand the City faces budget constraints, and that difficult choices have to be made. But the Legacy Business Program represents an extraordinary investment in the City and keeps some of the soul that has brought so many people here for over 150 years. With a relatively small budget, it helps keep hundreds of businesses afloat, preserves neighborhood identity, supports tourism and local economies, and keeps San Francisco unique from any other city in the world.

I urge you to:

- Restore the dedicated staff position for the Legacy Business Program.
- Maintain full funding for the Rent and Business Stabilization Grants.
- Protect the Legacy Business Program to continue its important work.

San Francisco cannot afford to lose the small businesses and cherished institutions that make it San Francisco.

Let's go, San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Raphael

San Francisco Born and Raised

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: 2026.06.08%20Letter%20Re-%20Agenda%20Item%20260361.pdf
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:36:26 AM
Attachments: [2026.06.08%20Letter%20Re-%20Agenda%20Item%20260361.pdf.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached regarding **File No. 260361**:

Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; eliminate exceptions allowing indoor smoking in bars with no employees, bars with historically compliant semi-enclosed smoking rooms, and hotel rooms, to conform to provisions of California law; and repeal suspended and superseded provisions regulating smoking in certain locations.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

***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: Stephen Torres <stephenjontorres@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2026 5:01 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2026.06.08%20Letter%20Re-%20Agenda%20Item%20260361.pdf

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

Good afternoon Clerk Carrol,

Please see the attached letter in response to the continuance on Item 6 in today's agenda.

Thank you,

Stephen

Stephen Torres
Mission Bernal
San Francisco, California

June 8, 2026

The Land Use & Transportation Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Chairperson Melgar and Committee Members,

Although I appreciate your decision to delay vote on this item to the call of the Chair, I strongly urge that you withdraw the ordinance completely.

As I have stated before, this is poorly written legislation that gives the appearance of the City doing something to address the impacts of second-hand smoke while doing nothing effective in implementation. Indeed the implementation is fraught with negative impacts for workers and small businesses alike.

Workers and business owners will be unfairly burdened with enforcement of this ordinance while also being targeted if unsuccessful. The impacts of second hand smoke will not cease, but rather be relocated to the public right of way where they will be further endangered by the dangers of unknown passersby, unregulated electric bikes and scooters, and being clipped if forced off the sidewalk during crowd control.

Small businesses face both potential fines and violations used as pretext for evictions as they do not enjoy tenant protections. Especially in the context of upzoning and increased speculative real estate, this kind of reckless implementation could have devastating consequences.

The notion that this is no different than when the state law was enacted is equally misleading. One component is that this is not a loophole closure that is necessary to be in compliance with that law. The other is that other compounding factors such as vaping and legalized marijuana use were not in existence at that time.

I assert this coalition's dedication at continuing to fight and activating around this issue and strongly urge that this be taken as a signal against pursuing this ordinance further now or in the future.

Sincerely,

Stephen Torres
Nightlife Worker

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:33:57 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **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.

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: First Name Last Name <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 7, 2026 6:02 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

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

First Name Last Name

Email

example@example.com

District

D5

Subject

Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Re: Geary/Larkin; Larkin/O'Farrell

The job of city leaders is to ensure safe public spaces, it isn't just expected, it is required. Yet, apocalyptic scenes still remain at the above locations. City leaders can clean it up in a couple hours by sending SFPD to arrest drug users and dealers; and sending foot patrols to secure the area. SFPD can claim understaffing but it also has a job to do, and cannot refuse to do it simply because they are understaffed. I was driving through the Tenderloin and whilst there were problems, the streets looked clean, but the above locations were one of the few areas where, in open daylight, 2023-style open air drug markets remain.

I will extend my deadline by one final month. This is my final letter.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: CalAcademy Layoffs
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 2:10:44 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the California Academy of Sciences.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

***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: Cara B <ccbardine@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 1:43 PM
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: CalAcademy Layoffs

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

Hello,

My name is Cara Bardine. I am a San Francisco native and resident in District 1. I have been a visitor of CalAcademy my entire life and am a former employee of the Walt Disney Family Museum. Museums, and especially the people who make them run are very important to me!

That said, I was deeply troubled to hear about the current financial situation at one of our city's best museums. As I am sure you are aware, CalAcademy recently announced that they will be laying off 50 employees. This is after previous cuts to staffing and public programs (which they had grants and funding for). Cal Academy Workers United is currently planning to ask the SFBOS to do a financial audit of the museum. I wholeheartedly agree with this call to action, especially since \$7.5million of their budget comes from the City & County of San Francisco.

These cuts strike me as being odd, especially since I have always been under the impression that the museum was both profitable and receiving a very healthy amount of support by way of grants and donations. So where the heck is the money going?

After looking at the museum's 990 forms and financial statements we can at least partially answer that question. When looking at CalAcademy's 2024 tax form, all the salaries of employees listed total to \$4,015,008. All employees listed are being paid between \$100,000-\$600,000 more than San Francisco's median income, and this is just their base pay. Their bonuses/additional compensation total to \$568,478. Combined, this is \$4,583,486. Surely if they have nearly \$5million to give in compensation to those in executive/director roles, as well as almost as well as almost \$5million to spend on third-party advertising services, on top of plans to invest heavily in AI (expensive and antithetical to the museum's mission) they should also have plenty of money to pay the salaries and hourly wages of the employees they are planning to lay off. Especially when you consider that they state in their annual reports that they are overspending by nearly \$5million.

To quote CAWU's petition "Public and private support have built the Academy into one of San Francisco's cultural treasures. In turn, the Academy has brought the San Francisco Bay Area community together to deliver scientific research and education, to form lifelong memories, and to weave new relationships into our global fabric. The Academy's indispensable collections and research both reflect and help shape humanity's understanding of the past, present, and future of our living world. Repeated layoffs and program cuts in 2020, 2024, and now 2026 have failed to correct ongoing financial problems or produce meaningful solutions."

Please support CalAcademy by supporting the folks who make the museum special and by holding it's leadership accountable for their disastrous mismanagement.

All the best,

Cara Bardine

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding the SF Budget
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:06:27 AM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding the SF Budget.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding the San Francisco Budget.

Ref. File Nos.: 260616, 260596, and 260597

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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: [Marie Jobling](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: For the June 10 Budget Hearing
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 6:18:20 PM
Attachments: [Dignity Fund Policy Concerns in the Dept of Disability and Aging.docx](#)

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

Please share in advance of the hearing agenda items for the Dept. of Disability and Aging Services



Marie Jobling

Co-Executive Director

1663 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103

(415) 821-1003 x101 * (415) 640-8239

(cell) www.sfcommunityliving.org

I'm back to work at reduced hours. Still crafting a regular schedule. In the meantime, just email me to request a meeting or call.

CLC believes our workplace and our leadership should be representative and inclusive of the communities we serve. This improves our ability to identify and understand community needs and to increase the impact of our work. [Full statement and more on DEIB at CLC.](#)

.

Date: June 9, 2026

To: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From: The Dignity Fund Coalition

Re: Keeping the Promise of the Dignity Fund



Older adults and adults with disabilities comprise over 25% of San Francisco's population and represent its fastest growing demographic. An estimated 45% of SF residents 65 and older lack sufficient income to meet basic needs.

The Dignity Fund was created to provide a predictable and increasing source of funding for services that support San Francisco's older adults and adults with disabilities. Voters overwhelmingly approved the Fund because they understood that these populations are growing in number, living longer, and often struggling with rising costs while relying on fixed incomes.

The Dignity Fund Charter Amendment established a baseline level of funding and annual growth, including the well-known \$3 million annual increase through FY 2026-27. The purpose of that growth was clear: to expand services, address unmet needs, and improve quality of life and independence for older adults and people with disabilities.

Today, however, we face a fundamental policy question: Is the City implementing the Dignity Fund in a way that reflects the promise made to voters? How can cuts be justified based on how much has been taken away from the Dignity Fund the last few years, both through the suspension of the annual allocation and using it for CODB.

I am not aware of any language in the Charter Amendment that requires Cost of Doing Business (CODB) increases to come out of the Dignity Fund allocation itself. The Fund establishes minimum funding levels and annual growth, but it does not appear to require that inflationary increases, wage adjustments, or provider contract costs be absorbed within that growth.

In fact, a strong argument can be made that the opposite interpretation better reflects voter intent.

If every annual increase is first consumed by rising costs, like has been the case in past years, then the Dignity Fund is not expanding services. It is merely maintaining the status quo. The promised growth becomes little more than an inflation adjustment rather than an investment in addressing growing needs and service gaps.

Other City departments generally receive Cost of Doing Business increases through the broader budget process. Why should Dignity Fund programs be treated differently?

Perhaps the most important question is this:

Where is the policy or legal requirement that Cost of Doing Business increases for Dignity Fund-funded providers must come out of Dignity Fund growth rather than being funded through the General Fund, as occurs elsewhere in the City budget?

There is a second issue that deserves immediate public examination.

The proposed DAS budget would create a new Dignity Fund stabilization reserve of approximately \$1.1 million at the very same time that at least \$2.9 million in cuts to Dignity Fund-related services at DAS are proposed.

This is precisely the kind of budget year when reserves are typically used to protect services, not when new reserves are created!

The justification offered appears to be that future Dignity Fund allocations will be tied to changes in the Annual Documented Revenue (ADR) in the next budget year, and that a reserve is needed to guard against potential future declines.

How does it serve older adults, people with disabilities, and family caregivers to set aside funds for a hypothetical future downturn while cutting services now that people currently rely upon?

A public hearing should examine both of these issues:

1. Why Cost of Doing Business increases are being charged against annual Dignity Fund growth, thereby reducing the Fund's ability to expand services and address unmet needs; and
2. Why a new stabilization reserve is being established during a year of significant service reductions, rather than using available resources to preserve services and protect vulnerable residents.

These questions go to the heart of whether the Dignity Fund is fulfilling the promise made to voters and meeting the needs of San Francisco's growing population of older adults and people with disabilities.

From: [barbarae](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Funding for seniors
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 4:56:17 PM

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

I am 81 years old and have lived my entire life in San Francisco.

I have noticed the City now funds conveniences for bike riders, helps the homeless and immigrants and more. That's well and good, but what is the City doing for *me* with my property tax? Access to Golden Gate Park and the De Young have been taken away (I can only drive through - I can't walk, leave alone ride a bike). I have noticed access to the beach greatly diminished. I have noticed so many parts of the City that are no longer accessible to me because of exorbitant parking fees.

What is the City doing that benefits *my* life with my tax dollars? Well, thank god there are some lovely senior programs like **Community Living** and **San Francisco Village**. They help to keep me and other seniors from being **ISOLATED**. As you may know, social connection is important for life. But now, it looks like the City is going to take that away too!

These programs are so important. **PLEASE** do not defund senior programs!

Barbara Elbl, 827 Kirkham Street, San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding the SF Budget
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 12:06:35 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding the SF Budget.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding the San Francisco Budget.

Ref. File Nos.: 260616, 260596, and 260597

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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: [Phanny Lun](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Group 1 and 2 Budget and Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 12:22:26 PM

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

Group 1:

Good Morning Supervisors,

Before I begin, I want to honor past and present Black transgender women and Black trans leaders whose courage made it possible for girls like me to write in public and demand better from systems that were never built for us.

My name is Phanny Lun. I am a San Francisco resident and a transgender woman.

I support budget cuts, conditions, audits, and performance requirements for any department or funded organization that cannot prove equity outcomes.

That includes DHR. That includes Civil Service. That includes the Controller's Office. That includes every core City function that claims fairness, transparency, accountability, and inclusion while transgender people are still pushed out of jobs, stability, and dignity.

San Francisco cannot keep saying it is inclusive while the machinery of government remains opaque, insider-driven, and protected for people already inside the system.

DHR should not receive funding for equity language if it cannot prove equitable hiring outcomes.

Civil Service should not receive funding to protect merit if merit is invisible in the record.

The Controller's Office should not only audit dollars. It should audit outcomes. That means departments, contractors, nonprofits, and yes — transgender organizations too.

Hold everyone accountable.

If public money is being spent in the name of transgender people, then the City should know who was served, who was hired, who was housed, who was protected, what outcomes were produced, and where the money went.

Do not tell me the City is equitable.

Prove it.

Show who applies. Show who gets interviewed. Show who gets hired. Show who gets promoted. Show whether qualified transgender applicants are being discouraged, bypassed, humiliated, or erased from the outcome.

From where I stand, the City's core functions do not look inclusive. They look like a protected ladder for people already inside the building.

That is not equity.

That is extraction.

To every ally inside these departments: this is where your allyship gets tested. Not at Pride. Not in a training. Not in a staff email.

Use your access to open doors, challenge discrimination, correct false statements, secure resources, and produce outcomes.

Otherwise, do not call it allyship.

Call it career advancement.

If departments claim inclusive hiring, prove it.

If they claim civil service merit, prove it.

If they claim fiscal accountability, prove it.

And if they cannot prove it, condition the funding, cut the performance, audit the outcomes, and redirect those dollars to organizations that can show the work.

Thank you.

Group 2

2nd Email for Group 2

Good Morning Supervisors,

Before I begin, I want to honor past and present Black transgender women and Black trans leaders whose courage made it possible for girls like me to be visible, speak publicly, and demand accountability from institutions that too often use our communities without protecting us.

My name is Phanny Lun. I am a San Francisco resident and a transgender woman.

Today, DPH, MOHCD, OEWD, HRC, and the Mayor's budget should not be allowed to come before this Committee with beautiful language and no measurable proof.

Do not tell us you serve transgender people.

Prove it.

DPH should prove transgender inclusion in health access, mental health support, harm

reduction, patient dignity, community safety, and accountability when transgender people are bullied, dismissed, retaliated against, or harmed by systems that are supposed to protect them.

MOHCD should prove how many transgender people were actually housed, protected from displacement, and connected to stable housing.

OEWD should prove how many transgender people actually received jobs, wages, retention, employer accountability, and career access.

HRC should prove what happens after the press release, the hearing, the panel, the listening session, and the photo opportunity.

Show the complaints. Show the outcomes. Show the remedies. Show the enforcement. Show the funding that actually reached transgender communities.

Not feelings. Not intentions. Not community engagement.

Outcomes.

And that accountability should apply to everyone receiving public money — departments, contractors, nonprofits, and transgender organizations too.

Audit everyone.

If funding is awarded in the name of transgender people, then show who was served, what changed, what outcomes were produced, and whether the people most harmed actually benefited.

San Francisco should not use transgender people in budget language, equity plans, workforce reports, trainings, and public speeches while transgender people remain unemployed, unhoused, underfunded, bullied, discredited, and excluded from the systems claiming to serve us.

That is not equity.

That is extraction.

When people inside these systems cause harm to transgender people, the City should not hide behind process. The City should show accountability.

Who was protected?

Who was corrected?

Who was disciplined?

Who was believed?

Who was harmed?

And what changed?

To every ally inside these departments: stop using transgender pain as professional currency.

If you are really an ally, secure funding, open doors, challenge discrimination, correct false statements, stop bullying, and produce outcomes.

Otherwise, do not call it allyship.

Call it career advancement.

This budget should not reward performance. It should reward proof.

If departments or funded organizations cannot prove accountability for transgender outcomes, cut the performance and fund the work.

Thank you.

Phanny Lun

From: [Margo Rudd](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Cuts to Senior Centers
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:48:10 AM

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

Hello, I am writing to ask supervisors to NOT to cut funding to senior centers like the Golden Gate Village Program by almost 50%. This and other centers across the city provide vital support to seniors. For example, Cheryl Mar at this center, coordinates low cost or free tickets to the S.F. Symphony, Opera and the Best of Broadway shows. If the current budget passes, beginning in July her hours will be cut by approximately 50% and affect her ability to manage these tickets. Although seniors enjoy activities at the centers, these wonderful opportunities provide us with outside stimulation and the joy of experiencing live theater and musical events. Please examine this budget item and vote to NOT cut the funding by approximately 50%. Margo Rudd, 1654 Filbert Street
Sent from my iPad

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 5 Letters Regarding Crocker Amazon
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:56:47 AM
Attachments: [5 Letters Regarding Crocker Amazon.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 5 letters regarding the renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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: [Karen Schulkin](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [John-Baptiste, Alicia \(MYR\)](#); [Commission, Recpark \(REC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Crocker Amazon
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 4:08:46 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to review and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure and has been enjoyed by my family for 30 years. Please do not allow the San Francisco Rec and Park Dept to cut down over 100 trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20 acre artificial turf baseball complex. Converting this shared public space into a specialized facility serving only a narrow user group, would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for current users.

The organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burden on the neighborhood. Rec and Park has already concentrated about 85% of the synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities.

Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain and welcoming, multi-use park for the varied park users.

I ask that you prioritize and renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone-young and old.

Sincerely,
Karen Schulkin

From: [Miriam Mendoza Moody](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Commission, Recpark \(REC\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [John-Baptiste, Alicia \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 12:05:55 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,
I am writing to urge you to protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal to replace its natural open space with a fenced-in, artificial-turf sports complex.

The plan proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and team owner/Trump donor Charles B. Johnson is being framed as a "gift." However, many neighbors did not ask for this project and do not support paving over meadows, cutting down mature trees, and fencing off large portions of a beloved community park.

Artificial turf also raises serious concerns. Synthetic fields are associated with higher surface temperatures, higher injury rates than well-maintained natural grass, and exposure to toxins such as PFAS and microplastics. It's particularly troubling that the majority of artificial turf installations have been clustered in neighborhoods already burdened by asthma and environmental justice challenges.

I strongly support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing so the right way:

- Yes to meaningful community input.
- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.
- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.
- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers,

and youth sports alike.

- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.
- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-night bright field lighting.
- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.
- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.

Please stand with neighborhood residents and protect this city treasure. Invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access, not in plastic infrastructure that narrows and intensifies use.

Sincerely,

Miriam Mendoza Moody, MNA

miriammoody09@gmail.com

(415) 580-5624

From: [Wesley Saunders](#)
To: [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [John-Baptiste, Alicia \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Crocker Amazon Demolition project/ The Demand Argument
Date: Sunday, June 7, 2026 2:50:04 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's demolition plan for Crocker Amazon Park is predicated on a supposed need due to rainouts during the baseball season and an increased demand for fields. Today, we will be looking at the RPD's case for demand.

Essentially, the RPD never uses actual usage numbers to lead its arguments. Instead, officials conflate availability with "usage" to distract from the fact that there is no real case for an increased demand for baseball fields.

Rec and Park effectively admits it is incapable of backing up its own demand argument. Officials are unable to state any objective "occupancy" rate of total fields versus actual reservations.

On Feb 26, 2026, at 6:24 PM, Ketcham, Dana (REC) <dana.ketcham@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Wesley

Thanks for reaching out. I apologize for the slow response.

Unfortunately, our systems are not able to generate the specific data you are requesting. We are hoping that future improved systems can be improved on providing specific data points.

We were able to get the raw data on reservations by submitting a Public Records Act request. What the data shows is that, for 2025, fields D1 through D5 were reserved for a combined 2,000.5 hours out of a total capacity of 20,744 hours. Those booked hours represent a mere 9.6% of total capacity. This level of demand hardly justifies the alleged need for additional field hours.

Many fields in the RPD portfolio are extremely underutilized. When I worked as a gardener at Crocker Amazon in 2024, I maintained fields at Herz, Alice Chalmers, and Excelsior playgrounds that were never used. Never.

From a macro perspective, the youth population of San Francisco is decreasing as a percentage of the total population, even as our overall population increases (1). Furthermore, participation in youth baseball has decreased by 25% over the last ten years (2). Can the RPD show us how its leagues have increased their number of teams, players, or games? I doubt it.

Instead, they bravely trot out the 2008 joint task force report on fields to substantiate the need for more space. First of all, that report is now 18 years old—in Bay Area time, that is a century ago. The report relies on a 2004 survey (3) that actually shows baseball is one of the least desirable activities in the park, placing only slightly above “other.” Not only is the conclusion that we need more fields demonstrably false, but the numbers associated with it are never attributed to a real source. They are literally just made up. Frankly, it is embarrassing that they are still using this ancient report to justify a \$50 million project.

We challenge Dan Mauer and the RPD to show us any requests from park users asking for more fields prior to the start of this fiasco. We challenge the RPD to share the actual usage numbers against their field inventory.

The only purpose this project serves is to cater to privatized tournament baseball, which has grown into a \$40 billion-a-year industry. Is running a corporate-branded tournament baseball complex the ultimate goal of the RPD and the Giants? It seems highly likely, because there is very little other reason to add additional fields to this park.

Rec and Park should be looking to maximize underused assets and redistribute field time across other properties and neighborhoods. This would lessen the impact on an already highly strained neighborhood while retaining the current balance between organized sports and self-directed community activities.

**Thank you for your time,
Keep Crocker Real**

2.

3.



From: [Wesley Saunders](#)
To: [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [John-Baptiste, Alicia \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Crocker Amazon Demolition project/ The Demand Argument
Date: Sunday, June 7, 2026 3:13:18 PM

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

Hello,
Resending with attachments.

On Sun, Jun 7, 2026 at 2:49 PM Wesley Saunders <wesleymsaunders@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Supervisors,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's demolition plan for Crocker Amazon Park is predicated on a supposed need due to rainouts during the baseball season and an increased demand for fields. Today, we will be looking at the RPD's case for demand.

Essentially, the RPD never uses actual usage numbers to lead its arguments. Instead, officials conflate availability with "usage" to distract from the fact that there is no real case for an increased demand for baseball fields.

Rec and Park effectively admits it is incapable of backing up its own demand argument. Officials are unable to state any objective "occupancy" rate of total fields versus actual reservations.

On Feb 26, 2026, at 6:24 PM, Ketcham, Dana (REC) <dana.ketcham@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Wesley

Thanks for reaching out. I apologize for the slow response.

Unfortunately, our systems are not able to generate the specific data you are requesting. We are hoping that future improved systems can be improved on providing specific data points.

We were able to get the raw data on reservations by submitting a Public Records Act request. What the data shows is that, for 2025, fields D1 through D5 were reserved for a combined 2,000.5 hours out of a total capacity of 20,744 hours. Those booked hours represent a mere 9.6% of total capacity. This level of

demand hardly justifies the alleged need for additional field hours.

Many fields in the RPD portfolio are extremely underutilized. When I worked as a gardener at Crocker Amazon in 2024, I maintained fields at Herz, Alice Chalmers, and Excelsior playgrounds that were never used. Never.

From a macro perspective, the youth population of San Francisco is decreasing as a percentage of the total population, even as our overall population increases (1). Furthermore, participation in youth baseball has decreased by 25% over the last ten years (2). Can the RPD show us how its leagues have increased their number of teams, players, or games? I doubt it.

Instead, they bravely trot out the 2008 joint task force report on fields to substantiate the need for more space. First of all, that report is now 18 years old—in Bay Area time, that is a century ago. The report relies on a 2004 survey (3) that actually shows baseball is one of the least desirable activities in the park, placing only slightly above “other.” Not only is the conclusion that we need more fields demonstrably false, but the numbers associated with it are never attributed to a real source. They are literally just made up. Frankly, it is embarrassing that they are still using this ancient report to justify a \$50 million project.

We challenge Dan Mauer and the RPD to show us any requests from park users asking for more fields prior to the start of this fiasco. We challenge the RPD to share the actual usage numbers against their field inventory.

The only purpose this project serves is to cater to privatized tournament baseball, which has grown into a \$40 billion-a-year industry. Is running a corporate-branded tournament baseball complex the ultimate goal of the RPD and the Giants? It seems highly likely, because there is very little other reason to add additional fields to this park.

Rec and Park should be looking to maximize underused assets and redistribute field time across other properties and neighborhoods. This would lessen the impact on an already highly strained neighborhood while retaining the current balance between organized sports and self-directed community activities.

**Thank you for your time,
Keep Crocker Real**

Sports & Recreation > Sports & Fitness

PREMIUM +

Share of children aged 6 to 12 who participate in baseball on a regular basis in the United States from 2008 to 2021



© Statista 2025

Show source

Additional Information

DOWNLOAD



Sources

- Show sources information
- Show publisher information
- Use Ask Statista Research Service

Release date
November 2022

Region
United States

Survey time period
2008 to 2021

Citation formats

Share of participants in children's baseball in the U.S. 2021

Published by [Statista Research Department](#), Nov 2, 2023

The share of children aged 6 to 12 who participate in baseball on a regular basis in the United States increased between 2020 and 2021. According to the source, 12.6 percent of children participated in baseball on a regular basis in 2021, up from 12.2 percent in

Core Participation in Select Sports

Percentage of children ages 6-12 who participated on a regular basis in 2021
(number of days varies by sport)

Sport	2008	2019	2020	2021	2020-2021 Change	# Kids in 2021
 Baseball	16.5%	14.4%	12.2%	12.6%	3.0%	3,670,506
 Basketball	16.6%	14.0%	14.8%	14.5%	-2.3%	4,208,369
 Bicycling	27.7%	17.0%	18.2%	18.0%	-0.9%	5,243,326
 Cheerleading	2.4%	2.9%	2.3%	2.2%	-2.6%	649,347
 Flag Football	4.5%	3.5%	3.4%	3.4%	1.5%	1,000,296
 Tackle Football	3.7%	2.9%	2.8%	2.3%	-17.9%	677,872
 Golf	5.0%	4.6%	5.3%	5.2%	-1.9%	1,500,000
 Gymnastics	2.3%	3.6%	2.9%	3.0%	4.2%	881,905
 Ice Hockey	0.5%	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	-10.5%	272,662
 Lacrosse	0.4%	1.0%	0.9%	0.7%	-23.7%	200,509
 Soccer (Outdoor)	10.4%	7.7%	6.2%	7.4%	19.5%	2,160,186
 Softball (Fast-Pitch)	1.0%	1.4%	1.2%	1.2%	-0.1%	348,575
 Swimming (Team)	N/A	1.3%	1.0%	1.1%	11.9%	334,394
 Tennis	4.3%	4.3%	5.9%	5.8%	-2.9%	1,681,717
 Track and Field	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	-7.3%	322,862
 Volleyball (Court)	2.9%	2.9%	2.5%	2.6%	4.8%	751,197
 Wrestling	1.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	-11.5%	162,157

Source: Sports & Fitness Industry Association, 2021

Need For Recreation Facilities in San Francisco

From a list of 19 recreation facilities, respondents were asked to indicate which ones they and members of their household have a need for. Five of the 19 recreation facilities had at least 45% of respondent households indicate they have a need for it. The facilities that the highest percentage of respondent households indicated they have a need for include: walking and biking trails (76%); pools (52%); community gardens (47%); running/walking track (46%); and indoor exercise and fitness facilities (45%).

Figure 5 summarizes the number of households calculated from these percentages as having a need for various recreation facilities in the City of San Francisco, based on 337,710 households in the City.




Figure 5 – Rating of Need for Recreation Facilities

2.

3.

From: [Beck Schermesser](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Commission, Recpark \(REC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [John-Baptiste, Alicia \(MYR\)](#); [ChenStaff](#)
Subject: Re: Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon baseball fields
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 7:27:48 AM

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

Hello,

As a mom of an avid baseball player and an Environmental Toxicologist I'm writing to oppose the plan for artificial turf at Crocker Amazon. I understand all the pros and cons as a parent of a child disappointed when a game is rained out - but it's my ultimate prerogative and life's work to keep my child and other children safe from unnecessary environmental toxins. The materials used in artificial turf are known to be toxic and to leave a toxic footprint and a long legacy of chemicals in the environment as they break down and migrate over many, many years.

I think it's great that there is a desire to improve parks and ball fields - and I think there are better, more sustainable and healthier ways to go about it.

Please make a plan to revitalize the park that will also lend itself to the long term health of the people who use it - and the land itself. I'm sure many people are writing to you with similar concerns. I truly hope you can hear us and gain some knowledge about the health and environmental effects of artificial fields. It's hard to choose what is most upsetting about your current plan - I think cutting down old trees is a tragedy as well. But my main concern is that artificial fields will leave a troubling legacy in years to come.

Thank you,
Rebeccah Schermesser

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 9 Letters Regarding Retail Animal Sales
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 12:07:44 PM
Attachments: [9 Letters Regarding Retail Animal Sales.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 9 letters regarding banning of retail animal sales.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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: davendes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [David Cogswell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please End Animal Sales in Pet Stores
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:47:22 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident, I was thrilled to hear that the Commission of Animal Control and Welfare voted to recommend banning retail animal sales. I'm writing to ask you to act quickly on this recommendation and prohibit this source of animal suffering.

Virtually all animals sold in pet stores come from mills where hundreds or thousands of animals are confined to small cages, tubs, and tanks without adequate food, water, or veterinary care. Sick and injured animals may be ignored, gassed, or frozen to death.

At the same time, our shelters and rescues are overwhelmed with surrendered and rescued animals.

Please help stop this cruelty!

Sincerely,
David Cogswell
davendes@aol.com

From: [Bella Niven](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban (Support Letter Attached)
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 12:10:06 PM
Attachments: [SCIL SF BOS Support Letter-Retail Sales Ban.pdf](#)

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

*Please find our support letter attached to this email.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I write on behalf of Social Compassion in Legislation (“SCIL”) and our thousands of supporters across California in strong support of the San Francisco Animal Commission’s recommendation to ban the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in San Francisco.

SCIL is a political advocacy organization that promotes animal protection legislation in California. Over the course of twenty years, we have sponsored 30 bills that were signed into law, including AB 485 in 2017, which banned the sale of mill bred dogs, cats, and rabbits in pet stores. Especially since working on this bill and familiarizing ourselves with pet industries and breeding mills, we are horrified at the cruelty that exists within the pet trade, particularly for those animals sold at retail.

Animals sold in pet stores are either trafficked from the wild or bred in mills, which makes this both a conservation and humane issue. According to the Center for Biological Diversity (“CBD”), the United States “imports on average more than 90 million live amphibians, arachnids, birds, aquarium fish, mammals, and reptiles each year for the pet trade.” Additionally, “more than 30% of the animals it imports for the trade are sourced straight from wild populations.” Imported animals often die during shipment due to stress, asphyxiation, starvation, dehydration, disease, and injury. Many of these imported animals are also endangered or threatened. In the face of climate change and habitat loss, the exotic pet industry is further threatening conservation and biodiversity.

Retail animals are also sourced from breeding mills. Investigations into bird breeding mills by World Animal Protection reveal “thousands of birds confined in tiny cages covered in feces and dust, birds left vulnerable to the elements, enduring blistering heat in the summer and freezing cold in the winter, with little or no protection, and even a bird mill owner admitting to suffocating birds he couldn’t sell with a plastic bag.” Pet stores across California acquire their parrots, parakeets, cockatiels, and cockatoos from these bird mills. In the investigation video, the bird mill owner says she sells the birds to “PetCo reps.” Pet stores across California acquire their parrots, parakeets, cockatiels, and cockatoos from these inhumane bird mills. The same is true for other animals sold in retail pet stores.

As a progressive and conservation-oriented city, San Francisco cannot continue to support the deaths of millions of animals in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking incidents, in shipping, and in pet stores themselves. Hundreds of adoptable animals await homes in San Francisco shelters, and many will be euthanized due to the current pet overpopulation crisis. By introducing this ban, the board will alleviate the burdens faced by San Francisco shelters and take a stance against cruel breeding mills and wildlife trafficking.

After sponsoring animal protection legislation for twenty years, we are confident that this ban would save hundreds of lives and inspire other cities to do the same.

Sincerely,

Judie Mancuso
Founder / CEO / President
Social Compassion in Legislation

--

Bella Niven
Fellow, Social Compassion



SCIL
Social Compassion
in Legislation

June 9, 2026

RE: Ban on Retail Sale of All Animals

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I write on behalf of Social Compassion in Legislation (“SCIL”) and our thousands of supporters across California in strong support of the San Francisco Animal Commission’s recommendation to ban the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in San Francisco.

SCIL is a political advocacy organization that promotes animal protection legislation in California. Over the course of twenty years, we have sponsored 30 bills that were signed into law, including AB 485 in 2017, which banned the sale of mill bred dogs, cats, and rabbits in pet stores. Especially since working on this bill and familiarizing ourselves with pet industries and breeding mills, we are horrified at the cruelty that exists within the pet trade, particularly for those animals sold at retail.

Animals sold in pet stores are either trafficked from the wild or bred in mills, which makes this both a conservation and humane issue. According to the Center for Biological Diversity (“CBD”), the United States “imports on average more than 90 million live amphibians, arachnids, birds, aquarium fish, mammals, and reptiles each year for the pet trade.”¹ Additionally, “more than 30% of the animals it imports for the trade are sourced straight from wild populations.”² Imported animals often die during shipment due to stress, asphyxiation, starvation, dehydration, disease, and injury.³ Many of these imported animals are also endangered or threatened. In the face of climate change and habitat loss, the exotic pet industry is further threatening conservation and biodiversity.

Retail animals are also sourced from breeding mills. Investigations into bird breeding mills by World Animal Protection reveal “thousands of birds confined in tiny cages covered in feces and dust, birds left vulnerable to the elements, enduring blistering heat in the summer and freezing cold in the winter, with little or no protection, and even a bird mill owner admitting to suffocating birds he couldn’t sell with a plastic bag.”⁴ Pet stores across California acquire their parrots, parakeets, cockatiels, and cockatoos from these bird mills. In the investigation video, the bird mill owner says she sells the birds to “PetCo reps.”⁵ Pet stores across California acquire their parrots, parakeets, cockatiels, and cockatoos from these inhumane bird mills. The same is true for other animals sold in retail pet stores.

As a progressive and conservation-oriented city, San Francisco cannot continue to support the deaths of millions of animals in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking incidents, in shipping, and in pet stores themselves.

¹ <https://biologicaldiversity.org/programs/international/pdfs/Exotic-Exploitation-How-U-S-Pet-Trade-Threatens-Global-Wildlife.pdf>

² *Id.*

³ *Id.*


⁴ <https://www.worldanimalprotection.us/latest/press-releases/bird-mill-industry-exposed/>

⁵ *Id.*

Hundreds of adoptable animals await homes in San Francisco shelters, and many will be euthanized due to the current pet overpopulation crisis. By introducing this ban, the board will alleviate the burdens faced by San Francisco shelters and take a stance against cruel breeding mills and wildlife trafficking.

After sponsoring animal protection legislation for twenty years, we are confident that this ban would save hundreds of lives and inspire other cities to do the same.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Judie Mancuso". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Judie Mancuso
Founder / CEO / President
Social Compassion in Legislation

From: tamibennett2003@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Tami Bennett](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please End Animal Sales in Pet Stores
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:14:25 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident, I was thrilled to hear that the Commission of Animal Control and Welfare voted to recommend banning retail animal sales. I'm writing to ask you to act quickly on this recommendation and prohibit this source of animal suffering.

Virtually all animals sold in pet stores come from mills where hundreds or thousands of animals are confined to small cages, tubs, and tanks without adequate food, water, or veterinary care. Sick and injured animals may be ignored, gassed, or frozen to death.

At the same time, our shelters and rescues are overwhelmed with surrendered and rescued animals.

Please help stop this cruelty!

Sincerely,
Tami Bennett
tamibennett2003@yahoo.com

From: filomeno_narvios@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Filomeno Narvios](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please End Animal Sales in Pet Stores
Date: Sunday, June 7, 2026 7:38:28 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident, I was thrilled to hear that the Commission of Animal Control and Welfare voted to recommend banning retail animal sales. I'm writing to ask you to act quickly on this recommendation and prohibit this source of animal suffering.

Virtually all animals sold in pet stores come from mills where hundreds or thousands of animals are confined to small cages, tubs, and tanks without adequate food, water, or veterinary care. Sick and injured animals may be ignored, gassed, or frozen to death.

At the same time, our shelters and rescues are overwhelmed with surrendered and rescued animals.

Please help stop this cruelty!

Sincerely,
Filomeno Narvios
filomeno_narvios@sbcglobal.net

From: [Wilson Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Monday, June 8, 2026 1:47:59 PM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident in the Portola neighborhood (district 9).

I just heard that the Animal Commission recommended banning retail pet sales, and I wanted to reach out and urge you to make this happen. Banning the retail sale of animals in our city is a massive step toward stopping a lot of unnecessary cruelty.

Right now, millions of animals are suffering in breeding mills, trafficking, and terrible shipping conditions. At the same time, our local rescues are completely overwhelmed. We really need to focus on promoting adoption and ending retail animal sales for good.

Thanks for your time,

Wilson

From: [Cynthia BL](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Elizabeth Young](#); [Kitty Jones](#)
Subject: Ban on Retail Animal Sales -- from Palomacy Pigeon and Dove Adoptions
Date: Monday, June 8, 2026 6:52:41 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

My name is Cynthia Bardouka-Large and I'm the co-director of Palomacy Pigeon and Dove Adoptions.

I'm grateful to you for considering this ban on the retail sale of animals in San Francisco. I hope it's approved and that San Francisco can lead the way for other parts of California and eventually to other cities, counties, and states across the country.

My knowledge is mostly about birds, and I can tell you that the horrors of breeding mills, along with the crisis of birds kidnapped from the wild for the pet trade, are reasons enough to cut off the supply of trafficked animals in this deadly commerce.

Rescues like Palomacy are overflowing with surplus, unwanted, and dumped birds, and those of us doing rescue work are outnumbered (by a factor of many thousands) by those who continue to breed, sell, and treat as disposable these sensitive, social beings.

And when you purchase a poorly bred or trafficked bird from a store like Petco, they will also sell you a heartbreakingly small cage that no sentient creature should be confined to. Their pamphlets on animal husbandry are often flatly wrong. I have seen them distribute a pamphlet on keeping doves, with a picture of a white pigeon on the front. ("pigeons" and "doves" are not interchangeable when it comes to the species commonly found in the pet trade and the care needed). I alerted them to the issue and they doubled down on their incorrect information and said that it didn't matter since the care advice was the same for both (so very wrong!). With bad advice like that, it's clear that the point of sale at the pet shop is not an end to the animal's trouble. Birds are one of the most frequently re-homed and discarded pets, as customers walk away from the store with their bird and their little cage, and no real information about the commitment of sharing a life with a species so different from our own.

And that's just birds! Please spare a thought for the inbred "naked" guinea pigs, unable even to stay warm by themselves, the reptiles confined to tiny aquariums, the goldfish drowning in the ammonia of their own urine, the beta "fighting fish" kept in 8 oz cups, listlessly floating and staring at nothing all day on account of their beautifully colored scales.

Chains such as Pet Food Express, along with many small independently owned pet supply shops, have demonstrated a robust business model where no live animals are bought or sold, and rescue is at the forefront of the conversation about where to find companion animals. These ethical pet supply shops are the majority in the city of San Francisco, and they prove every day that it can be done.

When the retail sales of dogs and cats were banned, Petco readily partnered with local rescues to feature adoptable kittens in their stores. They know how to do this. They were allowed to keep selling birds, reptiles, and fish, and I ask you to consider how those animals have fared -- inbred for novel effects and sold as merchandise to anyone willing to pay.

I expect you will soon hear from breeders around California -- and out of state -- who will protest that we are trying to "outlaw pets" and that breeding will be driven into the black market. Please don't listen to them. Listen to those of us who are left to pick up the pieces and repair the harm caused by those breeders and retailers, every day. This ban will absolutely prevent a great deal of suffering.

In gratitude,
Cynthia Bardouka-Large
www.pigeonrescue.org

From: [Susan Setterholm](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: PLEASE! It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:32:11 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Susan Setterholm
susan.setterholm@icloud.com
1000 Sutter Street #501
San Francisco, California 94109-5818

From: [Elois Farnsworth](#)
To: [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:23:40 AM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban. As a San Francisco resident, I'm reaching out as I want to encourage you all to introduce a ban on the unnecessary sale of retail animals in our city!

These animals come from breeding mills and pet stores sales support these cruel mills. Furthermore, the sale of retail animals exacerbates wildlife trafficking. A whopping 90% of all trafficked parrots die before they even can be sold. Meanwhile, prominent bay area animal rescues, such as Mickaboo Companion Bird Rescue, is overwhelmed with intakes and birds needing good homes. The city of San Francisco has the opportunity to be at the forefront of a nationwide change in encouraging adoption and ending the retail sale of precious animal lives, and I urge you all to introduce a ban on the retail sale of animals in pet stores!

Sincerely,
Elois Farnsworth

From: [Annelise](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Introduction to Ban Sale of Retail Animals
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:16:05 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I strongly support the San Francisco Animal Commission's recommendation that San Francisco introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in San Francisco.


Please use your platform of influence and create change that betters the lives of all non-human animals, making our world a better place while inspiring freedom and advocacy.

All animals need our voice, choice, and action to protect them from abuse and exploitation.

Please consider these words and ban the selling of "retail" animals.

Thank you,

Annelise Day



Annelise Day
619-569-6541
adphoto94@gmail.com

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: 113 Letters Regarding Cigarettes
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 12:09:25 PM
Attachments: [113 Letters Regarding Plastic Filters.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 113 letters regarding the banning of plastic cigarette filters.

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: [Constance Kao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:12:32 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Constance Kao
conniekaohealth@yahoo.com
211 Nevada
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Alex Dvorak](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:19:24 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Alex Dvorak
alexdvorak229@gmail.com
1420 Green Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Glenn Etow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:19:46 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Glenn Etow
gtetow@gmail.com
1200 California St, 17D
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Chris Etow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:20:13 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Chris Etow
cetow@sbcglobal.net
1200 California Street 17D
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Anthony Trask](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:22:10 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Anthony Trask
atrask@gmail.com
554 7th Ave
San Francisco, 94118

From: [David Umberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:29:02 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

David Umberg
david.umberg@gmail.com
2171 Mission St Apt 302
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94110

From: [Susan Weisberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:31:58 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. I know this from personal experience--when I volunteered to help clean the sidewalks and streets of my neighborhood, by far the largest kind of trash I picked up was cigarette butts.

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.

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.

Susan Weisberg
swhys42@gmail.com
544 Greenwich St.
San Francisco, California 94133

From: [Kara Murphy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:37:39 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kara Murphy
kmurphym83@gmail.com
3515 Fillmore Street, Apartment #105
San Francisco, California 94123

From: [Hannah Thorner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:43:45 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Hannah Thorner
hmthorner@gmail.com
2400 Virginia Ave NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20037

From: [Barbara Bodager](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:45:06 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Barbara Bodager
barbarabodager@sbcglobal.net
3760 Webster Street
San Francisco , California 94123

From: [Thomas King](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:53:28 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Thomas King
king-tom@sbcglobal.net
523 Oak Park Drive
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Edwin Marwitz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:54:00 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Edwin Marwitz
ed@emarwitz.com
ed@emarwitz.com
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Jackie Noonan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:04:38 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 you about cigarette butts, please either support banning them totally or provide cigarette butt disposable cans all around the city.

There is no reason cigarette butts shd line our streets, streams, parks or pollute our rivers and oceans. Either option is a simple solution.

As a former smoker , I didn't want to ever throw a cigarette butt on the ground. Lack of disposal areas or even lack of trash cans made that very difficult to avoid. Although I've often felt strongly that an outright ban would help so many smokers quit also.

I urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jackie Noonan

jackienoonan@yahoo.com

2559 20th ave

San francisco, California 94116

From: [Laurel Wigham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please help San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:13:39 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Laurel Wigham
lauriewigham@yahoo.com
31 Bennington street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Jean Hansen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:18:01 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jean Hansen
cookooducky@gmail.com
50 Natick St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Paul Muldown](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:18:44 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Paul Muldown
pjmuldown@gmail.com
50 Natick St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Riyad Ghannam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:43:25 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Riyad Ghannam
riyad@rg-architecture.com
428 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA, California 94103

From: [Antoinette Wythes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:48:19 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Antoinette Wythes
maitsai@yahoo.com
2844 Broderick St
San Francisco, California 94123

From: [Sasha Sommer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:50:22 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Sasha Sommer
sashalsommer@gmail.com
960 Baker Street #2
SF, California 94115

From: [Jake Kaplove](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:52:51 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jake Kaplove
jake.kaplove@gmail.com
1554 23rd Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Syrsha Harvey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:53:46 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Syrsha Harvey
syrshaharv@gmail.com
1021 Clay Street
San Francisco, California 94108

From: [Chris Etow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:10:29 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Chris Etow
cetow@sbcglobal.net
1200 California Street 17D
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Tim dense](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:16:04 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Tim dense
tim@timdense.com
1812 high st
alameda, California 94501

From: [Virginia Remondino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:21:11 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency,
Virginia Remondino

Virginia Remondino
virenze@gmail.com
52 Lyon St

SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

From: [Sara Morgan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:21:36 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Sara Morgan
saramorgan1111@gmail.com
1450 35th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Heidi Hansen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:36:24 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Heidi Hansen
heidi@heidihansen.com
145 Laurel Street , #7
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Doug Spradlin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 11:00:28 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Doug Spradlin
djs006@yahoo.com
2815 22nd Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Jim Soukup](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 11:32:05 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jim Soukup
jim_soukup@icloud.com
1205 Oak St. Apt. 3
San Francisco , California 94117

From: [matthew goo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 11:39:58 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

matthew goo
mattgoo@gmail.com
1458 noe st
san francisco, California 94131

From: [Laura Alpert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 12:46:29 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Laura Alpert
lmalpert9@gmail.com
357 Allison St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Raymond Kania](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 1:00:57 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Raymond Kania
raymond.kania@gmail.com
501 33rd Avenue, #205
San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Christine Safreno](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 1:41:21 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Christine Safreno
csafreno@gmail.com
221 Cherrywood Avenue
San Leandro, California 94577

From: [Lesley Thompson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 3:56:46 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Lesley Thompson
lesfthompson@gmail.com
821 Edinburgh Street
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Steven Collins](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:31:42 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Steven Collins
charity089@icloud.com
555 4th St Unit 712
San Francisco, California 94107

From: [Judith Evind](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:36:24 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Judith Evind
judith.evind@gmail.com
400 Locust Street, Apt 6
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Daniel Levine](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:19:35 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Daniel Levine
daniel.mark.levine@gmail.com
235 Jersey Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Callie Shiang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:33:30 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Callie Shiang
cshiang@gmail.com
1515 Pine St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Jessica Finkel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:36:17 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jessica Finkel
jffinkel@gmail.com
642 Chenery Street
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Joshua Siebalt](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:37:27 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Joshua Siebalt
jsiebalt@yahoo.com
1186 Eddy St, A
San Francisco , California 94109

From: [Ron Ypil](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:38:57 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Ron Ypil
rmypil@aol.com
1031 Le Conte Ave
SF, California 94124

From: [Cait Lawson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:45:28 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Cait Lawson
cait.lawson@gmail.com
1500 N Street #216
Sacramento, 95814

From: [Madison Kotack](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:51:00 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Madison Kotack
madisonkotack@gmail.com
1536 Great Hwy
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Senta Tsantilis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:55:45 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Senta Tsantilis
Sptsantilis@hmail.com
2865 Lincoln Way
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Eric Gregory](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 8:57:04 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Eric Gregory
mrericsir@gmail.com
255 Dolores St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Mikayla Tencer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:00:32 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Mikayla Tencer
mikaylatenc@gmail.com
1607 McAllister St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [brianna adams](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:05:12 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

brianna adams
adamsjbri@gmail.com
775 1/2 commercial st
san francisco, California 94108

From: [Anya Harris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:12:40 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Anya Harris
anyarharris@gmail.com
1063 Melrose Avenue
Alameda, California 94502

From: [Vanessa Homewood](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:14:42 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 gathered 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, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Vanessa Homewood
vhomewood@yahoo.com
225 Miramar Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Ariel Feingold-Shaw](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:18:26 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Ariel Feingold-Shaw
ahfeingoldshaw@gmail.com
360 Guerrero St, unit 204
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Div Manickam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:24:34 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect

Div Manickam
nowhere.div@gmail.com
4132 3rd street, Unit 6
San Francisco, California 94124

From: [Angela Descalso](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:39:18 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Angela Descalso
andesca26@gmail.com
1937 Eaton ave
San Carlos , California 94070

From: [Isaac McLaughlan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:45:55 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Isaac McLaughlan
isaacmclaughlan@gmail.com
108 Tapia Drive
San Francisco, California 94132

From: [Alice De Carlo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:46:18 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Alice De Carlo
alicethecanary@gmail.com
3156 Turk Blvd
San Francisco , California 94118

From: [Terry Hill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:49:46 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Terry Hill
hillx1sf@yahoo.com
698 19th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Cathy Ricque](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:50:46 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Cathy Ricque
spideyweber@gmail.com
655 4th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Karen Strauss](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:55:21 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Karen Strauss
kls91rnb@gmail.com
4275 24th Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Casey Riscoe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:00:42 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

-Casey

Casey Riscoe
casey.riscoe@gmail.com

933 Grove Street
San Francisco, California 94117-1713

From: [Russalynne Griggs](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:06:26 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Russalynne Griggs
russalynnegriggs@gmail.com
193 W MACARTHUR BLVD
OAKLAND, California 94611

From: [Russell Griggs](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:08:33 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Russell Griggs
rg1376@icloud.com
193 West MacArthur Boulevard
Oakland, California 94611

From: [Deborah Underwood](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:16:16 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

Until I participated in a local street clean-up, I had no idea how prevalent cigarette butts are on the streets of San Francisco. If you haven't taken a look around on your block, I hope you do.

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Deborah Underwood

vegdeb@gmail.com
1318 17th Ave Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Julianne De Bell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:35:28 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Julianne De Bell
debelljulianne@gmail.com
3410 22nd St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Miqdaad Bhuriwala](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:42:07 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Miqdaad Bhuriwala
miqdaadbhuriwala@gmail.com
2287 39th Ave
San Francisco , California 94116

From: [Cynthia Cohen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 11:00:02 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Cynthia Cohen
csc Cohen1214@gmail.com
1525 44th Avenue
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122-2930

From: [Laura McErlane](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 12:06:48 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Laura McErlane
lauramcerlane@gmail.com
652A Lombard Street
San Francisco, California 94133

From: [Hannah Takasuka](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 12:12:40 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. I participate in SF trash cleanups and clean up hundreds each year, and I know that that represents the millions that aren't picked up.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Hannah Takasuka
hannaht.cadette.gs.1@gmail.com
400 China Basin St, 707

San Francisco, California 94158

From: [Wanda Nichols](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 12:34:52 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Wanda Nichols
wm5cents@gmail.com
1550 Eddy Street Apt 209
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Karen Irwin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 12:58:17 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Karen Irwin
clfsmhr7@aol.com
1 Cabrillo St 307
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Peter Barschall](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 3:53:19 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Peter Barschall
barschall@yahoo.com
1525 44th Ave
San Francisco, 94122

From: [David Baker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:20:45 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

David Baker
wonderificdave@gmail.com
274 Joost Ave
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Georges Geha](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:30:22 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Georges Geha
georgeygeha@gmail.com
Sacramento St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Brynn Valinoti](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:35:35 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Brynn Valinoti
bvalinoti@gmail.com
250 Laurel St
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Caroline Ayres](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco should Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:16:55 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Caroline Ayres
carolineayres6@gmail.com
87 Dolores Street , APT 105
San Francisco , California 94103

From: [Kimberly Quan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:44:05 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 to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kimberly Quan
kimberlyq+actionnetwork@gmail.com
408 Chestnut St
San Francisco , California 94133-2361

From: [Sandy Cavallaro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:21:58 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Sandy Cavallaro
lafmonster@sbcglobal.net
1893 Page St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Eve Vaccaro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:36:38 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Eve Vaccaro
evalorrie@gmail.com
405 Clipper Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Denelle Numis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 7:11:28 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Denelle Numis
denelle.numis@gmail.com
2563 Clay Street, San Francisco, CA, USA, Apt 6
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Oscar Moll](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:26:27 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Oscar Moll
rimoll@gmail.com
575 Cole St
SF, California 94117

From: [Rafael Galvan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:28:18 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Rafael Galvan
rglvn@gmail.com
1418 noe st
SF, California 94131

From: [Smita Carvalho](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:34:47 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

As a volunteer in San Francisco who spent only a few hours picking up trash in our beautiful city's downtown area, I see what a problem this is. Our beautiful streets are infected with cigarette butts which end up in our beautiful parks and Bay. Please ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco!

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Smita Carvalho
smita.carvalho@sephora.com
350 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Sarah Cummings](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:36:56 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Sarah Cummings
sarah.cummings@me.com
2186 California Street Apt 25
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Cameron Willis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:38:30 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Cameron Willis
camiewillis1@gmail.com
1900 washington st unit 101
san francisco , California 94109

From: [Marissa Shumaker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SF Is Ready to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters Now!
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:44:51 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 and support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

What we need 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 from a concerned citizen.

-Marissa Shumaker

Marissa Shumaker
marissa.shumaker@yahoo.com
822 Jefferson Ct

San Mateo, California 94401

From: [Vanessa Kainz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:59:18 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Vanessa Kainz
vkainz@sbcglobal.net
218 Roosevelt way
San Francisco , California 94114

From: [Casey Fritz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:01:16 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Casey Fritz
caseyleighfritz@gmail.com
2015 Judah Street
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Riana Hunter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:06:01 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilized 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.

Riana Hunter
rianahunter31@gmail.com
2637 24th St Apt 5
San Francisco, California 94110-3579

From: [Rachel Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:10:00 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Rachel Smith
trjsmith7@gmsil.com
7 Marietta Dr
San Frnacisco, California 94127

From: [Michael May](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:10:24 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Michael May
maym86@gmail.com
2637 24th St, Apt 5
San Francisco, California 94110

From: marisabaca@sbcglobal.net
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:17:59 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

marisabaca@sbcglobal.net
38740 aurora terrace
fremont, California 94536

From: [Kaila Stein](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:19:19 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kaila Stein
kaila.r.stein@gmail.com
635 Lyon St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Suzana Rego](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:27:56 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Suzana Rego
srego911@gmail.com
3234 Washington Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Joyce Driscoll](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:28:09 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Joyce Driscoll
joyce.driscoll@gmail.com
1901 Paru St
Alameda, California 94501

From: [Rachel Clyde](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:38:38 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Rachel Clyde
raclyde959@gmail.com
460 Lyon St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Shekufeh Samii](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:55:14 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Shekufeh Samii
SHEKUFEH.SAMII@GMAIL.COM
2867 Clay Street
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

From: [Sonia Jaidka](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:55:57 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Sonia Jaidka
sjaidka2@gmail.com
1655 10th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Molly Orner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:02:39 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Molly Orner
mollyo_2000@yahoo.com
200 Brannan Street, 427
San Francisco, California 94107

From: [Julie Roley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:04:50 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Julie Roley
jaroleysf@gmail.com
1771 46th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Perrin Brady](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:09:03 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Perrin Brady
perrinbradylatin@gmail.com
431 Pennsylvania Ave
San Francisco, California 94107

From: [Kaylene Lemen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:09:57 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kaylene Lemen
Kaylenemarieclark@gmail.com
4250 Diamond St Unit 3
Capitola, California 95010-3059

From: [Choku Proudfoot](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:12:00 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Choku Proudfoot
Choku.proudfoot@sfzc.org
300 Page St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Meeta Marathe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:14:36 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Meeta Marathe
meetam412@gmail.com
601 Van Ness Ave #846
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Angelika Joast](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:15:50 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Angelika Joast
angelika.joast@gmail.com
357 Cumberland St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Mark Troianovski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:17:57 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Mark Troianovski
mrktroia@gmail.com
2535 Taraval St
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [John Farkas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:25:49 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

John Farkas
Hikeon99@gmail.com
150 Haight St #103
San Francisco, California 94102-5733

From: lynnxmiao@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:32:30 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

lynnxmiao@gmail.com
1207 Arguello Blvd
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Louisa Basarrate](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:33:35 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Louisa Basarrate
weezie6464@gmail.com
4536 20th Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Kit Wooler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:42:21 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kit Wooler
ekwooler6@gmail.com
1478 8th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Kristina Setka](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:42:24 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kristina Setka
kristina.setka@gmail.com
550 Fell St. , Apt. 16
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Neal Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco needs to ban plastic cigarette filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:51:08 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

Kids are being exposed to toxins at this very moment.

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, common sense 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.

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.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency,

Neal Wong
nealwong0@gmail.com
450 5th Ave Apt 301
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Jeremy Vasquez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:01:06 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jeremy Vasquez
nextstep1200@gmail.com
1488 Valencia st
San Francisco , California 94110

From: [Nameer Hirschkind](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:06:03 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Nameer Hirschkind
nameerhirschkind@gmail.com
38 Lundys Ln
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Anne Hollander](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco - Please Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters!
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:40:16 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Anne Hollander
annekhollander@gmail.com
930 Anza St
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [V Austin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:54:07 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

V Austin
rind-barges6c@icloud.com
300 Page Street
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Ellen Geyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:58:17 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 gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Ellen Geyer
e.geyer@fehrandpeers.com
345 California Street
San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 3 Letters Regarding File No. 251003
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:57:38 AM
Attachments: [3 Letters Regarding File No. 251003.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 3 letters regarding **File No. 251003:**

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing (“PSH”) that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents (“Drug-Free PSH”) to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone (“Drug-Tolerant PSH”), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH’s strategies to meet PSH residents’ demands.

Regards,

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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: [Ian Hewitt](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Save PSH, vote no on Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 4:06:02 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to \$22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Ian Hewitt
ianrhewitt@gmail.com
238 San Carlos Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Joshua Steighner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Save PSH, vote no on Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 5:52:38 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to \$22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Joshua Steighner
jsteig7@gmail.com
1843 Divisadero St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [First Name Last Name](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Sunday, June 7, 2026 6:01:35 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent First Name Last Name

Email example@example.com

Subject Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message: Re: Geary/Larkin; Larkin/O'Farrell

The job of city leaders is to ensure safe public spaces, it isn't just expected, it is required. Yet, apocalyptic scenes still remain at the above locations. City leaders can clean it up in a couple hours by sending SFPD to arrest drug users and dealers; and sending foot patrols to secure the area. SFPD can claim understaffing but it also has a job to do, and cannot refuse to do it simply because they are understaffed. I was driving through the Tenderloin and whilst there were problems, the streets looked clean, but the above locations were one of the few areas where, in open daylight, 2023-style open air drug markets remain.

I will extend my deadline by one final month. This is my final letter.

First Name Last Name

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 3 Letters Regarding File No. 260178
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:58:15 AM
Attachments: [3 Letters Regarding File No. 260178.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 3 letters regarding **File No. 260178:**

Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to, for transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2026: halve the real property transfer tax rate from 5.5% to 2.75% when the consideration or value of the property conveyed equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 but is less than \$25,000,000, and from 6% to 3% when the consideration or value equals or exceeds \$25,000,000; exempt from these reductions the transfer of single-family residences; reduce the penalties for delinquent real property transfer taxes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Regards,

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.sf.gov/sfbos

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: [Molly Livingston](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
Cc: [mad.as.birds@gmail.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 6:41:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Bilal Mahmood and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

Hi Bilal and Dan,

I am writing to you today to ask you to protect prop I. Prop I should fund affordable housing, and a social housing program in particular. San Francisco needs permanently affordable housing for all income levels.

Please do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act (File No. 260178). Prop I's revenue should be spent on the Social Housing Program as voters intended.

Thank you.

Molly
District 5
SFUSD employee and parent of two elementary age children

Sincerely,
Molly Livingston
1683 turk st
[mad.as.birds@gmail.com](#)
District 5 resident

From: [Ellen Castillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Sunday, June 7, 2026 3:49:56 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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Ellen Castillo

Ellen Castillo
ellen.harms112@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Lloyd Affholter](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [laffhol@hotmail.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 7:06:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Matt Dorsey and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

San Francisco shame.
Do not repeal Prop I .

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 59.2% of District 6 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act (File No. 260178) as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,
Lloyd Affholter
laffhol@hotmail.com
District 6 resident

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 56 Letters Regarding File No. 260442
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 12:08:31 PM
Attachments: [56 Letters Regarding File No. 260442.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 56 letters regarding **File No. 260442:**

Resolution authorizing the Sheriff's Office to contract with the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial) for Pretrial Services for a three year period from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2029, for a contract total not to exceed amount of \$22,532,145, with two one-year options to extend.

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.sf.gov/sfbos

***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: [Anthony DiMartino](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 1:39:06 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing on behalf of Californians for Safety and Justice to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

--



Anthony DiMartino, MSW
Government Affairs Director
Californians for Safety and Justice
Email: adimartino@safeandjust.org
Phone: (760) 877-0004
Website: safeandjust.org

From: [Jazlyn Zelada](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [Camila Jimenez](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 1:40:42 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Jazlyn Isabelle Zelada

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: So the courts or the mayor or both no longer want San Francisco to be a leader in justice, nor in social justice. Must San Francisco must fall back in step with the laggards?
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 2:11:18 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

I just urged the mayor to not be San Francisco's Robert E Lee. I urge you to not follow any person fighting to uphold white supremacy, as Robert E Lee disgustingly fought to do and as this mayor seems eager to do with our budget.

Here is what one Black elder said about SF Pretrial last week in the Budget & Finance Committee:

My name was 4762090 for 40 years. San Francisco Pretrial's given my name back which is Ronald Clark and I'd like to keep it and I'd like to keep them and I'd like for you to fund them completely so that I can keep my name, so I don't have to go back to that number ever again. Thank you.

Here is an excerpt from my write up of this matter:

"Dorsey shared extra details that the California Superior court is concerned with the financial stability of SF Pretrial, as well as bring San Francisco into alignment with other counties regarding pretrial services. So the courts or the mayor or both no longer want San Francisco to be a *leader* in justice, nor in social justice. San Francisco must fall *back* in step with the laggards.

These conservative, regressive, harmful moves that San Francisco government has been doing has been heart-wrenching to watch. The renewed War on Drugs. The abandonment of Harm Reduction. The condemnation of Housing First. And now this."

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing

pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

Thank you,
Lea McGeever, MS.
D6 resident.

From: [Jill Robinson](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 4, 2026 2:39:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
[Your name]

From: [Silvo Lugo](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 5:26:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

I'm writing to you as my district supervisor to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Silvio Lugo

From: [Dan Kalafus](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF Pretrial!
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 5:34:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract - and to deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is an example of smart government, done right. It's one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city:

- 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled
- 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates.
- 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023

And all of this at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Moving this to Adult Probation would cost us MORE money, for WORSE outcomes.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial at the June 12 budget hearing!

Thank you,
Daniel Kalafus

From: [Julia R](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 5, 2026 10:34:48 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Julia

From: [Molly Fisher](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Saturday, June 6, 2026 6:23:46 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Sincerely,
Molly Fisher

From: [Ritlesch Chand](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Sunday, June 7, 2026 11:10:46 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

SB 129 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Ritlesch chand

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jill Blagso](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Monday, June 8, 2026 11:24:17 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Jill

From: [Cheyenne Cambri](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [Camila Jimenez](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 11:37:36 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

I have personally benefited from the SF Pretrial program, and my life may have had a much different outcome without its crucially valuable services and approach to rehabilitation.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Cheyenne Cambri

From: [Jasmine A.](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [Camila Jimenez](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 12:03:25 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I hope this email finds you well. I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office, not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

--

Jasmine E. Alvarez,
San Francisco-born and lifetime resident
Pronouns: she/her/hers
E-mail: jasmine.alvarez@gmail.com
Mobile: (415) 420-6485

"Be the change you wish to see in the world."
- Mahatma Gandhi.

From: [Sandy Sicairos](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [Camila Jimenez](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 5:05:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Sandy Sicairos

From: [Anne Stuhldreher](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 5:44:32 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Anne Stuhldreher

From: [Ellen Chaitin](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 6:56:37 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
[Your name]

From: [Sharon Rose](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [Camila Jimenez](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 8:17:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Sharon Rose
SF Pretrial Worker/Manager for OVER 34 YEARS

From: [Ethan Knighton](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:29:05 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a home owner in SF and I cannot believe that you would change apart of the very soul of SF. My tax dollars will not serve to increase law enforcement in this town that has very little crime in part due to programs like SF Pretrial.

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
[Your name]

Thank you,

Ethan K

From: [Jena McCain](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:05:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Jena McCain

From: [Amy Lemyre](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [Camila Jimenez](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:03:25 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Amy Lemyre

From: [Maria Jose Vides](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:33:57 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Maria Jose "MJ" Vides

From: [Kris Sosa](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:02:10 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. There's been so much success with this program. We've had so many of our participants successfully graduate and re-establish themselves not only in the community but within their lives. More punitive approaches is not the answer.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Kris Sosa
Apprentice Program & Human Resources Director
Farming Hope

From: [Madeline Bailey](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#); [Michelle Parris](#); [Claudine Constant](#)
Subject: Vera Institute of Justice Urges You to Preserve SF Pretrial
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 7:38:31 AM
Attachments: [6.11.26 Vera Letter to SF BOS - Preserve SF Pretrial.pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write on behalf of the Vera Institute of Justice to urge you to deny San Francisco Adult Probation's budget request that would eliminate the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial) and to approve SF Pretrial's contract. Vera is a national criminal justice research and policy organization that has worked to safely reform pretrial justice systems across the country for more than 60 years. Time and again, our experience has been that well-crafted pretrial programs and policies have a broad, positive impact on communities. They [improve case outcomes](#), [reduce spending](#), and [make communities safer](#), all at the same time. **SF Pretrial is one of the most effective pretrial programs in the country, and Vera regularly cites it as a top example of well-crafted pretrial policy that other jurisdictions should emulate.**

In a recent [publication](#) where Vera documented best practices in pretrial services, SF Pretrial was the first of just four programs that we chose to highlight. This is because SF Pretrial achieves a remarkable [93 safety rate and 96 court appearance rate](#) by creating customized treatment plans for each person they serve. Based on results of individual needs assessments, SF Pretrial provides a wide range of supports to ensure pretrial success, including case management, on-demand temporary housing, referrals to longer-term stable housing, and connections to health care resources. Vera considers this supportive, wraparound approach to be the gold standard in pretrial services.

Further, Vera has found that pretrial services are most effective when delivered by a separate agency, like SF Pretrial, that operates independently from the courts or probation. As an independent agency, SF Pretrial hires people who are specially trained in supportive case management and counseling. These professionals are best positioned to determine what specific support and supervision a person needs to

return to court as required and avoid rearrest. Probation departments, on the other hand, are not designed to make clinical assessments or provide supportive services to the pretrial population; rather, they are designed to supervise people who have been sentenced by the court and have received probation as a criminal penalty. Vera regularly advises jurisdictions to move away from probation-based pretrial services towards an independent agency model. Dismantling SF Pretrial in favor of probation-based pretrial services would be a significant step backward.

San Francisco has long been—and can continue to be—a national leader in delivering safety, justice, and accountability through successful pretrial services. We urge you not to dismantle one of the most successful pretrial programs in the country. Please act to preserve SF Pretrial by approving their contract and denying Adult Probation's budget request.

Thank you,

Michelle Parris

Director, Vera California

Vera Institute of Justice

mparris@vera.org

Claudine Constant

Director, Beyond Jails Initiative

Vera Institute of Justice

cconstant@vera.org

Madeline Bailey

Advocacy Manager, Beyond Jails Initiative

Vera Institute of Justice

mbailey@vera.org

June 11, 2026

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write on behalf of the Vera Institute of Justice to urge you to deny San Francisco Adult Probation's budget request that would eliminate the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial), and to approve SF Pretrial's contract. Vera is a national criminal justice research and policy organization that has worked to safely reform pretrial justice systems across the country for more than 60 years. Time and again, our experience has been that well-crafted pretrial programs and policies have a broad, positive impact on communities. They [improve case outcomes](#), [reduce spending](#), and [make communities safer](#), all at the same time. **SF Pretrial is one of the most effective pretrial programs in the country, and Vera regularly cites it as a top example of well-crafted pretrial policy that other jurisdictions should emulate.**

In a recent [publication](#) where Vera documented best practices in pretrial services, SF Pretrial was the first of just four programs that we chose to highlight. This is because SF Pretrial achieves a remarkable [93 percent safety rate and 96 percent court appearance rate](#) by creating customized treatment plans for each person they serve. Based on results of individual needs assessments, SF Pretrial provides a wide range of supports to ensure pretrial success, including case management, on-demand temporary housing, referrals to longer-term stable housing, and connections to health care resources. Vera considers this supportive, wraparound approach to be the gold standard in pretrial services.

Further, Vera has found that pretrial services are most effective when delivered by a separate agency, like SF Pretrial, that operates independently from the courts or probation. As an independent agency, SF Pretrial hires people who are specially trained in supportive case management and counseling. These professionals are best positioned to determine what specific support and supervision a person needs to return to court as required and avoid rearrest. Probation departments, on the other hand, are not designed to make clinical assessments or provide supportive services to the pretrial population; rather, they are designed to supervise people who have been sentenced by the court and have received probation as a

criminal penalty. Vera regularly advises jurisdictions to move away from probation-based pretrial services towards an independent agency model. Dismantling SF Pretrial in favor of probation-based pretrial services would be a significant step backward.

San Francisco has long been—and can continue to be—a national leader in delivering safety, justice, and accountability through successful pretrial services. We urge you not to dismantle one of the most successful pretrial programs in the country. Please act to preserve SF Pretrial by approving their contract and denying Adult Probation's budget request.

Thank you,

Michelle Parris
Director, Vera California
Vera Institute of Justice
mparris@vera.org

Claudine Constant
Director, Beyond Jails Initiative
Vera Institute of Justice
cconstant@vera.org

From: [Ivona Feldmárová](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:16:57 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Ivona

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Fernanda Nunes](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:20:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisor, I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer. Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future. Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing. Thank you, [Your name]

Fernanda Nunes

From: [Kelly Elliott](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:34:02 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Kelly Hoeltzel

From: [Mark D Lemyre](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfporetial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 11:20:34 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

Please show the wisdom you so often employ in your public policy decisions and don't dismantle a program that has:

1. Industry-leading practices and outcomes
2. Much lower cost than the proposed alternative
3. Enormous community support
4. Nationwide respect as an exemplary pretrial and diversion service provider.

It's that simple. Don't do it.

Respectfully,
Mark Lemyre

From: [Elsa Torres](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 2:55:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Elsa Torres

From: [Ashlee Alcantar](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:59:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Ashlee Alcantar

From: [Eehwa Ung](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 5:54:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Eehwa Ung

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

From: [Allen Corona](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 6:13:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Allen Corona

From: [Abby Bordin](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 6:13:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Abby Bordin

From: [Sarah Jalali](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 6:35:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Sarah Jalali

From: [Kathryn Lindstrom](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 6:54:35 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Kathryn Lindstrom

From: [Ria Chia](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 6:55:27 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Radhika

From: [Maudie](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:00:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Nancy McCormick

From: [Jenn Chen](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:24:10 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman and Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Jenn Chen
District 8 resident

From: [Lisa King](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:28:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Lisa King
San Francisco resident for 35 years

From: [Roisin Isner](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfporetial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Pretrial diversion is cheaper! Don't dismantle it!
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:44:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. **Doing this will not improve outcomes OR save us money.**

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 **at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation.** It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale. It is also backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation **expands the city's budget deficit** and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Roisin Isner

From: dlundstrom16@gmail.com
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:53:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Danielle Lundstrom
SF resident 94103

From: [Lindsey Morris](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:30:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer. Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future. Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Lindsey

From: [Maisie Bruno-Tyne](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 10:38:26 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Maisie and I'm a resident of north beach. I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer. Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future. Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Maisie Bruno-Tyne

From: [Amy Moore](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 11:01:44 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Amy Rose Moore
(SF resident for 20+ years)

From: [JACQUELINE RAMOS](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 5:45:29 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Jackie

Jackie Ramos

From: [Cary Mossing](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:03:44 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Cary Mossing
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: [Michaela Higgins](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 7:03:28 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Michaela Higgins

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Kaya Topolewski](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 7:13:18 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Kaya Topolewski

From: [Jacqueline Wetmore](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 7:22:13 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Jacqueline

From: [Comcast](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [camilaj@sfprettrial.org](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:06:11 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Anjali Kayal

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Diane Huffman](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:10:16 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Diane Huffman

From: [Julia Gallyot](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's Pretrial the most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:14:33 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Julia
D7

From: [Lillian Shanahan](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:40:36 AM

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

No Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Lillian

From: [Lucy Du](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:03:21 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Lucy

Sent from my iPhone

From: [VICKI RANDLE](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:35:17 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Vicki Randle

Random incoherence courtesy of overzealous autocorrectiveness

From: [Lucero Herrera](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:59:41 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Lucero Herrera

My name is Lucero Herrera, community organizer, member of the Latino Task Force, and bilingual coordinator at the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice.

I am here to speak on the importance of community support and uplifting the voices of those returning to the community, as well as those who are not here to speak for themselves. It is important to recognize the harm caused when critical community resources are cut while we continue to invest in punitive systems that often lack the infrastructure needed to truly support people and create lasting change. Divesting from proven community-based approaches and investing instead in punishment alone will not work.

Programs like pretrial diversion do work, and they are important because I have personally witnessed the impact they have had on individuals and families. I have seen people receive support, guidance, and opportunities that helped strengthen their self-determination and create positive paths forward. These programs connect individuals to resources, mentorship, stability, and healing rather than continuing cycles of harm and incarceration.

When we invest in our communities, we invest in prevention, healing, accountability, and long-term safety for everyone.

As someone who has personally experienced being on probation, I can say that probation alone did not work for me. What made a difference was community support. Programs like pretrial diversion, Community Works West's Rising Voices, and many others helped create spaces for growth, accountability, and transformation. These community-based programs give people the opportunity to rebuild their lives, reconnect with their communities, and move forward with dignity and support rather than punishment alone.

From: [amaline](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:03:23 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Best,
Amaline C

From: [Rose Mishaan](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfprettrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:47:01 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

I am an attorney who regularly practices at the Hall of Justice. I have seen first-hand how vital SF Pretrial's work is. SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Rose Mishaan