FILE NO. 231143

Petitions and Communications received from October 26, 2023, through November 2, 2023, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on November 7, 2023.

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

From the Office of the Mayor, making a reappointment to the following body. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

Reappointment pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(18) and 4.134.
- Small Business Commission
  - Ronald Benitez - term ending January 6, 2026

From the Department of Human Resources (DHR), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Department of Elections (REG), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Department of Technology (DT), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 2 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Department of Child Support Services (CSS), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 2 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department (JUV), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 2 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the Office of the City Administrator Real Estate Division (ADM - RED), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 3 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the San Francisco Public Library (LIB), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 5 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From the Human Services Agency (HAS), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From the Asian Art Museum (AAM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From the San Francisco War Memorial and Performing Arts Center (WAR), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (RNT), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From the Fire Department (FIR), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 3 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From the Department of Public Works (DPW), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 2 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From the Department of Emergency Management (DEM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting a 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From the Recreation and Park Department (REC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 5 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From the San Francisco International Airport (AIR), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Report. 3 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From the Port of San Francisco (PRT), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), submitting 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports. 2 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), Ben Rosenfield, submitting notice of resignation as Controller, effective February 2024. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, regarding the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) waitlist. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector (TTX), pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Pooled Investment Report for September 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Resolution No. 95-23, submitting a report on quarterly actual California Independent System Operator (CAISO) charges compared with projections and remaining contract expenditures. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-92, submitting the Annual Report on the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credit Sales Fund. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 8 Contracts Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, regarding a notice of proposal for emergency regulations regarding the White Sturgeon Fishery. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Charter Amendment (Third Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to define “Full-Duty Sworn Officers” for purposes of establishing minimum staffing levels for sworn officers of the Police Department. File No. 230985. 176 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From members of the public, regarding proposed Ordinances amending the Planning Code to encourage housing production. File Nos. 230446 and 231142. 29 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From Teamsters Local Union No. 665, regarding a proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require Conditional Use authorization for converting Private Parking

Lots or Vehicle Storage Lots to Fleet Charging in all Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) Districts. File No. 231080. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From Wynship Hillier, regarding a proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to reduce the membership of the Behavioral Health Commission from 17 to 11 seats. File No. 231076. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Charter Amendment (First Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to provide that the Mayor must affirmatively approve in writing certain San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) proposals as part of the SFMTA's proposed budget or budget amendment. File No. 230986. 22 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From Dave Warner, regarding 2045 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Regional Water System (RWS) demand. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From Norma Yee, regarding San Francisco Rent Board fees. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to clarify the Controller's audit and monitoring responsibilities with respect to nonprofit organizations contracting with the City. File No. 230973. 6 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (38)

From members of the public, regarding a Resolution urging the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) to develop and implement a plan for No Turn On Red (NTOR) at every signalized intersection in San Francisco and approve a citywide NTOR policy. File No. 231016, Resolution No. 481-23. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From the San Francisco Gray Panthers, regarding a proposed Resolution urging the Mayor and City agencies to inform residents and vulnerable communities of security, transportation, and service impacts from Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) activities; to prioritize City funding towards mitigation of impacts on neighborhoods, small businesses, and vulnerable communities; and to protect people's rights to freedom of speech and uphold City Sanctuary policies. File No. 231086. Copy: Each Supervisor. (40)

From members the public, regarding algal bloom in the San Francisco Bay. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (41)

From members of the public, regarding homelessness. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (42)

From Monica D., regarding various topics. 10 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (43)

From members of the public, regarding quality-of-life concerns. Copy: Each Supervisor. (44)

From Joe Kunzler, regarding a Motion amending the Board of Supervisors' Rules of Order by revising Rule 1.3.3 (In-Person and Remote Public Comment) to discontinue remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. File No. 231020, Motion No. M23-129. Copy: Each Supervisor. (45)

Item 1

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Sent: Friday, November 3, 2023 2:20 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Entezari, Mehran (BOS) <mehran.entezari@sfgov.org>; Mainardi, Jesse (MYR) <jesse.mainardi@sfgov.org>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <tom.paulino@sfgov.org>
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointment 3.100(18) - SBC

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached, correct appointment memo. Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instructions.

Thank you,

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

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records*

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

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: November 3, 2023

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Appointment - Small Business Commission

On October 30, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(18) and 4.134. This appointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (November 29, 2023).

Appointment to the Small Business Commission:

- Ronald Benitez - term ending January 6, 2026

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

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

If you wish to hold a hearing on this appointment, please let me know in writing by noon on Monday, November 8, 2023. Once we receive notice, we will work with the Rules Chair to schedule the hearing.

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

October 30, 2023

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Sections 3.100(18) and 4.134, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment:

Ronald Benitez to the Small Business Commission, for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending January 6, 2026. This seat was formerly held by Patricia Gregory, who resigned.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Boards and Commissions, Jesse Mainardi, at 415.554.6588.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: 2023 - DHR Annual Surveillance Report
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:17:00 PM
Attachments:	DHR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf image001.png Cover Letter - DHR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the Department of Human Resources' (DHR) Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report for 2023, submitted pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a).

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Ybanez, Grace (HRD) <grace.ybanez@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:31 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chrusciel, Julia (ADM) <julia.chrusciel@sfgov.org>; Cotter, Mike (HRD) <Mike.Cotter@sfgov.org>; Howard, Kate (HRD) <kate.howard@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2023 - DHR Annual Surveillance Report

Members of the Board of Supervisors and Madame Clerk,

In pursuant to Administrative Code sec. 19B.6(a), attached is our DHR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023. In addition, we have included a cover letter providing an explanation on what is being submitted and whether changes to our existing policy have been made.

Please let me know if there are any questions and/or concerns.

Grace Enriquez-Ybañez
IT Manager/DISO
Department of Human Resources

Connecting People with Purpose

One South Van Ness Ave., 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 557-4956
Website: www.sfdhr.org

November 1, 2023

Board of Supervisors,

In pursuant to the Administrative Code sec. 19B.6(a), DHR has completed the annual Surveillance Technology Policy review. At the time of completion, there are no identified changes to our existing policy.

DHR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

n/a

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

the purpose of the cameras is to provide extra security to our secured entrances.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

1

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

n/a

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 3

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Department of Elections 2023 Annual Surveillance Report
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:27:50 AM
Attachments:	Dept of Elections Annual Surveilance Report.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 19B.6(a), please see attached for the Department of Elections' 2023 Annual Surveillance Report.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
John Arntz, Director

Memorandum

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: John Arntz, Director

Date: October 31, 2023

RE: Annual Surveillance Report

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Board of Supervisors with the Department of Elections' Annual Surveillance Report as required under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 198.6(a).

A hard copy of the report is attached.

The report can also be viewed on the City's website: **https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-10/REG%20Nest%20Camera%20Annual%20Surveillance%20Report%202023.pdf**

Please let me know if I need to provide more information or if there are questions.

CC: Julia Chrusciel, Privacy Analyst, Committee on Information Technology

Attachment: Department of Elections' Annual Surveillance Report

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2023 OCT 31 AM 9:23
BY

REG Nest Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Google

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

0.01

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

—

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.30 Why have the one-time costs changed?

We do not plan to purchase new cameras at this time.

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

We no longer pay for the subscription to retain recordings. Cameras do not record, just live stream.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: The Department of Public Health"s Annual Surveillance Report for 2023
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:46:00 PM
Attachments:	DPH Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached DPH's Annual Surveillance Reports.

Regards,

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

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

From: Upchurch, Marc (DPH) <marc.upchurch@sfdph.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:35 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Raffin, Eric (DPH) <eric.raffin@sfdph.org>; Chrusciel, Julia (ADM) <julia.chrusciel@sfgov.org>; Price, Basil (DPH) <basil.price@sfdph.org>
Subject: The Department of Public Health's Annual Surveillance Report for 2023

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am submitting The Department of Public Health's Annual Surveillance Reports, which are being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a).
Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the reports.

Thank you,

Marc Upchurch

Marc Upchurch, MBA
Chief Information Security Officer
City and County of San Francisco ◆ Department of Public Health
1380 Howard Street, SF, CA 94103
Tel: (415) 255-3596
Cell: (415) 939-3134

This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the PHI contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

DPH Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Convergent/Lenel, Comtel Systems Tech (Maintenance Contract, technical support), and Johnson Controls

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The DPH functional requirements are clearly documented. Operational reports are reviewed regularly for operational process adjustment and refinement.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

The Police Department, District Attorney's Office, and the Public Defender's Office. The data involved was CC TV video. The video was released in order to initiate law enforcement action due to criminal nature of the actions and necessity of prosecutorial evidence provided by the video.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.

Password management and device inventory issues were identified and remediated. Our password policies and procedures were reviewed, revised and re-implemented. Strict enforcement was initiated.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.

If an audit finding is a violation, there was a password violation and an inventory violation. All generic admin passwords were reset. Missing device inventory information was obtained and verified.

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

Twelve including the Director.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$1,946,563

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$836,000

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

$3,690,575

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$354950

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

City and County of San Francisco General Fund.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 5

From: Roberts, Brian (TIS)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Makstman, Michael (TIS); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Subject: DT Annual Surveillance Technology Report 2023
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 8:38:55 AM
Attachments: image001.png
DT Annual Surveillance Report Cvr Ltr 2023.pdf
DT Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
DT Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Dear Clerk of the Board Calvillo, with this e-mail, the Dept. of Technology is submitting its 2023 Annual Surveillance Technology Reports for Drones and Security Cameras. Please see attached.

Sincerely,
Brian

SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
TECHNOLOGY

Brian Roberts
Policy Analyst
1 South Van Ness Ave., 2nd Floor

www.sfgov.org/dt
Past President, National Assoc. of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA)

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

Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
Linda J. Gerull, CIO & Executive Director,
Department of Technology

Via E-Mail Attachment

October 31, 2023

Re: Department of Technology 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports pursuant to Administrative Code Section 19B6(a)

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Dear Clerk of the Board Calvillo:

Attached please find two Annual Surveillance Reports submitted by the department pursuant to Administrative Code Section 19B6(a). The two reports address the following technologies:

- Unmanned Aircraft Systems (Drones)
- Security Cameras

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

/s/ Brian Roberts

Brian Roberts
Policy Analyst

Cc: Michael Makstman, Chief Information Security Officer

DT Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

N/A

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Partially

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

We are in the process of procuring our first drone, so the effectiveness has not yet been tested or proven.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).
0.1

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?
Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?
No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?
No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?
Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.
$6000.00

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?
No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?
No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?
No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:
Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?
Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:
$12,500

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?
No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?
No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?
No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?
No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?
No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?
PEG Capital Funds

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
Yes

14.30 Why have the one-time costs changed?
Inflation.

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
No

DT Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your “approved use cases” in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of “authorized job titles” in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list “N/A” if not applicable): *

N/A

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The security cameras have allowed for the efficient monitoring of DT's facilities, primarily the radio sites for the City's public safety radio system. The security cameras are intended to discourage people from breaking into, sabotage vandalizing or otherwise damaging facilities. The security cameras are also intended to identify suspect

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

0.5

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$116000.

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

$11,000

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Department's operating budget.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

Salary increases/inflation

From: Beckett, Caroline (CSS)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Miralda, Jennifer (CSS)
Subject: CSS Annual Surveillance Report
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 4:25:18 PM
Attachments: CSS Annual Surveillance Report to BOS 10 30 2023.pdf
CSS Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am submitting Child Support Services' (CSS) Annual Surveillance Report, which is being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a).

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the report.

Thank you,
Carol

Carol Beckett
Assistant Director
San Francisco Department of Child Support Services
617 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
Desk: 415-356-2929; Cell 510-589-3595
caroline.beckett@sfgov.org
Pronouns: She, her, hers

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. For more information, please visit our website at www.childsupport.ca.gov or you may also contact us Monday- Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm at 1-866-901-3212.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
617 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3503 Tel. (415) 356-2700
Child Support Automated Information System 1-866-901-3212

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

KAREN M. ROYE
DIRECTOR

October 30, 2023

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlet Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am submitting Child Support Services' (CSS) Annual Surveillance Report, which is being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a).

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the report.

Thank you,

Carol Beckett
Deputy Director, CSS

Cc: Board of Supervisors;
Julia Chrusciel, COIT Privacy Analyst

CSS Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Sonitrol Security Services, Guardsmark Security via work order agreement with the Human Services Agency.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The technology continues to monitor the security of employees, the property and child support case and participant data.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

60

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$138,788

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$6,000

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Federal and state grant.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 7

From:	Higgins, Amanda M
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Gale, Josh (PUC); Harp, Jeff (PUC); Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer (PUC); Spitz, Jeremy (PUC)
Subject:	SFPUC Surveillance Technology Report
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 2:30:45 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png 2023 SFPUC Annual Surveillance Reports.pdf

---

Dear Madam Clerk,

In accordance with SF Administrative Code Sec. 19B.6(a), the SFPUC is submitting to the Board of Supervisors the attached Annual Surveillance Reports for security cameras and drones, the two surveillance technologies used by the SFPUC.

Sincerely,

Amanda Higgins
Pr. Administrative Analyst
Emergency Planning & Security
Cell: 415-816-7219
sfpuc.org

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

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

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 31, 2023

TO: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Amanda Higgins
SFPUC Emergency Planning & Security
Principal Administrative Analyst

Amanda Higgins

SUBJECT: SFPUC Annual Surveillance Reports - Security Cameras and Drones

---

Dear Madam Clerk,

In accordance with SF Administrative Code Sec. 19B.6(a), the SFPUC is submitting to the Board of Supervisors Annual Surveillance Reports for security cameras and drones, the two surveillance technologies used by the SFPUC.

The Board of Supervisors approved the Surveillance Technology Policies for both technologies in 2021. Please contact me at amhiggins@sfwater.org should you have any questions.

cc: Julia Chrusciel, COIT Privacy Analyst

London N. Breed
Mayor

Tim Paulson
President

Anthony Rivera
Vice President

Newsha K. Ajami
Commissioner

Sophie Maxwell
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

PUC Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

SFPUC Emergency Planning & Security Staff: 0931 Director of Security, 0932 Emergency Planning Director, 1844 Senior Management Assistant, 1824 Pr. Admin Analyst, 1054 Principal IS Business Analyst; SFPUC Headquarters: 0922 Building Manager, 8304 Deputy Sheriff; 8300 Sheriff Cadet; Southeast Community Facility: A-1 Security Guards (contractor); 0923 Southeast Community Facility Manager, 7334 Stationary Engineer; Information Technology Services: 1044 IS Engineer Principal; Water Supply & Treatment: 5149 Superintendent of Water Treatment Facilities, 1844 Senior Management Assistant, 0933 Maintenance Manager, 7343 Sr. Stationary Engineer; City Distribution Division: 7120 Buildings and Grounds Supt, 7334 Stationary Engineer, 0933 Programs and Maintenance Manager, 7341 Stationary Engineer; Hetch Hetchy: 5601 Personnel and Training Analyst, Contractor, 5602 Personnel & Training manager, 5602 Utility Specialist

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

These personnel are responsible for the safety and security of SFPUC facilities.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?

Broken cameras are replaced with new cameras as-needed

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).

The cameras SFPUC uses are manufactured by Axis Communications, of various models such as P3375-V D/N fixed Dome Camera, Q6074-E Network Dome Camera, T91L61 Wall and Pole Mount Canera

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).

Cameras are replaced in-kind.

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.

About 35 non-functioning cameras were replaced in the last year

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

SFPUC recently awarded Contract PUC-0002, "Master As-Needed Security Camera & Integration Services" to 6 vendors: Johnson Controls, Inc., Netronix Integration, Ojo Technology Inc., RFI Enterprises, Inc., Siemens Industry, Inc., DBA Allied Universal Technology Services. This contract began October 2023 and has a five-year term and $10 million capacity. These six vendors will be performing security camera maintenance, integration, and repair for the SFPUC. Additionally, SFPUC cameras run on software Milestone XProtect.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Camera footage is critical to resolving incidents related to safety and security. Footage is shared with law enforcement. SFPUC maintains an internal security incident log to capture incidents such as assault, theft, threats, vandalism, and trespassing. In 2022, there 216 incidents. From January to October 2023, there were 194 incidents.

For example, footage from cameras is critical to ensure the safety of the SFPUC Southeast Community Center (SECC) Facility. In 2023, footage from SECC cameras was provided to law enforcement after an individual with a weapon made threats to the facility. This footage ultimately enabled the SFPUC to get a restraining order against the individual.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

Footage is only shared to law enforcement as requested in relation to an SFPUC safety incident/threat. This includes law enforcement in all counties where our SFPUC facilities are located - San Mateo, San Francisco, Alameda, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Santa Clara.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.

SFPUC is constantly performing audits to assess the functionality of our SFPUC security system to see if cameras need to be repaired or replaced

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.

No violations were revealed from the audits.

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

Two Emergency Planning & Security personnel are primarily responsible for the security camera system - the 0931 Director of Security and 1054 Principal IS Business Analyst. Both spend about 20 hours a week on the camera system.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

About $180K

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

It costs $42,050 to renew the Milestone software annually. This includes renewal of two servers and end user support.

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

SFPUC spends about $30K each year to purchase replacement cameras

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

SFPUC contracts with Milestone Value Added Resllers to install cameras and integrate them to the Milestone software that SFPUC uses to view footage. We expect to replace/install at least 30 cameras in FY23-24. It costs about $700 to install and integrate a camera, so we expect to spend about $21,000 on professional services in FY23-24

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

SFPUC operating budget

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

Both labor and software costs have increased. The Director of Security and Principal IS Business Analyst both spend about 20 hours a week working on the camera security system, more than the hours previously listed on the Impact Report. Since the Impact Report was approved, SFPUC has added additional cameras to our system as new facilities were added to the SFPUC portfolio. The increased quantity of cameras in our security system has also led our software costs to increase.

PUC Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your “approved use cases” in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of “authorized job titles” in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

SFPUC Infrastructure: 1770 Photographer, 1774 Head Photographer; Water Supply and Treatment Division: 5312 Survey Assistant II, 5314 Survey Associate, and 5216 Chief Surveyor; Water Natural Resources: 2483 Biologist; Water Infrastructure: 5207 Associate Engineer; Wastewater Engineering/Project Management: 5241 Engineer, 5203 Assistant Engineer, 5211 Senior Engineer, 5212 Principal Engineer, 5508 Project Manager IV, 5201 Jr. Engineer, 5130 Sewage Treatment Plant Superintendent, 0943 Manager VIII, 1824 Principal Admin Analyst, 7252 Chief Stationary Engineer, Sewage Plant, 0942 Manager VII, 5506 Project Manager III, 0933 Manager V, 1844 Senior Management Assistant, 6319 Senior Construction Inspector, 0955 Deputy Director V, 0941 Manager VI, 0932 Manager IV, 1446 Secretary II

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

The 1774 Head Photographer and 1770 Photographer in SFPUC's Infrastructure Division use drones to create records of documentation for infrastructure capital projects. The Survey Staff in SFPUC's Water Supply and Treatment Division use drones to support various projects regarding land detection change and imagery capture throughout PUC properties. The Water Natural Resources Biologist was overseeing a project in which a contractor used a drone to collect rare plant population data in an SFPUC watershed. The Water Infrastructure 5207 Associate Engineer was overseeing a project in which a consultant used a drone to collect data documenting the left abutment hillside geologic mapping of the Turner Dam. The remaining job titles in Wastewater Engineering/Project Management had access to data collected by contractors working on project WW-647R "Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant Biosolids Digester Facilities" and WW-628 "Southeast Plant New Headworks Facility Project ". Drone images and video help the WasteWater project teams track project progress.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

Yes

5.2 Why has the technology been added?

Additional units were purchased to comply with the March 16, 2024 FAA requirement that all operators of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) must comply with its new Remote ID rules. Old drone did not have Remote ID capability. Additionally, drones were purchased to survey SFPUC-owned watersheds to detect land detection changes. These survey drones are flown exclusively in the watersheds with no operations near any private or public right-of way.

5.3 Please list technology which was added (include manufacturer and model information.

The SFPUC currently owns five drones - two drones in SFPUC Infrastructure flown by SFPUC Photographers: DJI Phantom 4 Pro and a DJI Mavic 3 Pro. Three drones are owned by the SFPUC Water Supply and Treatment Survey Section: 2 Mavic Pros and 1 M300.

5.4 Please list how many units have been added.

4 units added since the last report.

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

The following SFPUC contractors have operated non-SFPUC owned drones for various SFPUC projects: Sundt, Minilab Factory USA/SF Drone School for project WW-628 "Southeast Plant New Headworks Facility Project"; Multivista and WCG (Webcor Concrete Group) operated drones for SFPUC project WW-647R Biosolids Digester Facilities Project; AECOM operated a drone for a Turner Dam Improvements Project; AECOM operated a drone over an SFPUC watershed to monitor rare plants to fulfill California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife permit requirements.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The SFPUC has logged 350 flights since January 2022, of which 215 were for construction management, 107 were for environmental monitoring and documentation, 7 for disaster relief, and 21 for inspections and surveys.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

The following SFPUC contractors working on SFPUC projects operated drones to help them fulfill their deliverables: 1) AECOM worked on contract PRO-138C Task Order 30 Turner Dam Improvements project. The ortho images from the drone flight were included in the deliverables documenting the left abutment hillside geologic mapping memo.
2) AECOM used a drone to collect RGB imagery to enumerate rare plant population within 200ft radius of (37.513562N, -122.350276E), 8494-8604 Skyline Blvd, Redwood City, CA, 94062. The project was rare plant monitoring to fulfill California Department of Fish and Wildlife permit requirements.
3) Sundt, contractor for WW-628 Southeast Plant New Headworks Facility Project, as well as Minilab Factory USA/ SF Drone School operated drones to collect images and video to show site progress at Southeast Plant
4) Contractor and subcontractors for WW-647R Biosolids Digester Facilities Project operated drones and viewed drone footage. These contractors and subcontractors are: MWH Constructors/Webcor Builders, Malcolm Drilling Co., WCG (Webcor Concrete Group), Multivista, Jacobs, Brown and Caldwell, ENGEO, Structus, Black and Veatch, HCLA, SRT Consultants), CM Consultants (Arcadis, ECS, Thier Group, Parsons, RDH Building Science, DCMS), HDR, Subcontractors (DN Tanks, Sachs Electric, VMA Communications, Malcolm Drilling, Smartvid, Monterey Mechanical, Terra Engineers), Russell Clough, Jim Foley, Bill Nugteren

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

As noted above, SFPUC contractors working on SFPUC projects operated drones to fulfill project deliverables

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.

SFPUC requires SFPUC personnelto document planned drone flights from both contractors and SFPUC employees using a Flight Summary form that is routed to SFPUC Emergency Planning & Security (EPS). EPS ensures that the planned flight is in compliance with the SFPUC Drone Policy and then uploads the flight information into the COIT SharePoint Portal. Since EPS reviews flight information for Policy compliance before a flight occurs, there are no policy violations.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.

n/a

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

It takes the 0931 Emergency Planning Director and 1824 EPS Pr. Admin Analyst about 2 hours a week collectively to review flights and upload into the COIT Portal. The Infrastructure Photographers operate drones on an as-needed basis throughout the year. For, the WST Surveyors, it is approximately 5% of a FTE.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

Yes

14.6 List total one-time Software costs for FY 2023-2024.

The WST Surveyors purchased a $6k photogrammetry add-on to Trimble Business Center that we are testing this year, but no decision has been made to make this an annual cost.

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$7,644 for one-year of flights to document construction progress at SFPUC Southeast Treatment Plant (750 Phelps St) by vendor Minilab Factory LLC/SF Drone School. This expense may occur annually until completion of capital projects at location

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

Yes

14.27 List total annual "Other" costs for FY 2023-2024:

It costs $175 per license to renew the FAA licenses for pilots

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

SFPUC Operating budget

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.30 Why have the one-time costs changed?

The Impact Report lists professional services and software as $0. As noted above, the WST Surveyors purchased a $6k photogrammetry add-on to Trimble Business Center that we are testing this year, but no decision has been made to make this an annual cost.

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 8

From: Miller, Bryn (HOM)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Schneider, Dylan (HOM)
Subject: 2023 HSH Surveillance Technology Report
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 4:21:07 PM
Attachments: HSH Surveillance Report with Cover Letter - 2023.pdf

---

Hello Clerk's Office –

Happy Halloween!

Attached is HSH's 2023 Surveillance Report.

Thanks,

Bryn Miller (she/her)
Senior Legislative Analyst
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
bryn.miller@sfgov.org

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: @SF_HSH | Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

London Breed, Mayor

November 1, 2023

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

Re: Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing - Annual Surveillance Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 19B.6(a), which requires all city departments to submit annual surveillance technology reports, I am submitting the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing's 2023 report.

If you have any questions, please contact HSH Manager of Legislative Affairs Dylan Schneider at dylan.schneider@sfgov.org.

Respectfully,

Emily Cohen

Emily Cohen (she/her)
Deputy Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

HOM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Microbiz Security Company 444 Jessie Street San Francisco, CA 94103 415-777-1151 service@mbiz.com

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Our security camera has been effective in providing security for the safety of our shelter clients. As an extension to our shelter security staff, it has also been effective in helping us providing service while keeping cost manageable.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
Data is shared with the Police Department. It is shared in an event of a crime for evidence purposes.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
Data is shared with the CBO's. This is shared for crime or violence purposes.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.
HSH Facilities team audited the sites and checked DVR login for abnormality.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.
No violation

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

4 existing employees Total expected staff hours (all): 15 hrs/mo

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.10 List total one-time Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$510.00

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Security camera and DVR rarely break down. When they do, HSH uses general fund to address small break-fix. Alternatively, if the camera and DVR were procured as part of the provider contract, then break fix cost will be part of said contract.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

From:	Baeza, Elisa (JUV)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); McKee, Maria (JUV); Martinez, Veronica (JUV); Miller, Katherine (JUV); Cowan, Sheryl (JUV)
Subject:	Annual Surveillance Reports & Memo, 2023 - JUV
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 4:24:57 PM
Attachments:	JUV Continuous Alcohol Monitoring Device Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf JUV Electronic Monitoring Ankle Bracelet (GPS) Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf Memo_ClerkBOS_JUV 2023.pdf

Hello,

Enclosed are JUV's completed 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports for the following surveillance technologies: Continuous Alcohol Monitoring and Electronic Monitoring devices.

Should you require more information or have questions about the content of these reports, please contact Elisa Baeza at elisa.baeza@sfgov.org or Verónica Martínez at veronica.martinez@sfgov.org.

Thank you.

Elisa

Elisa Baeza, MPP (she/her/ella)
Senior Administrative Analyst
Finance & Administrative Services
San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Katherine Weinstein Miller
Chief Probation Officer

Elisa Baeza
Senior Contractrs & Policy Analyst
DIRECT DIAL: (415) 753 - 7595
EMAIL: elisa.baeza@sfgov.org

October 31, 2023

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Elisa Baeza, Senior Contracts & Policy Analyst, through Verónica Martínez, Deputy Direction of Administrative Services
Re: 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports – Juvenile Probation Department (JUV)

Enclosed are JUV's completed 2023 Annual Surveillance Reports for the following surveillance technologies: Continuous Alcohol Monitoring and Electronic Monitoring devices.

Should you require more information or have questions about the content of these reports, please contact Elisa Baeza at elisa.baeza@sfgov.org or Verónica Martínez at veronica.martinez@sfgov.org.

Cc:
Katherine Weinstein, Chief Probation Officer
Maria McKee, Director of Research & Planning
Julia Chrushiel, COIT Privacy Analyst
Board of Supervisors

JUV Continuous Alcohol Monitoring Device Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

The following FTEs participte in the implementation of the alcohol monitoring program: - 24 Class 8444/8530 Deputy Probation Officers - 5 Class 8434 Supervising Probation Officers, - 1 Senior Supervising Probation Officer - 1 Director of Probation Services - 1 Chief Probation Officer - 1 Assistant Chief Probation Officer

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

The number of Deputy Probation Officers changed to reflect a more accurent count of staff (e.g., due to new hires, etc.). Classification 8530 and the Assitant CPO should have been listed initially and so they are now being added here.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?

BI Incorporated - JUV's new equipment lessor - was selected in the Fall of 2022, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 21.16 (c) through RfQ#APD2022-01 (Adult Probation Department), issued 03/23/2022 and reissued 03/31/2022. JUV's BI Incorporated equipment lease agreement start date is 11/01/2022.

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).

SCRAM CAM bracelet (continuous alcohol monitoring); SCRAM GPS (electronic monitoring); SCRAM Base Station.

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).

BI Incorporated's alcohol monitoring devices are as follows: -SL2 & SL3 Remote Breathe Alcohol Monitor; -TAD Transdermal Alcohol Detector (landline w/ radio frequency); -TAD Transdermal Alcohol Detector (cellular w/ radio frequency); -BI Mobile Device w/ SmartLINK Verify.

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.

All prior SCRAM devices are now replaced with BI Incorporated devices including alcohol monitoring devices.

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

BI Incorporated, which leases the equipment to JUV.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The technology has served its intended purpose in an effective matter to fulfill the following court mandated requirements: Youth are only placed on continuous alcohol monitoring (CAM) in San Francisco with a court order. The Court may order a youth to be placed on CAM as a condition of probation, if the Court determines that is in the interest of public safety and the youth's well being. Continuous alcohol monitoring data is analyzed on a daily basis by probation officers to ensure compliance with the Court's order.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

As noted in JUV's policy, data regarding individual youth may be shared with the Superior Court, Police Department, District Attorney, other Law Enforcement agencies, and/or Public Defender/Defense counsel, on a case-by-case basis, on a need-to-know basis; pursuant to an ongoing investigation and/or court proceeding/ court order. This could include law enforcement agencies from other jurisdictions outside of the City. Information shared includes monitoring outcomes (e.g., alcohol detected or none detected); young person's full name and PIN.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.
JUV conducts regularly conducts inventory checks for the leased equipment, and holds periodic meetings with the lessor to ensure full compliance with the program.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.
N/A

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
Yes

13.2 How many public records requests have been made regarding this surveillance technology?
JUV received 3 records requests regarding the surveillance technology within the last year.

13.3 Please summarize what has been requested via public records requests, including the general type of information requested and disclosed, as well as the number or requests for each general type of information.
Request 1: Information about young people enrolled in the electronic monitoring program. Request 2: BI Incorporated agreement copy and recent invoices. Request 3: Communications between JUV and SCRAM (prior contractor) about the application of continuous alcohol monitors on juveniles since May 1, 2022.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

The following FTEs participte in the implementation of the alcohol monitoring program: - 24 Class 8444/8530 Deputy Probation Officers - 5 Class 8434 Supervising Probation Officers, - 1 Senior Supervising Probation Officer - 1 Director of Probation Services - 1 Chief Probation Officer - 1 Assistant Chief Probation Officer"

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

Actual costs between July 2023 and September 2023 were $21,84,46. This includes costs to lease equipment and replace lost or damaged units (for alcohol monitoring and EM combined). Using the monthly average, JUV estimates that its equipment leasing/replacement costs for FY23-24 would be about $87,400.

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General Funds

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.30 Why have the one-time costs changed?

As mentioned, JUV executed a new equipment lease agreement with a new vendor: BI Incorporated. This updated the total annual costs due to pricing differences.

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

As mentioned, JUV executed a new equipment lease agreement with a new vendor: BI Incorporated. This updated the total annual costs due to pricing differences.

JUV Electronic Monitoring Ankle Bracelet (GPS) Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

The following FTEs participate in the implementation of the electronic monitoring program: - 24 Class 8444/8530 Deputy Probation Officers - 5 Class 8434 Supervising Probation Officers, - 1 Senior Supervising Probation Officer - 1 Director of Probation Services - 1 Chief Probation Officer - 1 Assistant Chief Probation Officer

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

The number of Deputy Probation Officers changed to reflect a more accurent count of staff (e.g., due to new hires, etc.). Classification 8530 and the Assitant CPO should have been listed initially and so they are now being added here.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?

Yes - JUV is now using equipment by BI Incorporated, its new equipment lessor. BI Incoporated was selected in the Fall of 2022, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 21.16 (c) through RfQ#APD2022-01 (Adult Probation Department), issued 03/23/2022 and reissued 03/31/2022. JUV's BI Incorporated equipment lease agreement has a start date of 11/01/2022.

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).

SCRAM GPS (electronic monitoring); SCRAM Base Station.

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).

BI Incorporated's electronic monitoring devices are as follows: LOC8 XT GPS Tracker; HomeGuard 200 landline; HomeGuard 206 & 20|20 cellular; BI Mobile Device w/ SmartLINK Verify

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.

All prior SCRAM devices are now replaced with BI Incorporated devices including electronic monitoring devices.

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

BI Incorporated, which leases the equipment to JUV.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The technology has served its intended purpose in an effective matter to fulfill the following court mandated requirements: Youth are only placed on electronic monitoring in San Francisco with a court order. The Court may order a youth to be placed on electronic monitoring as an alternative to detention:

- Court ordered curfews
- Inclusion zones: addresses/areas where the minor has approval to be present, for example their home, school, work.
- Exclusion zones: addresses/areas where the minor should not be present, including Stay Away orders
- Schedules: To monitor school attendance, program participation, work.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

As noted in JUV's policy, data regarding individual youth may be shared with the Superior Court, Police Department, District Attorney, other Law Enforcement agencies, and/or Public Defender/Defense counsel, on a case-by-case basis, on a need-to-know basis; pursuant to an ongoing investigation and/or court proceeding/ court order. This could include law enforcement agencies from other jurisdictions outside of the City.

Information shared includes GPS monitoring violations and outcomes; young person's full name and PIN.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

As noted in our policy, data regarding individual youth may be shared with the Superior Court, Police Department, District Attorney, other Law Enforcement agencies, and/or Public Defender/Defense counsel, on a case-by-case basis, on a need-to-know basis; pursuant to an ongoing investigation and/or court proceeding/ court order. This could include law enforcement agencies from other jurisdictions outside of the City.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.

JUV conducts regularly conducts inventory checks for the leased equipment, and holds periodic meetings with the lessor, and internally among authorized staff, to ensure full compliance with the program and policies.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.

N/A

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

Yes

13.2 How many public records requests have been made regarding this surveillance technology?

JUV received 3 records requests regarding the surveillance technology within the last year.

13.3 Please summarize what has been requested via public records requests, including the general type of information requested and disclosed, as well as the number or requests for each general type of information.

Request 1: Information about young people enrolled in the electronic monitoring program. Request 2: BI Incorporated agreement copy and recent invoices. Request 3: Communications between JUV and SCRAM (prior contractor) about the application of continuous alcohol monitors on juveniles since May 1, 2022.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

The following FTEs participte in the implementation of the electronic monitoring program: - 24 Class 8444/8530 Deputy Probation Officers - 5 Class 8434 Supervising Probation Officers, - 1 Senior Supervising Probation Officer - 1 Director of Probation Services - 1 Chief Probation Officer - 1 Assistant Chief Probation Officer.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

Actual costs between July 2023 and September 2023 were $21,84,46. This includes costs to lease equipment and replace lost or damaged units (for alcohol monitoring and EM combined). Using the monthly average, JUV estimates that its equipment leasing/replacement costs for FY23-24 would be about $87,400.

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General Funds

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.30 Why have the one-time costs changed?

As mentioned, JUV executed a new equipment lease agreement with a new vendor: BI Incorporated. This updated the total annual costs due to pricing differences.

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

As mentioned, JUV executed a new equipment lease agreement with a new vendor: BI Incorporated. This updated the total annual costs due to pricing differences.

Item 10

From:	Chin, Susanna (ADM)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Cc:	Penick, Andrico; Legg, Douglas (ADM); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Subject:	2023 Annual Surveillance Policy Report - Real Estate Division
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:10:08 AM
Attachments:	Letter Clerk BOS Surveillance_cjq11.01.23.pdf ADM-RED Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Dear Madam Clerk,

Please find the attached for your review.

Thank you,

Susy Chin (*She/Her/Hers*)
Executive Secretary
Real Estate Division, City & County of San Francisco
25 Van Ness Ave, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: 415 554 9850 (*main*) | 415-554-9870 (*direct*)
susanna.chin@sfgov.org
**in office Mon-Wed*

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

Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
Andrico Q. Penick, Director of Real Estate

November 1, 2023

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
angela.calvillo@sfgov.org

RE: Annual Surveillance Policy Report: Real Estate Division - City and County of San Francisco

Dear Madam Clerk:

Attached, pursuant to Administrative Code sec.19B.6(a), please find the Annual Surveillance Report from the City of San Francisco Real Estate Division of the Office of the City Administrator.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me or Rohan Lane of our office at 415-554-9850.

Respectfully,

Claudia J. Gorham
Deputy Managing Director

cc: Board of Supervisors (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)
Julia Chrusciel (COIT) (julia.chrusciel@sfgov.org)

ADM-RED Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your “approved use cases” in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of “authorized job titles” in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?

Equipment failure

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).

Pelco spectra 3

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).

Avigilon H4A

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.

2

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

Yes

5.2 Why has the technology been added?

Additional cameras to augment existing facility coverage

5.3 Please list technology which was added (include manufacturer and model information.

Avigilon H4A fisheye, Arecont 360 multisensor

5.4 Please list how many units have been added.

1 of each.

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Paganini Corp. Replace old coax cable pull new camera cables. Microbiz Corp - replace old coax cable, pull new replacement cameras, mount replacement cameras.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Technology has been utilized to assist staff to efficiently view and assess remote locations. Technology has helped security response to incidents, and has aided law enforcement in the prevention and prosecution of criminal acts against City facilities, City personnel, City residents and visitors.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) video footage, ongoing criminal investigations .
San Francisco Sheriff's Department (SFSD) video footage, ongoing criminal investigations and exigent operational circumstances.
Real Estate Division, video footage, property damage
Animal Care and Control, video footage, property damage.
San Francisco Office of the City Attorney, video footage, ongoing litigation.
California Highway Patrol, (CHP) video footage, ongoing criminal investigations .
SFMTA, video footage, property damage.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

California Highway Patrol. Traffic incident and assault, that occurred adjacent to City Facility, that CHP responded to. Law enforcement investigation with assigned case #.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

(1) 0922 Media Security Systems and Facilities Manager (1) 1781 Media Security Systems Manager (4) 1777 Media Security Systems Specialist. * NOTE: all FTE but have multiple daily responsibilities not related to security systems. ** NOTE: (2 additional) 1777 as needed positions with multiple daily responsibilities not related to security systems/security tasks.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

1777 salary + fringe (4) ($730,060) 1781 salary + fringe ($205,989) 0922 Salary + fringe ($223,661) 1781 Standby pay off-hours 24/7 response to critical systems ($21,174) TOTAL ($ 1,180.884)

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

Individual camera software license costs $(23,000) for 2-4 year term. Video management software Support Agreement (2 year term) $24,000 for 2 year term.

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

Replacement of broken or aging cameras $5,000

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$6,000 re-pulling/replacement of outdated wiring.

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Real Estate Division, allocation of departmental funds received from city Administrator's Office, general fund budget

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

From:	Miller, Robert
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Warsi, Sohail (MTA); Cunningham, Sean (MTA); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Subject:	SFMTA Annual Reports for SFMTA Surveillance Security Camera, ALPR, and Taxi Cab Dash Camera.
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:10:34 AM
Attachments:	SFMTA Annual Surveillance Reports Cover Letter.docx MTA Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf MTA Security cameras inside SFMTA-regulated taxi cabs Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf MTA Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

---

Greetings,

Please find the attached documents for the Annual Surveillance Reports for SFMTA Security Camera, Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR), and Taxicab Security Dash Camera.

Regards,

Robert Miller
IS Business Analyst Principal
Technology and Performance Group
SFMTA

Annual Security Video Surveillance Report for SFMTA Security Camera, Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR), and Taxicab Security Dash Camera.

SFMTA

November 1, 2023

Greetings,

Attached are the annual video surveillance reports that are being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code sec. 19B.6(a). Question and concerns may be directed to Sohail Warsi (sohail.warsi@sfmta.com) or Sean Cunningham (sean.cunningham@sfmta.com)

Regards,

Robert Miller (robert.miller@sfmta.com)
IS Business Analyst Principal
Technology and Performance Group
SFMTA

MTA Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

No new companies or entities added.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

1. Helped Parking Control Officer (PCO) cover larger geographic areas and improved effectiveness and efficiency in performance of their duties.
2. Parking garage staff no longer required to work within confined areas in parking garages. Minimized repetitive motion injuries from physical chalking by automating the process for Parking Control Officer (PCOs) to mark vehicles.
3. Improved accuracy and simplified parking enforcement duties. Provided data required to calculate parking fees, especially when patrons lost their parking tickets within City-owned parking garages and lots. Provided data to inform potential new on-street parking and curb policies and regulations. For instance, eliminated physical permits on residential parking.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
SFMTA contractor LAZ Parking and their subcontractor, Dixon Resources Unlimited, were provided with parking occupancy data (i.e., vehicle counts). These entities were not provided with license plate numbers or other personally identifiable information.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
Yes

12.2 How many violations have there been over the last year?
1

12.3 Please describe each violation and document what the department did to respond to violation – in terms of correction, public disclosure, and discipline of involved parties.
Data retention violation occurred due to system observed a vehicle twice and counted as a hit. Vendor incorrectly assumed every hit was a violation.

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.
Digital image associated with a parking citation are retained for 365 days.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.
This was not a violation. Department worked with the vendor and fixed the issue in a timely manner.

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

104x – IT Staff • 109x – Operations Support Admin • 182x – Administrative Analyst • 184x - Management Assistant • 917x - Managers • 5277 – Planner I • 5288 – 5290 Transportation Planners • 8214 – Parking Control Officer(s)

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

Yes

14.6 List total one-time Software costs for FY 2023-2024.

$80,000

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

$1.4 Million

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$130,620

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$120,000

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Operating Budget

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

Additional equipment acquired.

MTA Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

NA

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The technology has made us more efficient through live monitoring and helped us get ahead of security issues on revenue vehicles and SFMTA Facilities. This helps to keep the Transit system safe. It has deterred crime on buses and assaults on employees and customers. Furthermore, technology was utilized to respond to 985 inquiries from the public through 311 as well as 7 sunshine requests and 56 inquires related to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
SFMTA shared security camera video with SFPD, the City Attorney's Office, and SF Sheriff. No legal standard applies; the data was not confidential. These city departments required the data to support criminal and other investigations.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
Yes

13.2 How many public records requests have been made regarding this surveillance technology?
Department received approx. 158 requests in the past year, all requesting video from the vehicles or platforms.

13.3 Please summarize what has been requested via public records requests, including the general type of information requested and disclosed, as well as the number or requests for each general type of information.
The inquiries were predominantly received through Sunshine Ordinance requests, which requested video footage.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

10 – 7318 Electronic Maintenance Tech 1 – 1044 IS Engineer-Principal 3 – 14xx Surveillance Clerks

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$100,000

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

$100,000

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$50,000-$100,000

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

Yes

14.27 List total annual "Other" costs for FY 2023-2024:

$5,000

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

The Department funds its use and maintenance of the surveillance technology through general operations budget and occasional grants.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

MTA Security cameras inside SFMTA-regulated taxi cabs Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Not Applicable

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

1. Technology has helped recording of on-board incidents based upon complaints received from the public and at appeals hearing in response to a fine, suspension or response to fine revocation.
2. Technology as assisted in review of video data in response to complaints from the public to ensure compliance by taxi cab companies and other taxi permittees with requirements and conditions under Article 1100 (Regulation of Motor Vehicles for Hire) of Division II of the SF Transportation Code.
3. The review of video data to confirm taxi cab companies and other taxi permittees complete rides paid for with public funds before paying the companies for those rides. For example, under its wheelchair program taxi incentive, the Department reviews video data from the technology to confirm that taxi cab drivers pick up.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

In the last 12 months video footage data was shared only one time with SFPD by owners' consent (Taxi Company)."

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

0

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

NA

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

From:	Blandon, Jason (LIB)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Singleton, Maureen (LIB); Lambert, Michael (LIB); Goyal, Dolly (LIB)
Subject:	Annual Surveillance Report
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:37:09 AM
Attachments:	LIB Computer Management System Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf LIB RFID Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf LIB Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf LIB Sensource Patron Counter System Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf LIB Social Media Monitoring Software Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

---

To Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

I am submitting Public Library's Annual Surveillance Report(s), which are being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a).
Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the report(s).

Attached are the following reports

- Computer Management System Annual Surveillance Report 2023
- RFID Annual Surveillance Report 2023
- Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023
- Sensource Patron Counter System Annual Surveillance Report 2023
- Social Media Monitoring Software Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Jason Blandón
Acting Chief Information Officer
San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street | San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfpl.org| jason.blandon@sfpl.org

LIB Computer Management System Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

1092 IT Operations Support Admin II (1), 1822 Administrative Analyst (1), 1042 IS Engineer-Journey (4)

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

1042 classification support the servers directly. Unsure why they are not part of the STP. 1092 & 1822 are new hires to the LIB IT Dept.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Library IT, TBS technical & customer support

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Partially

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The Surveillance Technology Policy helped define the usage of Today's Business Solutions (TBS) Computer Time and Print Management in supporting the library's mission and has helped define and limit access to authorized parties. This technology is essential for the operations of public computer and printer management access. In that effect this technology has been effective in maintaining the public service model of providing computer access for patrons and managing time and printing. This is a timeout software that is essential for patrons to use public computers and doesn't store any PII.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

19

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$525,293

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$3,696

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Library Preservation Funds (LPF)

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

LIB RFID Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Library IT Dept, Envisionware, Bibliotecha

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Partially

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The library asserts that using passive low-frequency RFID technology for inventory control is not considered surveillance technology because it doesn't collect or process patron information. Instead, it enhances customer service by expediting self-checkout and circulation tasks, allowing both patrons and staff to handle multiple items simultaneously. Additionally, RFID security gates enhance security and streamline the alarm response process, reducing the need to manually check each item against patron records.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).
550

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?
Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?
No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?
No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?
No

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?
No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?
No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?
No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:
Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?
Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:
$577,476

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?
No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?
No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?
No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?
No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?
Yes

14.27 List total annual "Other" costs for FY 2023-2024:
$20,000

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?
Library Preservation Fund (LPF)

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
No

LIB Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Johnson Control (JCI), DTIS, SFPL IT

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The purpose of library security cameras is to ensure public safety, enforce patron code of conduct, protect library resources. These cameras can deter theft, vandalism, and other disruptive activities within the library premises. They also aid in monitoring and responding to security incidents.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
SFPD & Sheriff's Department. Requests have been made via a warrant that is part of an investigation from law enforcement.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.
Our internal tracking system manages the release of video data to outside library departments, ensuring compliance with our retention policy. Additionally, we have a script in place that automatically overwrites data to maintain policy adherence.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.
N/A

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

48

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

0

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$33,557

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$16,128

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

$15,170

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$23,611

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Library Preservation Fund (LPF)

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

LIB Sensource Patron Counter System Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

Add 0953 Chief Operating Officer (2), 1823 Senior Data Analyst (2). Remove 1840 Junior Management Assistant (1), 1801 Analyst Trainee (1)

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

Departmental reorganization.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Library Facilities, Sensource vendor tech support.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The Department shall use Sensource Patron Counter System only for the following authorized purposes:
– to tally the entry and exit of Library visitors at all 28 public facilities.
– to track usage of meeting rooms, elevators and restrooms for purposes of resource allocation.

Its been effective in gathering data for library statistics.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

Number of FTE (new & existing): The technology does not require additional FTE; however, it is supported by staff members representing the following classifications: o 0.02 FTE - 1822 Administrative Analyst o 0.01 FTE - 1823 Senior Data Analyst

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$4,614.71

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$47,000.00

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

$6,500.00

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Library Preservation Fund (LPF)

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

LIB Social Media Monitoring Software Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

Add 1312-Public Information Officer (1)

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

New employee

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Library Public Affairs team, Library IT Dept, Hootsuite technical services/customer support

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Partially

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

This Policy applies to all to department personnel that use, plan to use, or plan to secure Social Media Monitoring Platform, such as Hootsuite, including employees, contractors, and volunteers. Employees, consultants, volunteers, and vendors while working on behalf of the City with the Department are required to comply with this Policy.
Hootsuite is a platform that primarily is used to schedule and monitor social media posts related to San Francisco Public Library. It is also used to identify trending posts. All information available via Hootsuite has already been made public by individuals and is not retained by the Library.
This social media platform has been effective in monitoring mentions of SFPL and allows our PR dept to respond to any corrective action or celebrate any positive public comment with SFPL management and staff.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

18

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$150,491

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$7,200

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Library preservation fund (LPF)

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 13

From:	Li, Kevin (HSA)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Subject:	City and County of San Francisco Human Services Agency - Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:40:57 AM
Attachments:	HSA Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am submitting City and County of San Francisco Human Service Agency's Annual Surveillance Report for our Security Cameras, which is being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a). Our surveillance systems are installed in our client lobbies and is used by our Investigation department and building security.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the report.

Thank you,
Kevin Li
Human Services Agency – I.T.
415-557-6034

HSA Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

Yes

5.2 Why has the technology been added?

Adding surveillance equipment to the 3120/3125/3127 Mission St. building lobbies

5.3 Please list technology which was added (include manufacturer and model information.

Xtech - Technology Marketplace Vendor who resold the Vivotek products Vivotek - Manufacturer same as last year

5.4 Please list how many units have been added.

51

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Xtech - Technology Marketplace Vendor who resold the Vivotek products Vivotek - Manufacturer same as last year

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

High resolution cameras allow for easier identification of suspects and simplify the investigation process. The replacement of the cameras executed last year has removed blind spots and is providing a better coverage of the areas in the Lobbies. Direct video feed to the building's security guards is of a higher quality and is more suitable for live monitoring.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

SFPD, SF Sheriff's department. Data shared as part of incident investigations. Standard Law Enforcement data sharing request.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

.1 FTE

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

None

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

13% Federal, 12% State, and 75% General Fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 14

From: Calen McEldowney
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Cc: Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: AAM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:11:30 AM
Attachments: AAM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
AAM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023 cover letter.pdf

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

Dear Angela Calvillo

Attached please find a cover letter as well as the Asian Art Museum (AAM) Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report for 2023. This is being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a).

Please let me know if you have any question or need more information.

Sincerely,

Calen McEldowney
Director of Security

Asian Art Museum
200 Larkin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 | www.asianart.org
Tel: 415.581.3610 | Email: cmceldowney@asianart.org

ASIAN ART MUSEUM
Chong-Moon Lee Center
for Asian Art & Culture

200 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.581.3500

Asian
Art
Museum

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

November 1, 2023

RE: AAM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Dear Angela Calvillo,

Attached with this cover letter, please find the AAM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report for 2023. Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarification on this report.

Sincerely,

Calen McEldowney
Director of Security
Asian Art Museum
200 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-581-3610
cmceldowney@asianart.org

cc: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc: Julia Chrusciel, COIT Privacy Analyst

AAM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?

Older cameras and cameras failing

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).

2 Arecont (10mp) cameras on the roof were replaced. 6 Hikvision (4mp) cameras in our new pavilion gallery space, 3 Hikvision (3mp) cameras in the Osher gallery, and 3 Samsung (3mp) cameras in our museum store.

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).

2 Axis P3268-LVE 4k, and 12 Axis 12mp fisheye cameras

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.

14

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Pacific Technology CCTV

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?
Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective
We have been able to use the technology to augment our security staff allowing us to identify potential problems and mitigate issues. We have also been able to use the technology during investigations.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
Police, Sheriff, Public Defender, District Attorney's office. Security camera footage was released for active criminal investigations and court cases.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.
Audits are to ensure proper working condition of the camera system

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.
NA

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).
NA

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?
Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?
No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?
Yes

14.6 List total one-time Software costs for FY 2023-2024.
$850.00

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?
Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.
$13500.00

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?
Yes

14.10 List total one-time Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:
$8700.00

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?
No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?
No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:
No

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:
$850.00

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?
Foundation non-City funding

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
No

From:	Limcaco, Veronica (ART)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Remington, Ralph (ART); Hollenbeck, Sarah (ART); Leifheit, Lex (ART); Te, Coma (ART)
Subject:	San Francisco Arts Commission's Annual Surveillance Report
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:50:17 AM
Attachments:	image001.png ART Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf Cover Letter_Annual Surveillanace Report_11.1.23.pdf

November 1, 2023

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: San Francisco Arts Commission's Annual Surveillance Report

I am submitting San Francisco Art Commission's Annual Surveillance Report, which is being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a) and posting on the Department's web site.

CC: Ralph Remington, Director of Cultural Affairs
Sarah Hollenbeck, Deputy Director of Finance & Administration
Lex Leifheit, Deputy Director of Programs
Coma Te, Director of Communications
Julia Chrusciel, COIT Privacy Analyst

Veronica Limcaco
Operations Associate
Pronouns: she/her
Email: veronica.limcaco@sfgov.org
Office: 415-252-2211
Mobile: 415-471-4453

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.

San Francisco Arts Commission

London N. Breed
Mayor

Ralph Remington
Director of Cultural Affairs

401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325
San Francisco, CA 94102

SFAC Galleries
401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 126
San Francisco, CA 94102

tel 415-252-2100
fax 415-934-1022
sfartscommission.org
facebook.com/sfartscommission
twitter.com/SFAC

City and County of San Francisco

November 1, 2023

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: San Francisco Arts Commission's Annual Surveillance Report

I am submitting San Francisco Art Commission's Annual Surveillance Report, which is being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a) and posting on the Department's web site.

CC: Ralph Remington, Director of Cultural Affairs
Sarah Hollenbeck, Deputy Director of Finance & Administration
Lex Leifheit, Deputy Director of Programs
Coma Te, Director of Communications
Julia Chrusciel, COIT Privacy Analyst

ART Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

Yes

6.2 Why is the technology no longer used?

Camera not working properly in the Arts Commission Main Gallery

6.3 Please list how many units have ceased operation.

1 camera ceased operation (no longer working properly) in SF Arts Commission Main Gallery

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Department of Technology (DT) - SF Arts Commission Main Gallery; Microbiz Security Company - Cultural Centers (Tenant funded - not funded with City dollars)

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

For cultural centers, Bayview Opera House and African American Art and Culture Complex reported sharing video footage with law enforcement (Police Department). Allowed under authorized use policy.

The SF Arts Commission gallery camera is functional but DT has recommended replacement to be in compliance with cybersecurity regulations

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

Bayview Opera House and African American Art and Culture Complex reported sharing video footage with law enforcement (Police Department). Allowed under authorized use policy.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

NA

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

$13703.22

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.10 List total one-time Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$3000

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

Yes

14.12 List total one-time Training costs for FY 2023-2024:

Included above

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General Fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

From: D"Cruz, Donna (WAR)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Cicero, Francesca (WAR); Farnan, Sean (WAR)
Subject: RE: Annual Surveillance Reports Reviewed 2023 - WAR
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 12:06:24 PM
Attachments: image001.png
Annual Surveillance Report 2023-Cover.pdf
WAR Third-Party Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
WAR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am attaching the War Memorial's Annual Surveillance Report for the Veterans Building Security Camera System. The Veterans Building Security Camera System previously received Board of Supervisors' approval as a Surveillance Technology.

This report is being provided per Ordinance 19B.6(a) which requires all departmental Annual Surveillance Reports for each Surveillance Technology be submitted to the Board of Supervisors on or before November 1 annually.

A copy of this report has been provided to COIT and a link to the report will also be posted on the War Memorial's website as required by 19B.6.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if there are any questions concerning this report.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Donna

Donna D'Cruz
Director of Finance & Administration
San Francisco War Memorial & Performing Arts Center
401 Van Ness, Room 110
San Francisco, CA 94102
Direct: 415.554.6319 Main: 415.554.6300
Fax: 415.554.5091
https://sfwarmemorial.org/

San Francisco War Memorial & Performing Arts Center

San Francisco War Memorial & Performing Arts Center

November 1, 2023

To: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
angela.calvillo@sfgov.org

From: Donna D'Cruz
Director of Finance & Administration, War Memorial
donna.dcruz@sfgov.org

Re: Veterans Building Security Camera System Annual Surveillance Report

Attached please find the War Memorial's Annual Surveillance Report for the Veterans Building Security Camera System. The Veterans Building Security Camera System previously received Board of Supervisors' approval as a Surveillance Technology.

This report is being provided per Ordinance 19B.6(a) which requires all departmental Annual Surveillance Reports for each Surveillance Technology be submitted to the Board of Supervisors on or before November 1 annually.

A copy of this report has been provided to COIT and a link to the report will also be posted on the War Memorial's website as required by 19B.6.

I can be contacted at donna.dcruz@sfgov.org or by phone at 415-554-6319 if there are any questions concerning this report.

cc: Julia Chrusciel
Privacy Analyst, COIT
julia.chrusciel@sfgov.org

Francesca Cicero
Public Information Officer, War Memorial
francesca.cicero@sfgov.org

Sean Farnan
IT Manager, War Memorial
sean.farnan@sfgov.org

Board of Supervisors General Email
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

WAR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

AVS, Xtech

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The Veterans Building Security Camera System has been effective in enhancing Security staff's ability to monitor and respond to incidents in the Veterans Building. Monitoring of live views increases situational awareness. This allows Security Officers at the Security Camera Workstation or Supervisors to radio roving staff to investigate suspicious or problematic activities detected on the premises.

Access to recorded footage has been useful in the investigation of incidents by the Director of Security.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

.025 of 1093 and .05 of 0922

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

$15245.52

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.10 List total one-time Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

$12830.00

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

War Memorial Operating Budget

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

WAR Third-Party Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your “approved use cases” in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of “authorized job titles” in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list “N/A” if not applicable): *

AVS, Xtech

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The Davies Symphony Hall camera system owned/operated by San Francisco Symphony has been effective in enhancing WAR Security staff's ability to monitor
and respond to incidents in this location.

This system allows Security Officers at the Security Camera Workstation or Supervisors to radio roving staff to investigate
suspicious or problematic activities detected on the premises.

One particular benefit is that there are cameras covering the parking lot and this has aided in monitoring potential vehicle theft.

Also there is a monitor at the security desk for Zellerbach Hall and cameras that cover the entrance and hallways of this portion of the building that have enhanced Security patrols.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

.025 1093 and .05 0922

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

War Memorial Operating Budget

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 17

From: Varner, Christina (RNT)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); PRADHAN, MANU (CAT); Docs, SF (LIB)
Subject: Rent Board Annual Surveillance Report
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 12:16:22 PM
Attachments: RNT 2023 Annual Surveillance Report.pdf

Dear Clerk Calvillo:

Pursuant to SF Administrative Code Chapter 19, Section 19B.6(a), please find attached the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board's Annual Surveillance Report.

Please don't hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Thank you,
Christina Varner

****

Christina A. Varner (she/her)
Executive Director
San Francisco Rent Board
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 320
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 252-4650 direct
(415) 252-4600 main/counseling line
christina.varner@sfgov.org
sf.gov/rentboard

City and County of San Francisco

Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

London N. Breed
Mayor

Christina A. Varner
Executive Director

DAVID GRUBER
PRESIDENT

DAVE CROW
JULIET HALEY
RICHARD HUNG
ASHLEY KLEIN
CATHY MOSBRUCKER
KENT QIAN
KION SAWNEY
ARTHUR TOM
DAVID WASSERMAN

November 1, 2023

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

VIA EMAIL TO: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Rent Board Annual Surveillance Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Section 19B.6(a) of Chapter 19 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Rent Board is providing its annual report for each Surveillance Technology used by the department. Attached please find the Rent Board's Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report. This report can be found on the Rent Board's website at https://sf.gov/information/rent-board-statistics-and-reports and on the Committee on Information Technology's website at https://sf.gov/resource/2022/annual-surveillance-report-inventory. Please contact me at (415) 252-4650 should you have any questions concerning this report.

Sincerely,

Christina Varner
Executive Director
Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

cc: Julia Chrusciel, COIT Privacy Analyst

RNT Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

Executive Director, Deputy Director, CIO, IT Operations Support Admin V

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

The vacant positions were filled recently.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

N/A

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Use of the technology continues to protect the safety of staff, patrons and facilities while promoting and open and welcoming environment; and allows the department to review video footage after a security incident, provide video evidence to law enforcement or to the public upon request by formal process, order, or subpoena.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

0.2

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

N/A - maintained using existing equipment

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 18

From: Corso, Mark
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Subject: FIR Annual Surveillance Reports
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:13:30 PM
Attachments: FIR Body-Worn Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
FIR Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
FIR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Good afternoon Ms. Calvillo. Attached is the Fire Department's surveillance reports to comply with Administrative Code section 19B.6(a). Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the reports. Thank you.

Mark Corso (he, him, his)
Deputy Director
Finance & Planning Division
San Francisco Fire Department
Tel (415) 558-3417

FIR Body-Worn Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Axon

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

It is used as a tool by our public information officer along the lines of the use cases outlined in our approved policy

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

1

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

N/A

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

FIR Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

N/A

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

While still in the initial stages of developing the Department's Drone Committee, the Department has begun training additional personnel on use of the drone as well as deploying it at incidents as described in the approved policy.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

N/A

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

$24,702

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

FIR Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?
No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)
No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?
No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?
No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?
No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *
N/A

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?
Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective
The video cameras have been used for their intended purpose to improve security around the Department facility.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

0

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

N/A

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 19

From:	Robertson, Bruce (DPW)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Short, Carla (DPW); Schneider, Ian (DPW); Gordon, Rachel (DPW); Rivera, Patrick (DPW); Rhee, Richard (DPW); Johnson, Jillian (ADM); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Subject:	Public Works Annual Surveillance Reports - 2023
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:44:10 PM
Attachments:	Annual Surveillance Report Memo_Public Works.110323.pdf DPW Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf DPW Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

---

Hello Ms. Calvillo and Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Administrative Code Sec. 19B.6(a), please see attached San Francisco Public Works documents serving as submittals to the Board of Supervisors:

- Automatic License Plate Reader (ALPR) Annual Surveillance Report 2023
- Aerial Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023
- Cover Letter for same

Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions.

Thank you
Bruce

Bruce Robertson
Deputy Director of Financial Management & Administration

Financial Management & Administration
San Francisco Public Works
City and County of San Francisco
49 SVN, 16th Fl
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 601-3423 (cell)
sfpublicworks.org · twitter.com/sfpublicworks

Bruce Robertson, Deputy Director | Financial Management & Administration
bruce.robertson@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.3128 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94103

November 1, 2023

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Administrative Code Sec. 19B.6(a), Public Works is submitting to the Board of Supervisors our Annual Surveillance Reports for:

1. Automatic License Plate Reader
2. Aerial Drone-Unmanned Aircraft Systems

If you have any questions, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Bruce Robertson
Deputy Director, Financial Management & Administration

attach. Public Works Automatic License Plate Reader Annual Surveillance Report
Public Works Aerial Drone-Unmanned Aircraft Systems Annual Surveillance Report

c: Julia Chrusciel, Privacy Analyst, Committee on Information Technology
Patrick Rivera, Acting Bureau Manager, Public Works

DPW Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

As of the writing of this report, we have yet to enter into contract with any vendor. We are in negotiations with a vendor working with OCA.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

No

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

We cannot make a determination regarding the success of this program or not, since we have not been successful in the procurement of cameras outlined in this policy. Working with OCA, we are in final contract negotiations with a new vendor with the goal to reduce illegal dumping by having a license plate reader that will allow us to capture illegal dumping and follow up with the bad actors.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

Public Works, in collaboration with OCA, are finalizing the procurement of the equipment. When procurement is complete, the FTE are the same as those identified in the policy document. All FTE are existing.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.4 List total one-time Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024.

0

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

Yes

14.6 List total one-time Software costs for FY 2023-2024.

$100,000

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

$100,000

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$100,000

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

$100,000

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Public Works budget, continuing funds from BOS addbacks and departmental funding.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

We are finalizing the contract for the first time. It is not final yet but will be by the end of the fiscal year.

DPW Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

n/a

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The drones have not been used during this reporting period.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

n/a

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Capital Project Funding

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 20

From: Geddes, Michelle (DEM)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Lee, William (DEM); Scanlon, Olivia (DEM)
Subject: DEM Annual 19B Surveillance Report 2023
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:17:14 PM
Attachments: DEM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

---

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am submitting the Department of Emergency Management's Annual Surveillance Report, which is being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a). Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the report.

Thank you,

Michelle Geddes
Chief Information Officer
Department of Emergency Management
1011 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Cell: 415-518-8126

DEM Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

San Francisco Department of Technology

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The surveillance technology continues to allow deputies on-site to remotely screen and see all visitors before they access the building. The cameras also allow the deputies to monitor the immediate surrounding area around the building to provide safe passage for employees as well as protecting their vehicles.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
The data is shared with both the San Francisco Sherriff's department and the San Francisco Police Department. The Sherriff's department provides security for the building, so they have access to live video as well as stored video for any investigations. Video has also been shared with the San Francisco Police Department in the past for any investigations that occurred outside of the building but under the San Francisco Police Department jurisdiction.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

.02

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:

We have as needed costs for maintenance through the department of technology. We have budgeted $10,000-15,000 for the year for these costs.

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

San Francisco DEM General Funds.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

From: Pawlowsky, Eric (REC)
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Subject: Annual Surveillance Reports
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:59:42 PM
Attachments: 2023 Privacy & Surveillance Reports_signed.pdf
REC Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
REC Body-Worn Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
REC Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf
REC Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Eric Pawlowsky
Sr. Administrative Analyst, Information Systems Division

San Francisco Recreation and Park Department | City & County of San Francisco
McLaren Lodge in Golden Gate Park | 501 Stanyan Street | San Francisco, CA | 94117

(628) 220-1118 | eric.pawlowsky@sfgov.org

Visit us at sfrecpark.org
Like us on Facebook
Follow us on Twitter
Watch us on sfRecParkTV
Sign up for our e-News

London Breed, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

November 1, 2023

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 19B.6(a) please find attached Annual Surveillance Reports for each Surveillance Technology used by the Recreation & Parks Department.

Sincerely,

Eric Pawlowsky

Eric Pawlowsky
Senior Administrative Analyst
San Francisco Recreation & Parks

REC Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Microbiz, ExacqVision

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Video identification provides a record of evidence that can be used to deter property crime, theft, and vandalism. In doing so they promote public safety and help the department fulfill its mission to maintain beautiful parks and facilities. ALPR's are a valuable tool that assists a small team of public safety personnel provide adequate protections to facilities located throughout the city of San Francisco.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

.1

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$21270

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General Fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

REC Body-Worn Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

Chief, Park Rangers (0951); Deputy Chief, Park Rangers (0922)

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

Promotion

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Axon, Evidence.com

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Body worn cameras protect have been effective public safety tools. They provide a record of incidents and activity that can be referenced later for evidentiary and training purposes. They help keep RPD staff and the public safe.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

.2

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

$14000

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$30000

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$12000

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General Fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

REC Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

N/A

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Drones have been an effective tool in support of maintenance and construction efforts. They provide detailed photographic data of areas of facilities that are difficult to reach in-person. They collect aerial view data of large tracts of land in a short amount of time, saving time and money.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

1

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General Fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

REC Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Microbiz, Samsung, Hanwa, Exacq, Arecont

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

This technology has been effective in helping the department maintain healthy, clean, and safe parks and facilities and in keeping the public and department staff safe. It does so by enabling staff to view multiple properties and multiple areas within a property simultaneously, with a relatively small number of staff. Cost savings result from staffing efficiencies and harm prevention.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
Yes

13.2 How many public records requests have been made regarding this surveillance technology?
1

13.3 Please summarize what has been requested via public records requests, including the general type of information requested and disclosed, as well as the number or requests for each general type of information.
The department received one invalid public records request to 'save footage' at Joe DiMaggio Playground.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

1.3

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024.

$10000 Confirmed for FY24; additional expenditures to be determined

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

No

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$160650

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

No

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

No

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

General Fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

Item 22

From:	Guy Clarke (AIR)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM); Cathy Widener (AIR); Francis Tsang (AIR)
Subject:	Ch.19B.6(a) - Annual Surveillance Reports: Airport
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:46:05 PM
Attachments:	SFO Ltr - BOS Annual Surveillance Reports 11-1-23.docx.pdf AIR ALPR Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf AIR Pre-security Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf AIR Third-Party Cameras Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

Good Afternoon Angela,

Pursuant to Administrative Code sec. 19B.6(a), please find attached a cover letter signed by Airport Director Ivar Satero, as well as the Annual Surveillance Reports for the Airport.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks & Best Regards,

Guy

Guy Clarke, CISA & ISO 20000/27001 LA
ITT Cybersecurity Governance Director| Cybersecurity & Compliance Team
Information Technology & Telecommunications (ITT) | San Francisco International Airport
P.O. Box 8097| San Francisco CA 94128
O: 650.821.3392
M: 650.704.0422
www.flysfo.com

SFO

San Francisco International Airport

November 1, 2023

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Subject: Chapter19B - Acquisition of Surveillance Technology Ordinance, Annual Surveillance Reports submission pursuant to Administrative Code sec. 19B.6(a).

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Administrative Code sec. 19B.6(a), I am forwarding to the Board of Supervisors the Annual Surveillance Reports for San Francisco International Airport.

Under Administrative Code Sec. 19B.6(a), a Department that obtains approval for the acquisition of Surveillance Technology under Section 19B.2 must submit to the Board of Supervisors and the Committee on Information Technology (COIT), and make available on its website, an Annual Surveillance Report for each Surveillance Technology used by the City Department within 12 months of Board approval of the applicable Surveillance Technology Policy, and annually thereafter on or before November 1, 2023.

The following is a list of accompanying documents:

- Annual Surveillance Reports for the three Board of Supervisors approved Airport Surveillance Technologies (Automated License Plate Readers (ALPR), Pre-Security CCTV Cameras, and Third-Party Cameras).
- The link to the Annual Surveillance Reports on the Airport's public facing website: (https://www.flysfo.com/about/aimort-commission/public-notices).

The following person may be contacted regarding this matter:

Guy Clarke
IT Governance & Compliance
SFO ITT Cybersecurity & Compliance
(650) 821-3392
guy.clarke@flysfo.com

Very truly yours,

Ivar C. Satero
Airport Director

AIRPORT COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED *MAYOR* | MALCOLM YEUNG *PRESIDENT* | EVERETT A. HEWLETT, JR. *VICE PRESIDENT* | JANE NATOLI | JOSE F. ALMANZA | MARK BUELL | IVAR C. SATERO *AIRPORT DIRECTOR*

Enclosures

cc: Julia Chrusciel, COIT
Guy Clarke, Information Technology & Telecommunications
Cathy Widener, Governmental Affairs
Francis Tsang, Governmental Affairs

AIR ALPR Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

SFO Landside Operations; SFO GTU Ground Transportation Unit; Contractors - IBI and Transcore.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The ALPR – GTMS has been effective as a fail-safe should the Automated Vehicle Identification (AVI) readers malfunction and fail to read the transponder which the Airport affixes to certain types of permitted vehicles. The technology assists in dispute resolution in the event that the operator challenges the transponder data (i.e., number of trips the operator has made to the Airport) collected from the AVI.

The technology is also effective in tracking permitted operators that are not issued transponders, such as TNC vehicles and long distance bus carriers; tracking unpermitted operators who solicit passengers for rides; and assisting public safety agencies in investigations.

The technology enables the Airport to assess trip fees on permitted Commercial ground transportation operators. Specifically, in 2021, the Airport collected a total of $ 22,373,523 in trip fees from ground transportation operators.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

The S.F. Police Department - Airport Bureau (SFPD-AB) receives surveillance technology data from the Airport. Specifically the data includes: License Plate number, image of car, and list of time & location of when the vehicle was on Airport property. Vehicles that did not have a permit to operate at the Airport are cited as being in violation of the contractual requirements of the Airport.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) receives surveillance technology data from the Airport. Specifically the data includes: License Plate number, image of car, and list of time & location of when the vehicle was on Airport property. Vehicles that did not have a permit to operate at the Airport are reported as being in violation of the contractual requirements of the Airport.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

SFO: TechShop Existing (.10 of FTE)

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$20,000

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$340,000 = Total Annual Cost of Software & Hardware Support

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

See 14.19 Note Above.

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Operating Expense

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

AIR Pre-security Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?
No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)
No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?
Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?
Malfunctioning, Damaged or Older Technology/End-of-Life

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).
PELCO & Ikegami - Older Tech

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).
PELCO - 8MP FISHEYE ENVIRONMENTAL BUILT IN IR ILLUMINATION S (IMF82-1ERS); Pelco (S6230-EGL1) 2MP Outdoor PTZ Dome IP Security Camera with 30x Optical Zoom - Pendant, Clear; Ikegami (ISD-A15S-TDN) 1.23MP Cube Camera (No Lens).

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.
6

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?
No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?
No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *
Cognyte (formerly Verint); Intellicene; Airport Tech Shop & ITT Teams.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

Within the public areas of the Airport, the pre-security CCTV camera monitoring has been very effective in providing vital/critical information regarding Safety and Security at the Airport (e.g., passenger accidents, customer service and law enforcement incidents), including supporting Situational Awareness for first responders.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

Police (SFPD - Airport Bureau)
City Attorney (assigned to SFO)
Recorded video footage of the incidents.
Safety, Security and Legal matters.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

Outside law enforcement agencies and with the public when the data is subject to disclosure pursuant to a Public Records Act request for the data.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
Yes

13.2 How many public records requests have been made regarding this surveillance technology?
From 07/01/2022 to 06/30/2023 = 221

13.3 Please summarize what has been requested via public records requests, including the general type of information requested and disclosed, as well as the number or requests for each general type of information.
Video footage of various incidents from safety to customer service.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).
Equivalent to the 2.95 Existing FTEs.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?
No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:
Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?
Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:
$601,650 based upon July 2023 salary expense.

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?
Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:
Maintenance & Support (annual Software Cost) - $ 315,000

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?
Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:
These are included in the Maintenance listed in 14.19 above.

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?
Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:
Professional Services = $400,000

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?
No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?
No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?
Operational Expense (OpEx).

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?
Increase in Compensation (Salary & Fringe) Costs.

AIR Third-Party Cameras Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

This is managed by the tenant.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The Airport leases space to airlines, concessionaires, food, and beverage operators, rental car agencies, etc. ("Tenants"). Tenants provide a host of services at the Airport, all focused on the needs of the public that traverse the Airport campus.

Use of the technology provides the Tenants with the ability to maintain operations safely and securely in accordance with their lease provisions. The technology provides added visibility and support legal enforcement and regulatory compliance during an incident.

- Financial savings – The Airport is relieved of the responsibility to provide additional safety and security services for the tenants.
- Time savings – CCTV feeds assist with resolving incidents expeditiously.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

S.F. Police Department - Airport Bureau (SFPD-AB) and City Attorney's Office received video footage in the process of an investigation.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

Tenants and their authorized staff as they manage their cameras.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.

Tenants use of technology is subject to Section 7.5. Video Monitoring and Recording Devices/Access to Airport Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) System of the Airport Rules and Regulations . The Airport conducts monthly and weekly audit of Tenant spaces to include inspection for camera use.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.

No major violations noted. If there were any violations of Section 7.5 (referenced above), the First Offense: Citation and Fine of $1,000; Second Offense: Citation and Fine of $2,000 and Third Offense: Citation and Fine of $3,000

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

Tenant manages their environment and does not report this information to the Airport.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Tenant manages their environment and does not report this information to the Airport.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

AIR ALPR Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

SFO Landside Operations; SFO GTU Ground Transportation Unit; Contractors - IBI and Transcore.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The ALPR – GTMS has been effective as a fail-safe should the Automated Vehicle Identification (AVI) readers malfunction and fail to read the transponder which the Airport affixes to certain types of permitted vehicles. The technology assists in dispute resolution in the event that the operator challenges the transponder data (i.e., number of trips the operator has made to the Airport) collected from the AVI.

The technology is also effective in tracking permitted operators that are not issued transponders, such as TNC vehicles and long distance bus carriers; tracking unpermitted operators who solicit passengers for rides; and assisting public safety agencies in investigations.

The technology enables the Airport to assess trip fees on permitted Commercial ground transportation operators. Specifically, in 2021, the Airport collected a total of $ 22,373,523 in trip fees from ground transportation operators.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
The S.F. Police Department - Airport Bureau (SFPD-AB) receives surveillance technology data from the Airport. Specifically the data includes: License Plate number, image of car, and list of time & location of when the vehicle was on Airport property. Vehicles that did not have a permit to operate at the Airport are cited as being in violation of the contractual requirements of the Airport.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) receives surveillance technology data from the Airport. Specifically the data includes: License Plate number, image of car, and list of time & location of when the vehicle was on Airport property. Vehicles that did not have a permit to operate at the Airport are reported as being in violation of the contractual requirements of the Airport.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

SFO: TechShop Existing (.10 of FTE)

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:

$20,000

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:

$340,000 = Total Annual Cost of Software & Hardware Support

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:

See 14.19 Note Above.

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

No

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Operating Expense

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

AIR Pre-security Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?

Malfunctioning, Damaged or Older Technology/End-of-Life

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).

PELCO & Ikegami - Older Tech

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).

PELCO - 8MP FISHEYE ENVIRONMENTAL BUILT IN IR ILLUMINATION S (IMF82-1ERS); Pelco (S6230-EGL1) 2MP Outdoor PTZ Dome IP Security Camera with 30x Optical Zoom - Pendant, Clear; Ikegami (ISD-A15S-TDN) 1.23MP Cube Camera (No Lens).

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.

6

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Cognyte (formerly Verint); Intellicene; Airport Tech Shop & ITT Teams.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?
Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective
Within the public areas of the Airport, the pre-security CCTV camera monitoring has been very effective in providing vital/critical information regarding Safety and Security at the Airport (e.g., passenger accidents, customer service and law enforcement incidents), including supporting Situational Awareness for first responders.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
Police (SFPD - Airport Bureau)
City Attorney (assigned to SFO)
Recorded video footage of the incidents.
Safety, Security and Legal matters.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
Outside law enforcement agencies and with the public when the data is subject to disclosure pursuant to a Public Records Act request for the data.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
Yes

13.2 How many public records requests have been made regarding this surveillance technology?
From 07/01/2022 to 06/30/2023 = 221

13.3 Please summarize what has been requested via public records requests, including the general type of information requested and disclosed, as well as the number or requests for each general type of information.
Video footage of various incidents from safety to customer service.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).
Equivalent to the 2.95 Existing FTEs.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?
No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:
Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?
Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2023-2024:
$601,650 based upon July 2023 salary expense.

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?
Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2023-2024:
Maintenance & Support (annual Software Cost) - $ 315,000

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?
Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2023-2024:
These are included in the Maintenance listed in 14.19 above.

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?
Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2023-2024:
Professional Services = $400,000

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?
No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?
No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?
Operational Expense (OpEx).

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?
Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?
Increase in Compensation (Salary & Fringe) Costs.

AIR Third-Party Cameras Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

This is managed by the tenant.

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The Airport leases space to airlines, concessionaires, food, and beverage operators, rental car agencies, etc. (“Tenants”). Tenants provide a host of services at the Airport, all focused on the needs of the public that traverse the Airport campus.

Use of the technology provides the Tenants with the ability to maintain operations safely and securely in accordance with their lease provisions. The technology provides added visibility and support legal enforcement and regulatory compliance during an incident.

• Financial savings – The Airport is relieved of the responsibility to provide additional safety and security services for the tenants.

• Time savings – CCTV feeds assist with resolving incidents expeditiously.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

S.F. Police Department - Airport Bureau (SFPD-AB) and City Attorney’s Office received video footage in the process of an investigation.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

Tenants and their authorized staff as they manage their cameras.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

Yes

12.5 Please provide general aggregate information about the result of your department's internal audits.

Tenants use of technology is subject to Section 7.5. Video Monitoring and Recording Devices/Access to Airport Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) System of the Airport Rules and Regulations . The Airport conducts monthly and weekly audit of Tenant spaces to include inspection for camera use.

12.6 If the audits revealed violations, please list any actions taken in response to the violations.

No major violations noted. If there were any violations of Section 7.5 (referenced above), the First Offense: Citation and Fine of $1,000; Second Offense: Citation and Fine of $2,000 and Third Offense: Citation and Fine of $3,000

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

Tenant manages their environment and does not report this information to the Airport.

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

Tenant manages their environment and does not report this information to the Airport.

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

From:	Graves, Stephen (PRT)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Chrusciel, Julia (ADM)
Cc:	SEXTON, MICHELLE (CAT); Delepine, Boris (PRT); Thomas, Kyle (PRT); Eng, Tedman (PRT)
Subject:	Annual Surveillance Reports Administrative Code section 19B.6(a). Port of San Francisco
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 7:53:20 PM
Attachments:	PRT Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf PRT Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023.pdf

---

"Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am submitting Port of San Francico's Annual Surveillance Report(s), which are being submitted pursuant to Administrative Code section 19B.6(a).
Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns for me regarding the report(s)."

v/r
Stephen Graves
Emergency Coordinator
Port of San Francisco
Pier 1 San Francisco 94111
415|640-9069

PRT Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

Yes

5.2 Why has the technology been added?

Emergency surveillance camera system added to one location (Pier 68) by Bay Alarm

5.3 Please list technology which was added (include manufacturer and model information.

Bay Alarm surveillance camera with monitoring

5.4 Please list how many units have been added.

3 Cameras have been added at Pier 68, Shipyard, building #109

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

San Francisco DIT, Bay Alarm

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?
Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective
Surveillance cameras and review of their recordings post incident has allowed the Port to provide to the San Francisco Police Department valuable information including suspect descriptions, vehicle descriptions and criminal trends all with the goal to reduce crime on Port property.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?
Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.
San Francisco Police Department - Received surveillance camera data related to criminal activity related to burglaries, vandalisms, assaults and arsons.
San Francisco District Attorney - Received surveillance camera data related to criminal cases being adjudicated at San Francisco Superior Court.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?
No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?
No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?
No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?
No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?
No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

$500,000

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

N/A

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

PRT Unmanned Aerial Vehicle - Drone Annual Surveillance Report 2023

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases

1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your "approved use cases" in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles

2.1 Does the list of "authorized job titles" in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology

Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No

Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

N/A

Surveillance Technology Goals

8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

No

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

The Port does not currently use drone/UAV technology.

Data Sharing

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

No

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data

10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints

11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

No

Violations

12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests

13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology

14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

0

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2023-2024:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2023-2024?

N/A

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
To: BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Legislative Services; BOS-IT; BOS-Finance; Gibson, Alistair (BOS); Esquivel Garcia, Alondra (BOS)
Subject: FW: Personal and professional news
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:56:20 AM

Hello Everyone,

Please see the email below. Please add a tickler to your calendars to update the referral lists in February.

Thank you,

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

From: Rosenfield, Ben (CON) <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:31 AM
To: Mayor London Breed <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Duning, Anna (MYR) <anna.duning@sfgov.org>; Rose, Harvey (BUD) <harvey.rose@sfgov.org>; Campbell, Severin (BUD) <severin.campbell@sfgov.org>; GIVNER, JON (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>; Rydstrom, Todd (CON) <Todd.Rydstrom@sfgov.org>
Subject: Personal and professional news

November 2, 2023

Dear Mayor Breed, President Peskin, and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Now in my 16th year serving as Controller and soon to enter my 27th with the City, I've come to the decision that it's the right time to step aside and let a new person take this role that has been such a personal and professional honor to hold. I plan to step down as Controller in February 2024, providing time for the Mayor and Board to appoint and confirm the next Controller and to work with that individual on an orderly transition into this role.

Thank you for your partnership and work together over the years. It is not easy to step away from work that has always felt important and impactful to me, but I know in doing so that the Controller's Office is in great and steady hands – An incredible group of people doing fantastic work every day in our department. I look forward to introducing the next Controller to them.

With my best,

Ben

Ben Rosenfield

Controller

City and County of San Francisco

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Housing Authority Waitlist Opening
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 11:44:57 AM
Attachments:	SFHA HCV Waitlist Flyer 2023.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached regarding the opening of the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) waitlist.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

From: Tonia Lediju, PhD <ledijut@SFHA.ORG>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 11:09 AM
To: Tonia Lediju, PhD <ledijut@sfha.org>
Subject: Housing Authority Waitlist Opening

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco (Authority) has opened its Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) waitlist on **October 23, 2023 at 8am PT, and will close on November 6, 2023 at 5pm PT**.

The Authority is accepting online applications to participate in a lottery for 6,500 applicants to be placed on the waiting list for tenant-based vouchers in the HCV program, also known as Section 8. The HCV program assists eligible individuals and families by paying a portion of their rent to private property owners.

Attached is an informational flyer that our partners may post/share to inform applicants of the waitlist opening. For more information on the waitlist opening, please visit: www.sfha.org/housing-programs/waitlist

Thank you for your support.

Respectfully,

Tonia Lediju, PhD

Chief Executive Officer

Housing Authority of the City & County of San Francisco

(650) 356-8401

(415) 619-1936

Clear is kind. Unclear is unkind -- Brene' Brown, PhD

This email is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this email in error, notify the sender and destroy the email immediately. Disclosure of the PHI contained herein may subject the disclosure to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Waitlist Opening

October 23rd, 2023, 8AM PT to November 6th, 2023, 5PM PT

The Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco is opening HCV waitlist applications to the public on 10/23/2023 starting at 8:00 AM PT and closing on 11/6/2023 at 5:00 PM PT.

After the application period closes, a lottery will be used to randomly select applicants. The names selected through the lottery will have waitlist preferences taken into consideration and placed on the HCV waiting list. Applying for the lottery does NOT guarantee a place on the HCV waitlist. For more information, please visit **www.sfha.org/housing-programs/waitlist**

Apply Online Only:

https://sfha.myhousing.com

Assistance Available:

- Service providers within the community are available to assist you with the application process. Visit the website for a full listing: www.sfha.org/housing-programs/waitlist
- If you need assistance with your application, please call the Housing Authority's Customer Care Center at (415) 715-5200 from 8:00 AM to 7:00 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM to 12:00 PM on weekends.
- If you are a person with a disability, please call the Housing Authority's Customer Care Center to request a reasonable accommodation to assist in the application process.
- If you have challenges speaking, reading or understanding English, please call the Housing Authority's Customer Care Center to request language assistance.
- If you have a hearing impairment, please use the TTY line at (415) 467-6754.

What You Need to Apply:

- Valid Email Address
- Phone Number
- Full Name for All Household Members
- Date of Birth for All Household Members
- Social Security for All Household Members (if available)

For more information, please visit www.sfha.org/housing-programs/waitlist
For questions, please contact Customer Care at (415) 715-5200

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for September 2023
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 2:44:38 PM
Attachments:	CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for September 2023.pdf image001.png

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached for the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of September 2023.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

From: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 12:20 PM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for September 2023

All-

Please find the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of September attached for your use.

Regards,

Ichieh C. Dion
Investment Settlement Operations/Reporting
Investments
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Office: 415.554.5433
San Francisco only, **call 311**
sftreasurer.org

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco

Tajel Shah, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Hubert R White, III CFA, CTP, Chief Investment Officer

José Cisneros, Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of September 2023

October 15, 2023

The Honorable London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Franicsco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of September 30, 2023. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of September 2023 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics *

	Current Month		Prior Month	
(in $ million)	Fiscal YTD	September 2023	Fiscal YTD	August 2023
Average Daily Balance	$ 15,462	$ 15,364	$ 15,462	$ 15,362
Net Earnings	120.73	40.34	80.39	40.31
Earned Income Return	3.11%	3.20%	3.07%	3.10%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

(in $ million) **Investment Type**	**% of Portfolio**	**Book Value**	**Market Value**	**Wtd. Avg. Coupon**	**Wtd. Avg. YTM**	**WAM**
U.S. Treasuries	21.80%	$ 3,490.2	$ 3,260.2	0.90%	1.03%	637
Federal Agencies	43.88%	6,790.1	6,561.9	2.63%	3.01%	608
Public Time Deposits	0.27%	40.0	40.0	5.47%	5.47%	88
Negotiable CDs	15.14%	2,265.0	2,263.9	5.68%	5.68%	190
Commercial Paper	2.10%	313.7	313.7	0.00%	5.71%	127
Money Market Funds	12.72%	1,902.1	1,902.1	5.27%	5.27%	1
Supranationals	4.10%	638.2	613.3	2.38%	2.02%	485
Totals	100.0%	$ 15,439.3	$ 14,955.1	2.99%	3.29%	462

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Respectfully,

José Cisneros
Treasurer

cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Kevin Kone, Brenda Kwee McNulty
Ben Rosenfield - Controller, Office of the Controller
Mark de la Rosa - Director of Audits, Office of the Controller
Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Francisco Public Library
San Francisco Health Service System

Portfolio Summary
Pooled Fund

As of September 30, 2023

(in $ million) Security Type	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value	Market/Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	$ 3,495.0	$ 3,490.2	$ 3,260.2	93.41	22.61%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	6,793.8	6,790.1	6,561.9	96.64	43.98%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	40.0	40.0	40.0	100.00	0.26%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	2,265.0	2,265.0	2,263.9	99.95	14.67%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	320.0	313.7	313.7	100.00	2.03%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	-	-	-	-	0.00%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds - Government	1,902.1	1,902.1	1,902.1	100.00	12.32%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	636.2	638.2	613.3	96.10	4.13%	30%	Yes
TOTAL	**$ 15,452.1**	**$ 15,439.3**	**$ 14,955.1**	**96.86**	**100.00%**	**-**	**Yes**

The City and County of San Francisco uses the following methodology to determine compliance: Compliance is pre-trade and calculated on a book value basis of the overall portfolio value. Cash balances are included in the City's compliance calculations.

Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution.
The full Investment Policy can be found at https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments

Totals may not add due to rounding.

City and County of San Francisco
Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics

For the month ended September 30, 2023

Average Daily Balance	$15,363,508,029
Net Earnings	$40,342,274
Earned Income Return	3.20%
Weighted Average Maturity	462 days

Investment Type	*($ million)*	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries		$ 3,495.0	$ 3,490.2	$ 3,260.2
Federal Agencies		6,793.8	6,790.1	6,561.9
Public Time Deposits		40.0	40.0	40.0
Negotiable CDs		2,265.0	2,265.0	2,263.9
Commercial Paper		320.0	313.7	313.7
Money Market Funds		1,902.1	1,902.1	1,902.1
Supranationals		636.2	638.2	613.3
Total		**$ 15,452.1**	**$ 15,439.3**	**$ 14,955.1**



Asset Allocation by Market Value

Portfolio Analysis
Pooled Fund





Yield Curves



Source: Bloomberg



	8/31/23	9/29/23	Change
3 Month	5.435	5.446	0.0105
6 Month	5.496	5.541	0.0458
1 Year	5.384	5.448	0.0640
2 Year	4.863	5.044	0.1807
3 Year	4.554	4.799	0.2449
5 Year	4.254	4.609	0.3549

Source: Bloomberg

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

As of September 30, 2023

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	912797FJ1	U.S. Treasury Bill	9/7/2023	11/9/2023	0.00	$ 10,000,000	$ 9,907,775	$ 9,942,908	$ 9,944,200
U.S. Treasuries	912797FL6	U.S. Treasury Bill	9/7/2023	11/24/2023	0.00	10,000,000	9,885,232	9,920,545	9,922,000
U.S. Treasuries	912797HC4	U.S. Treasury Bill	6/27/2023	10/24/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,137,250	49,833,250	49,839,000
U.S. Treasuries	9128285Z9	U.S. Treasury Note	10/4/2021	1/31/2024	2.50	50,000,000	52,511,719	50,360,930	49,517,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2022	2/15/2024	2.75	50,000,000	50,250,000	50,050,741	49,496,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	U.S. Treasury Note	3/9/2021	11/15/2024	2.25	50,000,000	53,160,156	50,964,235	48,297,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	U.S. Treasury Note	3/12/2021	11/15/2024	2.25	50,000,000	53,228,516	50,987,292	48,297,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	7/23/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	52,203,125	51,199,995	46,027,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	8/27/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	51,890,625	51,050,713	46,027,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	U.S. Treasury Note	12/17/2019	11/15/2023	2.75	50,000,000	51,960,938	50,061,751	49,836,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	U.S. Treasury Note	9/2/2021	5/15/2025	2.13	50,000,000	52,849,609	51,248,682	47,625,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828XT2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/6/2021	5/31/2024	2.00	50,000,000	52,263,672	50,518,936	48,861,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	U.S. Treasury Note	3/30/2021	7/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,210,938	50,551,374	48,490,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	U.S. Treasury Note	4/15/2021	10/31/2024	1.50	50,000,000	51,746,094	50,533,941	47,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	U.S. Treasury Note	3/15/2021	12/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,226,563	50,733,626	47,840,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	U.S. Treasury Note	3/30/2021	1/31/2025	1.38	50,000,000	51,515,625	50,527,174	47,486,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	U.S. Treasury Note	4/15/2021	1/31/2025	1.38	50,000,000	51,507,813	50,530,506	47,486,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/15/2021	2/28/2025	1.13	50,000,000	51,011,719	50,361,028	47,195,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/31/2021	2/28/2025	1.13	50,000,000	50,998,047	50,360,134	47,195,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	U.S. Treasury Note	4/15/2021	3/31/2025	0.50	50,000,000	49,779,297	49,916,511	46,605,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	U.S. Treasury Note	4/19/2021	3/31/2025	0.50	50,000,000	49,839,844	49,939,247	46,605,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	U.S. Treasury Note	5/18/2021	4/30/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,615,234	49,846,147	46,353,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	3/8/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,140,625	49,651,885	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	3/9/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,042,969	49,612,080	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,281,250	49,696,316	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,183,594	49,654,826	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/18/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,253,906	49,683,505	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,310,547	49,696,431	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/5/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,500,000	49,776,140	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,406,250	49,733,980	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	48,628,906	49,327,627	45,953,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	U.S. Treasury Note	8/5/2021	7/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,458,984	49,751,415	45,781,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	7/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,363,281	49,707,241	45,781,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/12/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,109,375	49,594,160	45,502,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/26/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,281,250	49,656,393	45,502,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,687,775	45,340,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/2/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,078,125	49,588,294	45,340,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/4/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,048,828	49,574,711	45,340,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/19/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,767,578	49,982,586	49,472,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,402,344	49,939,098	49,472,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	U.S. Treasury Note	12/15/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,443,359	49,942,811	49,472,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,455,078	49,746,935	45,205,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/26/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,271,484	49,661,481	45,205,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/8/2022	3/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	48,708,984	49,709,609	48,855,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/28/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,662,109	49,819,868	45,043,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,730,469	49,855,985	45,043,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCC3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	5/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,939,080	48,412,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,931,641	49,962,410	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,070,313	50,038,920	44,992,000

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,345,703	50,192,206	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,328,125	50,182,433	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,406,250	50,227,763	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/10/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,240,234	50,134,989	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	9/24/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,937,500	49,963,973	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	10/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,593,750	49,763,100	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	1/4/2022	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,027,344	49,404,411	44,992,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,998,047	49,999,476	48,051,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/9/2021	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,960,938	49,989,496	48,051,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	U.S. Treasury Note	4/12/2022	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	47,572,266	49,152,500	48,051,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	U.S. Treasury Note	8/25/2021	8/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,898,438	49,970,167	47,842,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	U.S. Treasury Note	9/28/2021	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,673,759	44,529,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,812,954	44,621,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,802,367	44,621,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/19/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,586,942	44,621,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/3/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,045,825	44,867,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,074,474	44,867,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	48,021,273	44,867,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	48,024,459	44,793,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/23/2022	1/31/2024	0.88	50,000,000	49,390,625	49,894,846	49,256,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2022	1/31/2024	0.88	50,000,000	48,605,469	49,742,223	49,256,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	U.S. Treasury Note	4/6/2022	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,830,070	23,224,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/7/2022	9/15/2025	3.50	50,000,000	48,968,750	49,313,460	48,537,000
Subtotals					**0.90**	**$ 3,495,000,000**	**$ 3,493,783,772**	**$ 3,490,234,396**	**$ 3,260,230,200**
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/18/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	$ 15,955,000	$ 16,008,449	$ 15,973,122	$ 15,651,376
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/18/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	17,980,000	18,043,829	18,001,641	17,637,841
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/12/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	25,500,000	25,552,530	25,517,670	25,014,735
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/16/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	50,000,000	50,204,000	50,068,984	49,048,500
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/10/2021	12/8/2023	2.25	10,000,000	10,301,000	10,028,115	9,930,500
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/10/2021	12/8/2023	2.25	30,000,000	30,903,000	30,084,346	29,791,500
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2021	9/12/2025	1.75	10,295,000	10,575,333	10,436,558	9,661,549
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/12/2021	2/13/2024	2.50	39,010,000	40,648,810	39,278,821	38,577,379
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.70	17,680,000	17,734,631	17,704,054	16,376,100
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,357,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,357,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,357,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,357,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,371,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,371,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,371,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,371,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,314,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,314,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,314,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,314,000
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,281,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,281,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,281,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,281,750

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,431,500
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,431,500
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,431,500
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,431,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,493,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,493,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,493,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,493,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,474,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,474,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,474,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,474,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,829,250
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,829,250
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,829,250
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,829,250
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/25/2022	2/28/2024	2.13	11,000,000	10,987,460	10,997,332	10,849,740
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/25/2022	2/28/2024	2.13	25,000,000	24,971,500	24,993,936	24,658,500
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/4/2022	6/13/2025	3.38	11,940,000	12,000,178	11,975,795	11,578,457
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/3/2022	6/13/2025	3.38	12,700,000	12,806,045	12,763,018	12,315,444
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	10,000,000	10,141,500	10,106,758	9,560,300
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	12,375,000	12,552,829	12,509,167	11,830,871
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/20/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	21,725,000	22,016,550	21,945,090	20,769,752
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/22/2022	6/14/2024	3.13	28,000,000	27,904,520	27,964,591	27,546,680
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/22/2022	6/14/2024	3.13	28,210,000	28,114,932	28,174,744	27,753,280
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/8/2022	7/8/2024	3.00	10,000,000	9,980,600	9,992,543	9,812,100
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/8/2022	7/8/2024	3.00	15,000,000	14,970,900	14,988,814	14,718,150
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/8/2022	7/8/2024	3.00	17,500,000	17,466,050	17,486,949	17,171,175
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	3,000,000	3,012,270	3,009,960	2,957,250
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/8/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	9,915,000	9,975,878	9,964,290	9,773,711
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/8/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	10,000,000	10,065,000	10,052,627	9,857,500
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/11/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	10,000,000	10,036,000	10,029,262	9,857,500
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	24,000,000	24,079,440	24,065,082	23,658,000
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/9/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	25,500,000	25,624,695	25,601,091	25,136,625
Federal Agencies	3130ATT31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/1/2022	10/3/2024	4.50	50,000,000	49,860,500	49,926,872	49,555,500
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/15/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	10,000,000	10,013,300	10,004,415	9,965,600
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	20,000,000	20,000,800	20,000,267	19,931,200
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	25,000,000	24,982,000	24,993,724	24,914,000
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	30,000,000	30,001,800	30,000,601	29,896,800
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	30,000,000	29,978,400	29,992,468	29,896,800
Federal Agencies	3130ATVD6	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/10/2022	9/13/2024	4.88	50,000,000	50,062,000	50,032,059	49,721,500
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	1/8/2024	4.80	11,000,000	10,998,900	10,999,725	10,975,030
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	1/8/2024	4.80	25,000,000	24,987,500	24,996,875	24,943,250
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/9/2023	2/6/2026	4.01	21,100,000	20,985,427	21,009,956	20,676,312
Federal Agencies	3130AUVZ4	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/13/2023	2/13/2025	4.50	50,000,000	49,921,500	49,946,199	49,450,500
Federal Agencies	3130AUYG3	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/16/2023	2/16/2024	5.10	25,000,000	24,996,500	24,998,677	24,950,750
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/3/2023	2/28/2025	5.00	25,000,000	24,967,000	24,976,610	24,861,000
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/3/2023	2/28/2025	5.00	35,000,000	34,953,800	34,967,254	34,805,400
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	17,045,000	16,991,479	16,998,305	16,548,138
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	20,000,000	19,939,200	19,946,624	19,417,000

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	10,000,000	9,934,300	9,941,541	9,771,100
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,899,350	14,910,442	14,656,650
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,992,971	9,918,300
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	15,000,000	14,987,550	14,989,456	14,877,450
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	25,000,000	24,979,250	24,982,427	24,795,750
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	52,000,000	51,956,840	51,963,448	51,575,160
Federal Agencies	3130AWFH8	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2023	7/12/2024	5.51	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,860,500
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/25/2023	6/13/2025	5.13	10,800,000	10,818,036	10,816,256	10,782,720
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/25/2023	6/13/2025	5.13	48,150,000	48,241,967	48,232,890	48,072,960
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2023	6/12/2026	4.75	50,000,000	49,856,000	49,867,191	49,753,000
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/24/2023	10/6/2023	0.00	30,000,000	29,326,250	29,979,583	29,982,900
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/24/2023	10/6/2023	0.00	36,000,000	35,191,500	35,975,500	35,979,480
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	5/5/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,456,750	24,965,833	24,967,250
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	5/5/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,456,750	24,965,833	24,967,250
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/12/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	40,000,000	39,029,333	39,946,667	39,947,600
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/12/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	60,000,000	58,544,000	59,920,000	59,921,400
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/21/2023	10/20/2023	0.00	35,000,000	34,132,972	34,909,486	34,910,400
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	6/6/2023	10/20/2023	0.00	40,613,000	39,807,509	40,500,468	40,509,031
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/21/2023	10/20/2023	0.00	54,113,000	52,772,501	53,973,058	53,974,471
Federal Agencies	313384NK1	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	6/21/2023	10/25/2023	0.00	43,944,000	43,154,216	43,793,565	43,800,303
Federal Agencies	313384NX3	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	6/20/2023	11/6/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,008,660	49,743,250	49,751,000
Federal Agencies	313384PG8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	9/7/2023	11/15/2023	0.00	17,500,000	17,322,565	17,384,281	17,390,625
Federal Agencies	313384PM5	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	9/6/2023	11/20/2023	0.00	10,000,000	9,889,896	9,926,597	9,930,400
Federal Agencies	313384ST7	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/21/2023	2/6/2024	0.00	10,650,000	10,236,780	10,468,240	10,455,425
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2019	12/3/2024	1.63	25,000,000	24,960,000	24,990,608	23,943,750
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/18/2020	2/14/2024	1.43	20,495,000	20,950,604	20,538,391	20,182,451
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/23/2020	3/3/2025	1.21	16,000,000	15,990,720	15,997,333	15,092,480
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/23/2020	3/3/2025	1.21	24,000,000	23,964,240	23,989,723	22,638,720
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	25,000,000	24,974,750	24,991,752	23,813,250
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	50,000,000	49,949,500	49,983,505	47,626,500
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	50,000,000	49,949,500	49,983,505	47,626,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	5,000,000	4,998,200	4,999,757	4,897,350
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	5,000,000	4,998,200	4,999,757	4,897,350
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	100,000,000	99,964,000	99,995,134	97,947,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/18/2021	3/18/2024	0.30	50,000,000	49,939,500	49,990,671	48,840,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/18/2021	3/18/2024	0.30	50,000,000	49,939,450	49,990,663	48,840,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/6/2021	7/23/2024	0.45	50,000,000	50,092,000	50,025,168	48,049,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMWT5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/21/2021	4/21/2025	0.60	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,989,697	46,485,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	16,545,000	16,549,633	16,545,872	16,071,648
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	29,424,000	29,432,239	29,425,550	28,582,179
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	39,000,000	39,010,920	39,002,055	37,884,210
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/9/2021	4/6/2026	0.69	15,500,000	15,458,150	15,477,414	13,953,100
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	4,650,000	4,646,792	4,647,413	4,539,609
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,996,550	4,997,218	4,881,300
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,987,001	20,989,518	20,501,460
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,750	24,986,091	24,406,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/13/2022	6/13/2025	4.25	15,000,000	14,988,383	14,992,098	14,731,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/13/2022	6/13/2025	4.25	15,000,000	14,989,800	14,993,062	14,731,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/13/2022	6/13/2025	4.25	15,000,000	14,989,050	14,992,552	14,731,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2022	12/20/2024	4.25	10,000,000	9,982,900	9,989,567	9,862,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2022	12/20/2024	4.25	25,000,000	24,954,500	24,972,239	24,656,250
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2022	12/20/2024	4.25	25,000,000	24,954,500	24,972,239	24,656,250
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	15,000,000	14,954,700	14,966,108	14,649,300
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	20,000,000	19,939,600	19,954,810	19,532,400
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	25,000,000	24,923,750	24,942,952	24,415,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026	4.00	20,000,000	19,982,400	19,986,591	19,567,600
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026	4.00	30,000,000	29,977,200	29,982,630	29,351,400
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	39,675,000	39,622,232	39,646,901	36,440,297
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	55,000,000	54,923,000	54,958,997	50,515,850
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	10,000,000	9,988,500	9,995,656	9,512,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	10,000,000	9,988,500	9,995,656	9,512,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	50,000,000	49,942,500	49,978,280	47,562,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	25,000,000	24,963,750	24,996,963	24,797,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	25,000,000	24,963,750	24,996,963	24,797,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	75,000,000	74,891,250	74,990,888	74,391,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/9/2021	12/9/2024	0.92	50,000,000	49,985,000	49,994,047	47,386,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/9/2021	12/9/2024	0.92	50,000,000	49,963,000	49,985,315	47,386,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	45,000,000	44,954,100	44,974,647	41,341,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	50,000,000	49,949,000	49,971,830	45,935,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	25,000,000	24,987,600	24,998,641	24,733,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	25,000,000	24,988,000	24,998,685	24,733,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	62,000,000	61,970,488	61,996,766	61,338,460
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/25/2022	2/25/2026	3.32	35,000,000	34,957,650	34,970,951	33,643,050
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ84	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/26/2022	8/26/2024	3.38	50,000,000	49,916,500	49,962,305	49,052,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	20,000,000	19,955,000	19,980,903	18,972,800
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,976,129	23,716,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,976,129	23,716,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/3/2022	1/18/2024	0.90	11,856,000	11,738,815	11,837,380	11,695,588
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/1/2022	1/18/2024	0.90	50,000,000	49,701,000	49,954,482	49,323,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENP79	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/26/2022	9/26/2024	4.25	50,000,000	49,996,000	49,998,025	49,380,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/16/2022	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	47,785,599	43,730,272
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	22,500,000	22,392,338	22,424,371	20,880,225
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	24,500,000	24,377,010	24,413,604	22,736,245
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	25,000,000	24,804,000	24,862,317	23,200,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	20,000,000	19,961,200	19,975,567	18,912,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	30,000,000	29,941,800	29,963,351	28,368,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/16/2022	5/16/2024	2.63	45,000,000	44,939,250	44,981,052	44,237,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/16/2022	5/16/2024	2.63	50,000,000	49,932,500	49,978,947	49,152,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2022	5/23/2025	2.85	6,000,000	5,991,600	5,995,401	5,768,880
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2022	5/23/2025	2.85	20,000,000	19,972,000	19,984,672	19,229,600
Federal Agencies	3133ENYH7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2022	6/10/2024	2.63	100,000,000	99,871,000	99,955,353	98,076,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENYQ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/13/2022	6/13/2025	2.95	50,000,000	49,975,500	49,986,118	48,064,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/17/2022	6/17/2024	3.25	25,000,000	24,970,500	24,989,508	24,623,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/17/2022	6/17/2024	3.25	25,000,000	24,970,750	24,989,596	24,623,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/17/2022	6/17/2024	3.25	50,000,000	49,970,000	49,989,330	49,247,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/10/2022	1/10/2025	4.88	10,000,000	9,999,400	9,999,646	9,929,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/10/2022	1/10/2025	4.88	20,000,000	19,998,800	19,999,292	19,859,400
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/10/2022	1/10/2025	4.88	20,000,000	19,999,580	19,999,752	19,859,400
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ94	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2022	11/18/2024	4.50	25,000,000	24,973,500	24,984,992	24,752,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2022	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	28,040,968	26,357,504

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2022	6/28/2024	3.10	25,000,000	24,987,500	24,995,366	24,579,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2022	6/28/2024	3.10	25,000,000	24,986,500	24,994,995	24,579,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2022	6/28/2024	3.10	50,000,000	49,973,000	49,989,990	49,159,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/10/2023	2/10/2025	4.25	10,000,000	9,947,200	9,964,030	9,847,700
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/10/2023	2/10/2025	4.25	29,875,000	29,716,065	29,766,724	29,420,004
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/21/2023	8/21/2024	4.88	10,000,000	9,995,700	9,997,445	9,950,700
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/21/2023	8/21/2024	4.88	20,000,000	19,992,000	19,995,247	19,901,400
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/21/2023	8/21/2024	4.88	25,000,000	24,990,000	24,994,059	24,876,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,953,500	24,962,834	24,653,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	28,000,000	27,954,080	27,963,298	27,611,360
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,918,000	49,934,460	49,306,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,977,484	9,754,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/15/2023	10/1/2025	4.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,793,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/28/2023	10/28/2024	4.50	20,000,000	19,968,400	19,977,379	19,782,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/28/2023	10/28/2024	4.50	25,000,000	24,959,000	24,970,650	24,728,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,928,500	24,938,227	24,224,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026	3.63	30,000,000	29,905,500	29,918,357	29,068,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	25,000,000	24,982,000	24,984,974	24,491,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	26,500,000	26,483,835	26,486,506	25,960,990
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	30,000,000	29,981,700	29,984,724	29,389,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	20,000,000	19,969,200	19,972,235	19,638,200
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	24,700,000	24,640,226	24,646,116	24,253,177
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	30,000,000	29,951,400	29,956,189	29,457,300
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2027	4.13	28,940,000	28,911,928	28,914,003	28,244,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,987,959	24,675,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,987,959	24,675,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,975,918	49,350,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/7/2023	8/7/2028	4.25	19,500,000	19,412,250	19,414,892	19,045,455
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/14/2023	8/14/2026	4.50	50,000,000	49,885,000	49,890,036	49,511,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	10,000,000	9,979,100	9,979,489	9,872,400
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,962,800	14,963,492	14,808,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	25,000,000	24,943,500	24,944,551	24,681,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	33,000,000	32,904,960	32,906,729	32,578,920
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,991,885	9,952,700
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	19,000,000	18,984,800	18,985,138	18,910,130
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	21,000,000	20,982,780	20,983,163	20,900,670
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/15/2023	9/15/2025	5.00	8,230,000	8,224,074	8,224,204	8,213,458
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/15/2023	9/15/2025	5.00	15,000,000	14,981,850	14,982,247	14,969,850
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/15/2023	9/15/2025	5.00	20,000,000	19,975,800	19,976,330	19,959,800
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,645,250
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,645,250
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,645,250
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,645,250
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	6/29/2023	6/29/2027	5.94	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,774,000
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	6/29/2023	6/29/2027	5.94	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,774,000
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	6/29/2023	6/29/2027	5.94	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,548,000
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	8/16/2023	8/16/2027	6.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,784,250
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	8/16/2023	8/16/2027	6.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,784,250
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	37,938,000	37,367,792	37,674,435	35,342,282
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	7/12/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	50,000,000	50,108,000	50,044,530	46,579,000

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	50,000,000	49,243,950	49,650,534	46,579,000
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	6/17/2025	0.50	4,655,000	4,556,640	4,607,234	4,305,037
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	6/17/2025	0.50	10,000,000	9,789,600	9,897,824	9,248,200
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/4/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	25,000,000	24,684,250	24,865,975	22,869,000
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	2/25/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	72,500,000	71,862,000	72,230,346	66,320,100
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/21/2021	1/7/2025	1.63	39,060,000	40,632,556	39,597,705	37,277,692
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/3/2023	10/3/2024	5.32	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,872,750
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/3/2023	10/3/2024	5.32	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,872,750
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/3/2023	10/3/2024	5.32	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,745,500
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,858,250
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,858,250
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,858,250
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,858,250
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,998,945	4,752,850
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,998,945	4,752,850
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,998,945	4,752,850
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	15,000,000	14,988,450	14,996,836	14,258,550
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	50,000,000	49,961,500	49,989,452	47,528,500
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	4/21/2021	2/12/2025	1.50	53,532,000	55,450,052	54,220,461	50,885,913
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	3/4/2021	9/23/2025	0.38	22,600,000	22,295,352	22,467,632	20,606,680
Subtotals					**2.63**	**$ 6,793,813,000**	**$ 6,782,636,078**	**$ 6,790,090,675**	**$ 6,561,851,727**
Public Time Deposit	PPG24NBE1	Bank of San Francisco	7/10/2023	1/8/2024	5.54	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000
Public Time Deposit	PPG250Y96	Bridge Bank NA	7/17/2023	1/16/2024	5.49	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposit	PPG42YDZ6	Bridge Bank NA	6/19/2023	12/18/2023	5.37	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposit	PPG62B630	Bank of San Francisco	6/5/2023	12/4/2023	5.46	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotals					**5.47**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**
Negotiable CDs	06367CYA9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	10/6/2022	10/6/2023	4.97	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,000,000	$ 49,994,000
Negotiable CDs	06367D3V5	Bank of Montreal/CHI	1/13/2023	1/12/2024	5.24	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	69,884,500
Negotiable CDs	06367D4E2	Bank of Montreal/CHI	3/1/2023	10/24/2023	5.42	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,992,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DAU9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	6/27/2023	6/21/2024	5.87	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,926,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DAX3	Bank of Montreal/CHI	7/5/2023	7/1/2024	6.00	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,017,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DBJ3	Bank of Montreal/CHI	7/17/2023	6/7/2024	5.89	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,985,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DBR5	Bank of Montreal/CHI	7/24/2023	7/1/2024	5.93	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,989,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DBW4	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/1/2023	7/29/2024	5.97	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,003,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DCF0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/28/2023	8/14/2024	6.01	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,028,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DD44	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/22/2023	9/23/2024	5.97	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,016,500
Negotiable CDs	06417MN84	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	12/5/2022	11/21/2023	5.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,992,500
Negotiable CDs	06417MT47	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	2/10/2023	2/9/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,934,500
Negotiable CDs	13606KC38	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	9/11/2023	9/9/2024	5.94	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,999,500
Negotiable CDs	13606KD78	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	9/20/2023	8/12/2024	5.92	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,998,500
Negotiable CDs	13606KRZ1	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	1/10/2023	11/6/2023	5.32	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,988,000
Negotiable CDs	13606KZN9	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	8/2/2023	7/29/2024	5.92	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,977,800
Negotiable CDs	13606KZR0	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	8/7/2023	7/1/2024	5.89	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,977,000
Negotiable CDs	65603AMM0	Norinchukin Bank/NY	9/21/2023	1/23/2024	5.65	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	54,997,800
Negotiable CDs	78015J5K9	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	9/12/2023	9/9/2024	5.90	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,986,200
Negotiable CDs	78015J7F8	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	9/20/2023	8/12/2024	5.93	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,013,200
Negotiable CDs	78015JAK3	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	9/22/2023	9/23/2024	5.96	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,024,600
Negotiable CDs	78015JMJ3	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	11/16/2022	10/23/2023	5.46	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,996,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Negotiable CDs	78015JPE1	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	12/19/2022	12/18/2023	5.37	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,946,500
Negotiable CDs	78015JRE9	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	1/5/2023	12/29/2023	5.43	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,881,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JXW2	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	6/28/2023	6/28/2024	5.89	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,981,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BC73	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	11/2/2022	10/23/2023	5.57	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,999,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BJX9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	12/2/2022	11/20/2023	5.51	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,991,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BNG1	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	6/27/2023	6/5/2024	5.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,968,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BPB0	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/5/2023	1/3/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,953,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BPF1	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/5/2023	1/5/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,951,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BQB9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/17/2023	1/17/2024	5.24	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,912,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BRG7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	7/6/2023	7/1/2024	6.05	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,027,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BS84	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	7/17/2023	7/1/2024	5.91	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,980,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BSQ4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	7/24/2023	7/1/2024	5.93	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,990,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BST8	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/30/2023	1/29/2024	5.21	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,787,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BV80	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	8/2/2023	7/3/2024	5.90	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,982,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BWK2	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/1/2023	2/22/2024	5.58	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,944,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BXF2	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/6/2023	3/6/2024	5.60	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,939,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BY79	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/8/2023	1/29/2024	5.75	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,985,500
Subtotals					**5.68**	**$ 2,265,000,000**	**$ 2,265,000,000**	**$ 2,265,000,000**	**$ 2,263,943,100**
Commercial Paper	62479LCR4	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	9/21/2023	3/25/2024	0.00	$ 60,000,000	$ 58,239,200	$ 58,333,867	$ 58,319,400
Commercial Paper	89233GE36	Toyota Motor Credit	8/8/2023	5/3/2024	0.00	60,000,000	57,489,333	57,993,333	58,017,600
Commercial Paper	89233GE69	Toyota Motor Credit	8/15/2023	5/6/2024	0.00	50,000,000	47,938,889	48,304,444	48,324,500
Commercial Paper	89233HY65	Toyota Motor Credit	6/26/2023	11/6/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,987,722	49,726,000	49,717,500
Commercial Paper	89233HY81	Toyota Motor Credit	8/2/2023	11/8/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,250,028	49,709,194	49,702,500
Commercial Paper	89233HYN8	Toyota Motor Credit	9/5/2023	11/22/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,415,000	49,610,000	49,597,000
Subtotals					**0.00**	**$ 320,000,000**	**$ 311,320,172**	**$ 313,676,839**	**$ 313,678,500**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	9/30/2023	10/1/2023	5.23	$ 12,731,456	$ 12,731,456	$ 12,731,456	$ 12,731,456
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	9/30/2023	10/1/2023	5.27	736,042,083	736,042,083	736,042,083	736,042,083
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fı	9/30/2023	10/1/2023	5.25	12,020,582	12,020,582	12,020,582	12,020,582
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Manageme	9/30/2023	10/1/2023	5.22	15,024,916	15,024,916	15,024,916	15,024,916
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MM	9/30/2023	10/1/2023	5.27	436,879,454	436,879,454	436,879,454	436,879,454
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity F	9/30/2023	10/1/2023	5.27	689,451,452	689,451,452	689,451,452	689,451,452
Subtotals					**5.27**	**$ 1,902,149,942**	**$ 1,902,149,942**	**$ 1,902,149,942**	**$ 1,902,149,942**
Supranationals	45818WDG8	Inter-American Development Bank	8/25/2021	2/27/2026	0.82	$ 19,500,000	$ 19,556,907	$ 19,530,406	$ 17,493,255
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	Inter-American Development Bank	12/15/2021	10/4/2023	3.00	25,756,000	26,837,752	25,760,932	25,753,682
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	Inter-American Development Bank	4/26/2021	1/15/2025	2.13	100,000,000	105,676,000	101,969,906	95,862,000
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	Inter-American Development Bank	11/1/2021	7/15/2025	0.63	28,900,000	28,519,098	28,716,029	26,655,048
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	Inter-American Development Bank	11/4/2021	9/23/2024	0.50	50,000,000	49,595,500	49,862,608	47,568,000
Supranationals	4581X0EE4	Inter-American Development Bank	7/1/2022	7/1/2024	3.25	80,000,000	79,992,000	79,997,001	78,599,200
Supranationals	459056HV2	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	11/2/2021	8/28/2024	1.50	50,000,000	50,984,250	50,317,253	48,174,500
Supranationals	459058JB0	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	7/23/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	40,000,000	40,086,000	40,035,744	37,176,000
Supranationals	45906M3B5	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	3/23/2022	6/14/2024	1.98	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	97,293,000
Supranationals	45906M4C2	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	5.75	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	31,853,120
Supranationals	45950VQG4	International Finance Corp	10/22/2021	9/23/2024	0.44	10,000,000	9,918,700	9,972,722	9,487,900
Supranationals	45950VRU2	International Finance Corp	1/26/2023	1/26/2026	4.02	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	97,342,000
Subtotals					**2.38**	**$ 636,156,000**	**$ 643,166,207**	**$ 638,162,602**	**$ 613,257,705**
Grand Totals					**2.99**	**$ 15,452,118,942**	**$ 15,438,056,172**	**$ 15,439,314,454**	**$ 14,955,111,174**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2023

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	T 2.750 11/15/2023	$ 50,000,000	112,092	(41,167)		$ 70,925
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	50,000,000	15,285	9,236		24,521
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	12,308		22,499
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	50,000,000	15,285	12,355		27,640
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	16,230		26,420
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	16,766		26,956
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	16,369		26,559
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	18,241		28,431
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	T 2.250 11/15/2024	50,000,000	91,712	(70,382)		21,330
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	T 2.250 11/15/2024	50,000,000	91,712	(72,065)		19,647
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	T 1.750 12/31/2024	50,000,000	71,332	(48,159)		23,172
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	T 1.125 02/28/2025	50,000,000	46,360	(20,990)		25,370
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	T 0.125 12/15/2023	50,000,000	5,123	6,966		12,089
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	T 1.375 01/31/2025	50,000,000	56,046	(32,408)		23,638
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	T 1.750 07/31/2024	50,000,000	71,332	(54,412)		16,920
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	T 1.125 02/28/2025	50,000,000	46,360	(20,938)		25,422
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	T 1.375 01/31/2025	50,000,000	56,046	(32,613)		23,433
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	T 1.500 10/31/2024	50,000,000	61,141	(40,450)		20,691
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	T 0.500 03/31/2025	50,000,000	20,492	4,579		25,071
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	T 0.500 03/31/2025	50,000,000	20,492	3,332		23,824
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	50,000,000	10,246	16,678		26,924
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	14,280		24,470
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	16,231		26,421
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	14,882		25,072
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	T 0.375 04/30/2025	50,000,000	15,285	7,999		23,285
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	30,571	5,737		36,307
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	30,571	4,586		35,157
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	1,124		36,790
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCC3	T 0.250 05/15/2024	50,000,000	10,190	8,051		18,241
U.S. Treasuries	912828XT2	T 2.000 05/31/2024	50,000,000	81,967	(64,066)		17,901
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	14,274		24,465
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(1,164)		34,502
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(5,749)		29,917
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(5,457)		30,209
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	66,236	(37,617)		28,619
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	50,000,000	10,246	14,121		24,367
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	10,526		20,717
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	11,147		21,338
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	12,509		22,699
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(6,812)		28,853
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	50,000,000	10,190	13,128		23,318
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	T 0.375 07/15/2024	50,000,000	15,285	55		15,340
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	T 0.375 07/15/2024	50,000,000	15,285	1,094		16,380
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAK7	T 0.125 09/15/2023		2,378	2,070		4,448
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	(4,038)		31,628
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	T 0.375 08/15/2024	50,000,000	15,285	2,806		18,091
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	66,236	(32,938)		33,299
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	T 2.125 05/15/2025	50,000,000	86,617	(63,278)		23,339

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	1,078		36,743
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	50,000,000	30,907	9,190		40,096
U.S. Treasuries	9128285Z9	T 2.500 01/31/2024	50,000,000	101,902	(88,753)		13,149
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,861	5,125		40,985
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,861	5,415		41,275
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	7,086		42,752
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,861	11,317		47,177
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	(1,189)		50,040
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	(1,933)		49,297
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,190	31,616		41,807
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	T 0.125 12/15/2023	50,000,000	5,123	24,361		29,484
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	T 0.125 12/15/2023	50,000,000	5,123	22,876		27,999
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	35,666	17,814		53,480
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	T 0.875 01/31/2024	50,000,000	35,666	25,858		61,523
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	T 0.250 03/15/2024	50,000,000	10,250	52,480		62,730
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	50,000,000	50,951	49,929		100,881
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	51,351		102,581
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	25,000,000	51,230	3,992		55,222
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	T 2.750 02/15/2024	50,000,000	112,092	(11,111)		100,981
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	T 0.875 01/31/2024	50,000,000	35,666	63,388		99,054
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	T 0.375 07/15/2024	50,000,000	15,285	88,281		103,567
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	T 3.500 09/15/2025	50,000,000	143,499	28,806		172,305
U.S. Treasuries	912797HC4	B 0.000 10/24/2023	50,000,000		217,500		217,500
U.S. Treasuries	912797FL6	B 0.000 11/24/2023	10,000,000		35,313		35,313
U.S. Treasuries	912797FJ1	B 0.000 11/09/2023	10,000,000		35,133		35,133
Subtotals			**$ 3,495,000,000**	**$ 2,559,828**	**$ 317,899**	**$ -**	**$ 2,877,727**
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	FFCB 1.625 12/03/2024	$ 25,000,000	$ 33,854	$ 657		$ 34,511
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	15,000,000	18,750	190		18,940
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	5,000,000	6,250	63		6,313
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	5,000,000	6,250	63		6,313
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	5,000,000	6,250	63		6,313
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	50,000,000	62,500	633		63,133
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	FFCB 1.430 02/14/2024	20,495,000	24,423	(9,572)		14,852
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025	24,000,000	24,200	594		24,794
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025	16,000,000	16,133	154		16,287
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	5,000,000	1,042	49		1,091
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	5,000,000	1,042	49		1,091
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	100,000,000	20,833	986		21,820
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	72,500,000	22,656	11,657		34,313
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025	22,600,000	7,063	5,492		12,555
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	25,000,000	7,813	5,794		13,606
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024	50,000,000	12,500	1,656		14,156
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024	50,000,000	12,500	1,657		14,157
Federal Agencies	3133EMWT5	FFCB 0.600 04/21/2025	50,000,000	25,000	544		25,544
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	FNMA 1.625 01/07/2025	39,060,000	52,894	(34,765)		18,128
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	53,532,000	66,915	(41,308)		25,607
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024	39,000,000	11,375	(302)		11,073
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024	29,424,000	8,582	(228)		8,354

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024	16,545,000	4,826	(128)		4,697
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	FHLB 0.700 06/30/2025	17,680,000	10,313	(1,131)		9,182
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025	50,000,000	26,042	(2,348)		23,694
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	FFCB 0.450 07/23/2024	50,000,000	18,750	(2,551)		16,199
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FFCB 0.690 04/06/2026	15,500,000	8,913	738		9,651
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	25,000,000	8,958	691		9,649
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	50,000,000	17,917	1,382		19,299
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	50,000,000	17,917	1,382		19,299
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3133EM6N7	FFCB 0.170 09/27/2023		6,139	1,781		7,920
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025	10,295,000	15,014	(5,965)		9,049
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	FHLB 2.500 02/13/2024	39,010,000	81,271	(59,738)		21,533
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	55,000,000	48,125	1,581		49,706
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	39,675,000	34,716	1,084		35,799
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024	50,000,000	36,458	1,574		38,032
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024	10,000,000	7,292	315		7,606
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024	10,000,000	7,292	315		7,606
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023	25,000,000	10,417	1,494		11,910
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023	75,000,000	31,250	4,481		35,731
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023	25,000,000	10,417	1,494		11,910
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FFCB 0.920 12/09/2024	50,000,000	38,333	411		38,744
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FFCB 0.920 12/09/2024	50,000,000	38,333	1,013		39,346
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FNMA 0.500 06/17/2025	10,000,000	4,167	4,904		9,071
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025	37,938,000	19,759	13,896		33,656
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FNMA 0.500 06/17/2025	4,655,000	1,940	2,293		4,232
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025	50,000,000	26,042	18,425		44,467

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FHLB 2.250 12/08/2023	30,000,000	56,250	(37,212)		19,038
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FHLB 2.250 12/08/2023	10,000,000	18,750	(12,404)		6,346
Federal Agencies	3135G0U43	FNMA 2.875 09/12/2023		26,045	(19,624)		6,421
Federal Agencies	3130AJXD6	FHLB 0.125 09/08/2023		510	1,865		2,375
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023	62,000,000	35,133	1,213		36,346
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023	25,000,000	14,167	510		14,676
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023	25,000,000	14,167	493		14,660
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	45,000,000	43,875	943		44,818
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	50,000,000	48,750	1,047		49,797
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025	20,000,000	18,750	1,237		19,987
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025	25,000,000	23,438	1,547		24,984
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025	25,000,000	23,438	1,547		24,984
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FFCB 0.900 01/18/2024	50,000,000	37,500	12,528		50,028
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FFCB 0.900 01/18/2024	11,856,000	8,892	5,125		14,017
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	48,573,000	68,002	18,807		86,810
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024	25,000,000	44,271	1,213		45,484
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024	11,000,000	19,479	534		20,013
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	20,000,000	44,000	797		44,797
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	30,000,000	66,000	1,195		67,195
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	24,500,000	53,083	2,022		55,105
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	22,500,000	48,750	1,770		50,520
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	25,000,000	54,167	3,222		57,389
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FFCB 2.625 05/16/2024	45,000,000	98,438	2,493		100,931
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FFCB 2.625 05/16/2024	50,000,000	109,375	2,770		112,145
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	25,500,000	61,094	(2,063)		59,031
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	50,000,000	119,792	(8,053)		111,739
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	17,980,000	43,077	(2,526)		40,551
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	15,955,000	38,226	(2,115)		36,110
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FFCB 2.850 05/23/2025	6,000,000	14,250	230		14,480
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FFCB 2.850 05/23/2025	20,000,000	47,500	766		48,266
Federal Agencies	3133ENYH7	FFCB 2.625 06/10/2024	100,000,000	218,750	5,294		224,044
Federal Agencies	3133ENYQ7	FFCB 2.950 06/13/2025	50,000,000	122,917	671		123,587
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024	50,000,000	135,417	1,231		136,648
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024	25,000,000	67,708	1,211		68,919
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024	25,000,000	67,708	1,200		68,909
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024	25,000,000	64,583	513		65,096
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024	50,000,000	129,167	1,108		130,275
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024	25,000,000	64,583	554		65,137
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	27,865,000	75,236	(3,865)		71,371
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024	15,000,000	37,500	1,194		38,694
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024	17,500,000	43,750	1,393		45,143

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024	10,000,000	25,000	796		25,796
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	12,375,000	36,094	(2,984)		33,110
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	10,000,000	29,167	(2,374)		26,793
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	21,725,000	63,365	(4,895)		58,470
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	FHLB 3.125 06/14/2024	28,000,000	72,917	4,133		77,050
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	FHLB 3.125 06/14/2024	28,210,000	73,464	4,115		77,579
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023		16,406	(1,231)		15,175
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023		16,406	(1,201)		15,205
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023		26,250	(1,754)		24,496
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	FHLB 3.375 06/13/2025	12,700,000	35,719	(3,044)		32,674
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	FHLB 3.375 06/13/2025	11,940,000	33,581	(1,729)		31,852
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026	35,000,000	96,833	993		97,826
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ84	FFCB 3.375 08/26/2024	50,000,000	140,625	3,427		144,052
Federal Agencies	3133ENP79	FFCB 4.250 09/26/2024	50,000,000	177,083	164		177,247
Federal Agencies	3130ATT31	FHLB 4.500 10/03/2024	50,000,000	187,500	5,962		193,462
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025	20,000,000	81,250	45		81,295
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025	10,000,000	40,625	23		40,648
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025	20,000,000	81,250	16		81,266
Federal Agencies	313384LJ6	FHDN 0.000 09/06/2023			32,083		32,083
Federal Agencies	3130ATVD6	FHLB 4.875 09/13/2024	50,000,000	203,125	(2,764)		200,361
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	10,000,000	39,583	(833)		38,750
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	21,000,000	72,188	238		72,425
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	5,000,000	17,188	63		17,251
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	4,650,000	15,984	59		16,043
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	25,000,000	85,938	315		86,253
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ94	FFCB 4.500 11/18/2024	25,000,000	93,750	1,088		94,838
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	20,000,000	79,167	(50)		79,116
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	30,000,000	118,750	(113)		118,637
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	FHLB 4.800 01/08/2024	11,000,000	44,000	83		44,083
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	FHLB 4.800 01/08/2024	25,000,000	100,000	947		100,947
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	30,000,000	118,750	1,421		120,171
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	25,000,000	98,958	1,184		100,143
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025	15,000,000	53,125	382		53,507
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025	15,000,000	53,125	335		53,460
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025	15,000,000	53,125	360		53,485
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024	25,000,000	88,542	1,867		90,409
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024	10,000,000	35,417	702		36,118
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024	25,000,000	88,542	1,867		90,409
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	15,000,000	50,000	1,240		51,240
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	25,000,000	83,333	2,087		85,420
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	20,000,000	66,667	1,653		68,320
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	30,000,000	100,000	624		100,624
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	20,000,000	66,667	482		67,148
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025	29,875,000	105,807	6,523		112,330
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025	10,000,000	35,417	2,167		37,584
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026	21,100,000	70,509	3,145		73,654
Federal Agencies	3130AUVZ4	FHLB 4.500 02/13/2025	50,000,000	187,500	3,222		190,722
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	10,000,000	40,625	236		40,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	25,000,000	101,563	548		102,111

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	20,000,000	81,250	439		81,689
Federal Agencies	3130AUYG3	FHLB 5.100 02/16/2024	25,000,000	106,250	288		106,538
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	2,245		184,536
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	1,273		92,419
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	28,000,000	102,083	1,257		103,340
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	10,000,000	34,375	475		34,850
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025	25,000,000	104,167	1,360		105,527
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025	35,000,000	145,833	1,904		147,737
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	FFCB 4.850 10/01/2025	50,000,000	202,083			202,083
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024	50,000,000	221,667			221,667
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024	25,000,000	110,833			110,833
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024	25,000,000	110,833			110,833
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	60,000,000		240,000		240,000
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	40,000,000		160,000		160,000
Federal Agencies	313384MH9	FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023			95,278		95,278
Federal Agencies	313384MH9	FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023			95,278		95,278
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	FFCB 4.500 10/28/2024	20,000,000	75,000	1,727		76,727
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	FFCB 4.500 10/28/2024	25,000,000	93,750	2,240		95,990
Federal Agencies	313384ST7	FHDN 0.000 02/06/2024	10,650,000		42,600		42,600
Federal Agencies	313384LY3	FHDN 0.000 09/20/2023			128,778		128,778
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023	35,000,000		142,917		142,917
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023	54,113,000		220,961		220,961
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	FHDN 0.000 10/06/2023	30,000,000		122,500		122,500
Federal Agencies	313384MD8	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023			81,750		81,750
Federal Agencies	313384MD8	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023			81,750		81,750
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	FHDN 0.000 10/06/2023	36,000,000		147,000		147,000
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	25,000,000		102,500		102,500
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	25,000,000		102,500		102,500
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	10,000,000	36,458	(2,542)		33,916
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	9,915,000	36,148	(2,381)		33,767
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	25,500,000	92,969	(4,884)		88,085
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	17,045,000	53,266	1,422		54,688
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	3,000,000	10,938	(481)		10,456
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	10,000,000	36,458	(1,414)		35,045
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	30,000,000	90,625	2,815		93,440
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	25,000,000	75,521	2,130		77,651
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	26,500,000	88,333	589		88,923
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	30,000,000	100,000	667		100,667
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	25,000,000	83,333	656		83,989
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	20,000,000	62,500	1,626		64,126
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	24,000,000	87,500	(3,144)		84,356

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	313384LR8	FHDN 0.000 09/13/2023			43,333		43,333
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	15,000,000	50,000	2,728		52,728
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	10,000,000	33,333	1,780		35,114
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023	40,613,000		177,682		177,682
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	25,000,000	96,354	859		97,213
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	15,000,000	57,813	515		58,328
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	52,000,000	200,417	1,786		202,203
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	10,000,000	38,542	343		38,885
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	30,000,000	106,250	1,330		107,580
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	20,000,000	70,833	843		71,676
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	28,940,000	99,481	576		100,058
Federal Agencies	3130AWFH8	FHLB 5.510 07/12/2024	50,000,000	229,583			229,583
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	24,700,000	87,479	1,636		89,115
Federal Agencies	313384NX3	FHDN 0.000 11/06/2023	50,000,000		213,958		213,958
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	725		183,017
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	363		91,509
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	363		91,509
Federal Agencies	313384NK1	FHDN 0.000 10/25/2023	43,944,000		188,044		188,044
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027	50,000,000	247,500			247,500
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027	25,000,000	123,750			123,750
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027	25,000,000	123,750			123,750
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	50,000,000	197,917	4,045		201,962
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	FHLB 5.125 06/13/2025	48,150,000	205,641	(4,004)		201,636
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	FHLB 5.125 06/13/2025	10,800,000	46,125	(785)		45,340
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	19,500,000	69,063	1,441		70,503
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	50,000,000	187,500	3,148		190,648
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027	25,000,000	125,000			125,000
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027	25,000,000	125,000			125,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	10,000,000	37,500	343		37,843
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	25,000,000	93,750	928		94,678
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	15,000,000	56,250	611		56,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	33,000,000	123,750	1,561		125,311
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	19,000,000	57,660	338		57,998
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	10,000,000	30,347	185		30,532
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	21,000,000	63,729	383		64,112
Federal Agencies	313384PM5	FHDN 0.000 11/20/2023	10,000,000		36,701		36,701
Federal Agencies	313384PG8	FHDN 0.000 11/15/2023	17,500,000		61,717		61,717
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	8,230,000	18,289	130		18,419
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	15,000,000	33,333	397		33,731
Federal Agencies	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	20,000,000	44,444	530		44,974
Subtotals			**$ 6,793,813,000**	**$ 14,695,696**	**$ 2,500,134**	**$ -**	**$ 17,195,830**
Public Time Deposits	PPG62B630	BKSANF 5.460 12/04/2023	$ 10,000,000	$ 45,500			$ 45,500
Public Time Deposits	PPG42YDZ6	BRIDGE 5.370 12/18/2023	10,000,000	44,137			44,137
Public Time Deposits	PPG24NBE1	BKSANF 5.540 01/08/2024	10,000,000	46,167			46,167
Public Time Deposits	PPG250Y96	BRIDGE 5.490 01/16/2024	10,000,000	45,123			45,123
Subtotals			**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 180,927**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 180,927**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Negotiable CDs	78015JFJ1	RY 4.750 09/20/2023		$ 125,347			$ 125,347
Negotiable CDs	06367CXX0	BMOCHG 4.820 09/25/2023		160,667			160,667
Negotiable CDs	78015JH67	RY 4.760 09/25/2023		158,667			158,667
Negotiable CDs	78015JHJ9	RY 4.810 09/22/2023		140,292			140,292
Negotiable CDs	06367CY27	BMOCHG 4.800 09/22/2023		140,000			140,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CYA9	BMOCHG 4.970 10/06/2023	50,000,000	207,083			207,083
Negotiable CDs	89115BC73	TDNY 5.570 10/23/2023	50,000,000	232,083			232,083
Negotiable CDs	78015JMJ3	RY 5.460 10/23/2023	50,000,000	227,500			227,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BJX9	TDNY 5.510 11/20/2023	50,000,000	229,583			229,583
Negotiable CDs	06417MN84	BNSHOU 5.500 11/21/2023	50,000,000	229,167			229,167
Negotiable CDs	78015JPE1	RY 5.370 12/18/2023	50,000,000	223,750			223,750
Negotiable CDs	78015JRE9	RY 5.430 12/29/2023	100,000,000	452,500			452,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BPB0	TDNY 5.430 01/03/2024	50,000,000	226,250			226,250
Negotiable CDs	89115BPF1	TDNY 5.430 01/05/2024	50,000,000	226,250			226,250
Negotiable CDs	13606KRZ1	CIBCNY 5.320 11/06/2023	50,000,000	221,667			221,667
Negotiable CDs	06367D3V5	BMOCHG 5.240 01/12/2024	70,000,000	305,667			305,667
Negotiable CDs	89115BQB9	TDNY 5.240 01/17/2024	50,000,000	218,333			218,333
Negotiable CDs	89115BST8	TDNY 5.210 01/29/2024	100,000,000	434,167			434,167
Negotiable CDs	06417MT47	BNSHOU 5.430 02/09/2024	50,000,000	226,250			226,250
Negotiable CDs	06367D4E2	BMOCHG 5.420 10/24/2023	100,000,000	451,667			451,667
Negotiable CDs	89115BWK2	TDNY 5.580 02/22/2024	50,000,000	232,500			232,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BXF2	TDNY 5.600 03/06/2024	50,000,000	233,333			233,333
Negotiable CDs	89115BY79	TDNY 5.750 01/29/2024	50,000,000	239,583			239,583
Negotiable CDs	06367DAU9	BMOCHG 5.870 06/21/2024	100,000,000	489,167			489,167
Negotiable CDs	89115BNG1	TDNY 5.850 06/05/2024	50,000,000	243,750			243,750
Negotiable CDs	78015JXW2	RY 5.890 06/28/2024	50,000,000	245,417			245,417
Negotiable CDs	06367DAX3	BMOCHG 6.000 07/01/2024	100,000,000	500,000			500,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BRG7	TDNY 6.050 07/01/2024	50,000,000	252,083			252,083
Negotiable CDs	89115BS84	TDNY 5.910 07/01/2024	50,000,000	246,250			246,250
Negotiable CDs	06367DBJ3	BMOCHG 5.890 06/07/2024	50,000,000	245,417			245,417
Negotiable CDs	06367DBR5	BMOCHG 5.930 07/01/2024	50,000,000	247,083			247,083
Negotiable CDs	89115BSQ4	TDNY 5.930 07/01/2024	50,000,000	247,083			247,083
Negotiable CDs	06367DBW4	BMOCHG 5.970 07/29/2024	50,000,000	248,750			248,750
Negotiable CDs	13606KZN9	CIBCNY 5.920 07/29/2024	60,000,000	296,000			296,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BV80	TDNY 5.900 07/03/2024	50,000,000	245,833			245,833
Negotiable CDs	13606KZR0	CIBCNY 5.890 07/01/2024	50,000,000	245,417			245,417
Negotiable CDs	06367DCF0	BMOCHI 6.010 08/14/2024	50,000,000	250,417			250,417
Negotiable CDs	13606KC38	CIBCNY 5.940 09/09/2024	50,000,000	165,000			165,000
Negotiable CDs	78015J5K9	RY 5.900 09/09/2024	60,000,000	186,833			186,833
Negotiable CDs	13606KD78	CIBCNY 5.920 08/12/2024	50,000,000	90,444			90,444
Negotiable CDs	78015J7F8	RY 5.930 08/12/2024	60,000,000	108,717			108,717
Negotiable CDs	78015JAK3	RY 5.960 09/23/2024	60,000,000	89,400			89,400
Negotiable CDs	65603AMM0	NORNY 5.650 01/23/2024	55,000,000	86,319			86,319
Negotiable CDs	06367DD44	BMOCHG 5.970 09/23/2024	50,000,000	74,625			74,625
Subtotals			**$ 2,265,000,000**	**$ 10,346,311**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 10,346,311**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Commercial Paper	89233HY65	TOYCC 0.000 11/06/2023	$ 50,000,000		$ 228,333		$ 228,333
Commercial Paper	89233HY81	TOYCC 0.000 11/08/2023	50,000,000		229,583		229,583
Commercial Paper	89233GE36	TOYCC 0.000 05/03/2024	60,000,000		280,000		280,000
Commercial Paper	89233GE69	TOYCC 0.000 05/06/2024	50,000,000		233,333		233,333
Commercial Paper	03785EW59	APPINC 0.000 09/05/2023			6,429		6,429
Commercial Paper	89233HYN8	TOYCC 0.000 11/22/2023	50,000,000		195,000		195,000
Commercial Paper	62479LCR4	MUFGBK 0.000 03/25/2024	60,000,000		94,667		94,667
Subtotals			**$ 320,000,000**	**$ -**	**$ 1,267,346**	**$ -**	**$ 1,267,346**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	$ 12,731,456	$ 67,262			$ 67,262
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	736,042,083	3,003,283			3,003,283
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	12,020,582	51,452			51,452
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	15,024,916	64,107			64,107
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	436,879,454	1,712,054			1,712,054
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	689,451,452	2,511,544			2,511,544
Subtotals			**$ 1,902,149,942**	**$ 7,409,702**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 7,409,702**
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	IADB 2.125 01/15/2025	$ 100,000,000	$ 177,083	$ (125,206)		$ 51,877
Supranationals	459058JB0	IBRD 0.626 04/22/2025	40,000,000	20,867	(1,885)		18,982
Supranationals	45818WDG8	IADB 0.820 02/27/2026	19,500,000	13,325	(1,037)		12,288
Supranationals	45950VQG4	IFC 0.440 09/23/2024	10,000,000	3,667	2,286		5,953
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	IADB 0.625 07/15/2025	28,900,000	15,052	8,452		23,504
Supranationals	459056HV2	IBRD 1.500 08/28/2024	50,000,000	62,500	(28,667)		33,833
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	IADB 0.500 09/23/2024	50,000,000	20,833	11,513		32,347
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	IADB 3.000 10/04/2023	25,756,000	64,390	(49,320)		15,070
Supranationals	45906M3B5	IBRD 1.980 06/14/2024	100,000,000	165,000			165,000
Supranationals	4581X0EE4	IADB 3.250 07/01/2024	80,000,000	216,667	328		216,995
Supranationals	45950VRU2	IFC 4.023 01/26/2026	100,000,000	335,250			335,250
Supranationals	45906M4C2	IBRD 5.750 06/15/2026	32,000,000	153,333			153,333
Subtotals			**$ 636,156,000**	**$ 1,247,967**	**$ (183,535)**	**$ -**	**$ 1,064,432**
Grand Totals			**$15,452,118,942**	**$ 36,440,431**	**$ 3,901,843**	**$ -**	**$ 40,342,274**

Investment Transactions
Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2023

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
57734	Buy	89233HYN8	TOYCC 0.000 11/22/2023	$ 98.83	9/5/23	9/5/23	$ 50,000,000	$ 49,415,000	-	$ 49,415,000
57738	Buy	313384PM5	FHDN 0.000 11/20/2023	98.90	9/6/23	9/6/23	10,000,000	9,889,896	-	9,889,896
57739	Buy	912797FL6	B 0.000 11/24/2023	98.85	9/7/23	9/7/23	10,000,000	9,885,232	-	9,885,232
57740	Buy	912797FJ1	B 0.000 11/09/2023	99.08	9/7/23	9/7/23	10,000,000	9,907,775	-	9,907,775
57741	Buy	313384PG8	FHDN 0.000 11/15/2023	98.99	9/7/23	9/7/23	17,500,000	17,322,565	-	17,322,565
57735	Buy	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	99.92	9/8/23	9/8/23	19,000,000	18,984,800	-	18,984,800
57736	Buy	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	99.92	9/8/23	9/8/23	10,000,000	9,991,700	-	9,991,700
57737	Buy	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	99.92	9/8/23	9/8/23	21,000,000	20,982,780	-	20,982,780
57742	Buy	13606KC38	CIBCNY 5.940 09/09/2024	100.00	9/11/23	9/11/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57746	Buy	78015J5K9	RY 5.900 09/09/2024	100.00	9/12/23	9/12/23	60,000,000	60,000,000	-	60,000,000
57743	Buy	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	99.93	9/15/23	9/15/23	8,230,000	8,224,074	-	8,224,074
57744	Buy	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	99.88	9/15/23	9/15/23	15,000,000	14,981,850	-	14,981,850
57745	Buy	3133EPVY8	FFCB 5.000 09/15/2025	99.88	9/15/23	9/15/23	20,000,000	19,975,800	-	19,975,800
57747	Buy	13606KD78	CIBCNY 5.920 08/12/2024	100.00	9/20/23	9/20/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57748	Buy	78015J7F8	RY 5.930 08/12/2024	100.00	9/20/23	9/20/23	60,000,000	60,000,000	-	60,000,000
57749	Buy	62479LCR4	MUFGBK 0.000 03/25/2024	97.07	9/21/23	9/21/23	60,000,000	58,239,200	-	58,239,200
57751	Buy	65603AMM0	NORNY 5.650 01/23/2024	100.00	9/21/23	9/21/23	55,000,000	55,000,000	-	55,000,000
57750	Buy	78015JAK3	RY 5.960 09/23/2024	100.00	9/22/23	9/22/23	60,000,000	60,000,000	-	60,000,000
57752	Buy	06367DD44	BMOCHG 5.970 09/23/2024	100.00	9/22/23	9/22/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
Activity Total				**$ 99.54**			**$ 635,730,000**		**$ -**	**$ 632,800,671**
57721	Maturity	03785EW59	APPINC 0.000 09/05/2023	$ 100.00	9/5/23	9/5/23	$ 11,000,000.00	$ 11,000,000.00	-	$ 11,000,000.00
47503	Maturity	313384LJ6	FHDN 0.000 09/06/2023	100.00	9/6/23	9/6/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47255	Maturity	3130AJXD6	FHLB 0.125 09/08/2023	100.00	9/8/23	9/8/23	20,975,000	20,975,000	-	20,975,000
47418	Maturity	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	100.00	9/8/23	9/8/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
47419	Maturity	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	100.00	9/8/23	9/8/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
47420	Maturity	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	100.00	9/8/23	9/8/23	40,000,000	40,000,000	-	40,000,000
47250	Maturity	3135G0U43	FNMA 2.875 09/12/2023	100.00	9/12/23	9/12/23	29,648,000	29,648,000	-	29,648,000
57670	Maturity	313384LR8	FHDN 0.000 09/13/2023	100.00	9/13/23	9/13/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
47123	Maturity	91282CAK7	T 0.125 09/15/2023	100.00	9/15/23	9/15/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57633	Maturity	313384LY3	FHDN 0.000 09/20/2023	100.00	9/20/23	9/20/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47461	Maturity	78015JFJ1	RY 4.750 09/20/2023	100.00	9/20/23	9/20/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47472	Maturity	06367CY27	BMOCHG 4.800 09/22/2023	100.00	9/22/23	9/22/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47470	Maturity	78015JHJ9	RY 4.810 09/22/2023	100.00	9/22/23	9/22/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47468	Maturity	06367CXX0	BMOCHG 4.820 09/25/2023	100.00	9/25/23	9/25/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57638	Maturity	313384MD8	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023	100.00	9/25/23	9/25/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
57639	Maturity	313384MD8	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023	100.00	9/25/23	9/25/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
47469	Maturity	78015JH67	RY 4.760 09/25/2023	100.00	9/25/23	9/25/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47164	Maturity	3133EM6N7	FFCB 0.170 09/27/2023	100.00	9/27/23	9/27/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57628	Maturity	313384MH9	FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023	100.00	9/29/23	9/29/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
57629	Maturity	313384MH9	FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023	100.00	9/29/23	9/29/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
Activity Total				**$ 100.00**			**$ 726,623,000**		**$ -**	**$ 726,623,000**

Interest Received
Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2023

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
46468	Interest Income	3133ELQY3	FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025	9/5/2023	$ 96,800	$	96,800
47168	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	9/5/2023	134,375		134,375
47169	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	9/5/2023	134,375		134,375
47170	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	9/5/2023	134,375		134,375
47171	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	9/5/2023	134,375		134,375
46467	Interest Income	3133ELQY3	FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025	9/5/2023	145,200		145,200
57523	Interest Income	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	9/8/2023	475,000		475,000
57524	Interest Income	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	9/8/2023	712,500		712,500
57537	Interest Income	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	9/8/2023	712,500		712,500
57538	Interest Income	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	9/8/2023	593,750		593,750
47255	Interest Income	3130AJXD6	FHLB 0.125 09/08/2023	9/8/2023	13,109		13,109
47314	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	9/8/2023	293,750		293,750
47315	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	9/8/2023	293,750		293,750
47316	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	9/8/2023	293,750		293,750
47317	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	9/8/2023	293,750		293,750
47418	Interest Income	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	9/8/2023	421,875		421,875
47419	Interest Income	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	9/8/2023	421,875		421,875
47420	Interest Income	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	9/8/2023	675,000		675,000
57507	Interest Income	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	9/8/2023	237,500		237,500
47321	Interest Income	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	9/11/2023	408,013		408,013
47196	Interest Income	3130A8ZQ9	FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025	9/12/2023	90,081		90,081
47250	Interest Income	3135G0U43	FNMA 2.875 09/12/2023	9/12/2023	426,190		426,190
47160	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	9/13/2023	131,250		131,250
47161	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	9/13/2023	131,250		131,250
47162	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	9/13/2023	131,250		131,250
47163	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	9/13/2023	131,250		131,250
47504	Interest Income	3130ATVD6	FHLB 4.875 09/13/2024	9/13/2023	1,218,750		1,218,750
47123	Interest Income	91282CAK7	T 0.125 09/15/2023	9/15/2023	31,250		31,250
47313	Interest Income	91282CBR1	T 0.250 03/15/2024	9/15/2023	62,500		62,500
47483	Interest Income	91282CFK2	T 3.500 09/15/2025	9/15/2023	875,000		875,000
46973	Interest Income	3133EMTW2	FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024	9/18/2023	75,000		75,000
46974	Interest Income	3133EMTW2	FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024	9/18/2023	75,000		75,000
47461	Interest Income	78015JFJ1	RY 4.750 09/20/2023	9/20/2023	2,407,986		2,407,986
47470	Interest Income	78015JHJ9	RY 4.810 09/22/2023	9/22/2023	2,384,958		2,384,958
47472	Interest Income	06367CY27	BMOCHG 4.800 09/22/2023	9/22/2023	2,360,000		2,360,000
46954	Interest Income	3137EAEX3	FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025	9/25/2023	42,375		42,375
47151	Interest Income	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	9/25/2023	53,750		53,750
47152	Interest Income	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	9/25/2023	107,500		107,500
47153	Interest Income	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	9/25/2023	107,500		107,500
47179	Interest Income	45950VQG4	IFC 0.440 09/23/2024	9/25/2023	22,000		22,000
47197	Interest Income	4581X0DZ8	IADB 0.500 09/23/2024	9/25/2023	125,000		125,000
47468	Interest Income	06367CXX0	BMOCHG 4.820 09/25/2023	9/25/2023	2,423,389		2,423,389
47469	Interest Income	78015JH67	RY 4.760 09/25/2023	9/25/2023	2,393,222		2,393,222
47465	Interest Income	3133ENP79	FFCB 4.250 09/26/2024	9/26/2023	1,062,500		1,062,500
47164	Interest Income	3133EM6N7	FFCB 0.170 09/27/2023	9/27/2023	42,500		42,500
	Activity Total				**$ 23,537,074**	**$**	**23,537,074**

Money Market Fund Activity
Pooled Fund

For month ended September 30, 2023

Ticker	Description	Activity Date	Transaction Type		Transaction Amount
TSTXX	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	9/1/23	Interest Received	$	91,472
TSTXX	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	9/12/23	Withdrawal		(8,000,000)
Activity Total				**$**	**91,472**
FRGXX	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	9/1/23	Deposit	$	15,000,000
FRGXX	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	9/6/23	Deposit		42,000,000
FRGXX	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	9/8/23	Deposit		138,000,000
FRGXX	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	9/29/23	Interest Received		3,003,283
Activity Total				**$**	**198,003,283**
GOFXX	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	9/29/23	Interest Received	$	51,452
Activity Total				**$**	**51,452**
DGCXX	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	9/29/23	Interest Received	$	64,107
Activity Total				**$**	**64,107**
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/11/23	Withdrawal	$	(130,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/13/23	Withdrawal		(43,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/20/23	Withdrawal		(25,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/21/23	Withdrawal		(100,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/22/23	Withdrawal		(48,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/27/23	Deposit		65,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/29/23	Deposit		170,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	9/29/23	Interest Received		1,712,054
Activity Total				**$**	**(109,287,946)**
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/5/23	Withdrawal	$	(30,000,000)
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/7/23	Withdrawal		(50,000,000)
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/14/23	Deposit		40,000,000
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/18/23	Deposit		30,000,000
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/19/23	Deposit		130,000,000
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/25/23	Deposit		50,000,000
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/26/23	Withdrawal		(50,000,000)
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/27/23	Deposit		10,000,000
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	9/29/23	Interest Received		2,511,544
Activity Total				**$**	**132,511,544**

Item 27

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: SFPUC Quarterly Report: Resolution No. 095-23
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 4:42:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png 10.27.23 BOS_QuarterlyReport_ReCAISO11152023.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for a report on quarterly actual California Independent System Operator (CAISO) charges compared with projections and remaining contract expenditures, submitted by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Resolution No. 95-23.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 4:53 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Carr, Barbara (PUC) <BCarr@sfwater.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>
Subject: SFPUC Quarterly Report: Resolution No. 095-23

Hello BOS team,

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

Thank you,
Jenny

Jennifer Oliveros Reyes (she/her/ella)
Policy & Government Affairs
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Cellphone: 628-249-8600
joliverosreyes@sfwater.org

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

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

525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.554.1575

DATE: October 20, 2023

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

THROUGH: Dennis J. Herrera, General Manager DJH
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power

FROM: Suni Jones, Acting Manager, Wholesale/Retail Services SS Simon Steiner acting for Sunita Jones

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

The following quarterly report for the first quarter of FYE24 has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors (Board) in accordance with Resolution No. 095-23.

Resolution No. 095-23 approved Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. PR0.0152, Power Scheduling Coordination and Related Support Services, with APX Inc. This contract allows for the processing of the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) power transmission service charges. Board approval increased the contract by $636,000,000 for a total not to exceed contract amount of $895,742,800, with no change to the five-year term from June 2022, through June 2027.

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

In summary:

- CAISO actual pass-through charges for Year 2 (6/2023 – 9/2023) are $27M compared to Projected annual pass-through charges of $200M.
- Remaining Contract Expenditures are $404M for CleanPowerSF and $292M for Hetch Hetchy Power.

London N. Breed
Mayor

Tim Paulson
President

Anthony Rivera
Vice President

Newsha K. Ajami
Commissioner

Sophie Maxwell
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

BOS EXHIBIT 3: PROJECTED ANNUAL CONTRACT EXPENDITURES			
Year	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
Year 2 (6/2023- 5/2024)	$143,000,000	$57,000,000	$200,000,000
SFPUC ACTUAL CONTRACT EXPENDITURES			
Year	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
Year 2 (6/2023- 9/2023)	$18,468,867	$8,707,117	$27,175,984
PROJECTED MINUS ACTUAL			
Year	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
Year 2 (6/2023 - 9/2023)	$124,531,133	$48,292,883	$172,824,016
REMAINING CONTRACT EXPENDITURES			
End Date 5/2027	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
	$404,386,779	$291,706,141	$696,092,920

This report meets the Quarterly reporting requirement for Fiscal Year 2023/2024 established by Resolution No. 095-23.

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

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Annual Report on the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credit Sales Fund Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 10.100-92
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:22:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png 11.2.23 FY23 LCFS Memo to BOS Signed.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the Annual Report on the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credit Sales Fund, submitted by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-92.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:09 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Clark, Michael (PUC) <MLClark@sfwater.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>
Subject: Annual Report on the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credit Sales Fund Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 10.100-92

Dear BOS team,

The attached annual report has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Section 10.100-92 of the Administrative Code.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Oliveros Reyes (she/her/ella)
Policy & Government Affairs
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Cellphone: 628-249-8600
joliverosreyes@sfwater.org

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

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

Hetch Hetchy POWER

525 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.551.4720
TTY 415.554.3488
HHPower@sfwater.org

DATE: November 1, 2023

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Office of the Controller

THROUGH: Dennis Herrera, General Manager
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power

FROM: Michael Clark, Finance and Administration Manager, Power

SUBJECT: Annual Report on the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credit Sales Fund Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 10.100-92

The following annual report has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors (Board) in accordance with Section 10.100-92 of the Administrative Code.

In Ordinance No. 199-19, the Board established the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credits Sales Fund (Fund #25455) and authorized the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to enter into one or more agreements to sell Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits. The Board also required the SFPUC to "submit an annual written report to the Board of Supervisors and the Controller: (1) specifying the number of Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits sold during the previous fiscal year, the price received for each credit, and the total amount of the sales; and (2) describing the expenditures made from the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credits Sales Fund during the previous fiscal year."

This report meets the reporting requirements established by Section 10.100-92 of the Administrative Code for Fiscal Year 2023.

The City's Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credits

In Assembly Bill 32,[1] entitled the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the Legislature required California to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

To achieve this goal, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted measures and programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from all sectors of the California economy. In 2009, at the direction of then Governor Schwarzenegger, CARB adopted Low Carbon Fuel Standard regulations to

[1] Statutes 2006, Ch. 488.

London N. Breed
Mayor

Tim Paulson
President

Anthony Rivera
Vice President

Newsha K. Ajami
Commissioner

Sophie Maxwell
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

reduce the greenhouse gas intensity[2] of transportation fuels by 20% by 2030. The regulations set benchmarks for greenhouse gas emissions for each type of transportation fuel that are increasingly reduced over time. Transportation providers that use fuels with a carbon intensity (or greenhouse gas emissions) lower than the benchmark established by CARB generate Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits that can then be sold.

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) uses greenhouse gas-free electric energy provided by SFPUC's Hetch Hetchy Power to operate its electric public transit fleet (electric trolley buses, cable cars, historic streetcars, and light rail vehicles). Because this fleet operates with a carbon intensity significantly below the Low Carbon Fuel Standard target, the SFMTA accumulates credits that can be sold.

In October 2017, the SFPUC and SFMTA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding approved by the SFPUC in Resolution 17-0199 that specifies the SFPUC execute the sale of SFMTA's Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits. The Memorandum of Understanding also states that SFPUC and SFMTA share equally the net revenues from these sales, and their use of the revenues support general operations that reduce San Francisco's carbon footprint and/or advance the City's sustainability goals.

Starting January 2022, the Port of San Francisco (Port) signed up for the Hetch Hetchy Power Premium – Low Carbon Fuel Standard Partnership Program and began earning Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits for its provision of shoreside power to docked ships. As part of the initial terms of this partnership, the SFPUC executes the sale of the Port's Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits, on behalf of the Port, retaining 20% of the revenues from these sales, returning the remaining 80% to the Port. Starting July 2022, the terms of the partnership changed, and the Port now receives 100% of the revenues from LCFS credit sales, and instead pays a service fee to SFPUC for performing the credit sale.

FY23 Low Carbon Fuel Standard Credit Sales

For Fiscal Year 2023, the number of Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits sold, price received for each credit, and total amount of the sales are set forth in the table below. There was a total of one transaction in the fiscal year with revenue of $1,364,767.60.

Quantity (Calendar Year)	Credits Sold	Average Price Received	Amount	Date
Quantity 1 (2023)	19,061	$71.60	$1,364,767.60	3/9/2023
Total	**19,061**		**$1,364,767.60**	

Per the respective agreements with each agency, SFPUC transferred $561,379.80 to SFMTA and $210,160.32 to Port. The remaining $593,227.48 was retained by the SFPUC for the Hetch Hetchy Power program.

[2] The Low Carbon Fuel Standard regulations use the term "carbon intensity" instead of greenhouse gas intensity.

FY23 Low Carbon Fuel Standard Expenditures

SFPUC spent $1,162,388 from Low Carbon Fuel Standard Sales fund in FY23, as detailed in the table below. This included expenditures of appropriations from prior fiscal years. SFPUC will continue to expend Low Carbon Fuel Standard proceeds for these and similar projects in future fiscal years.

Project Name	FY23 Expenditures
Northpoint Solar Refurbishment	$554,696
Electric Vehicles in New Construction	$308,509
GoSolarSF	$76,545
Retail Customer Programs	$68,415
Moscone Solar Refurbishment	$47,816
E-Mobility	$38,299
Moscone West Solar Electric Project	$32,742
Small Renewables	$12,690
San Francisco Police Academy Solar Carport	$9,230
Distributed Energy Resources Project Development	$6,739
Utility Field Services Project Support	$6,708
Total	**$1,162,388**

- The *Northpoint Solar Refurbishment* project includes the replacement of existing solar modules and inverters, which were at the end of their life cycle.
- The *Electric Vehicles in New Construction Program* is a newly launched program that provides incentives for installing electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new buildings for Hetch Hetchy customers.
- *GoSolarSF* supports the local solar industry and environmental goals with incentive offerings for customer adoption of rooftop solar throughout San Francisco, as well as addressing social and equity goals with a workforce program and low income and non-profit incentives.
- *Retail Customer Programs* promote emission reductions and decarbonization through electrification, energy efficiency, and improved utilization of SFPUC's Hetch Hetchy electricity within customer facilities and buildings.
- The *Moscone Solar Refurbishment Project* will allow for the replacement of solar array wiring that is at the end of its life cycle to improve system performance. The installation of the original project is approaching its twentieth anniversary.

- *E-Mobility* is a new program currently in development to provide incentives to help low-income customers purchase electric bicycles.
- The *Moscone West Solar Electric Project* will allow for the installation of an 800-kilowatt rooftop mounted photovoltaic generation system owned and operated by the SFPUC Power Enterprise.
- The *Small Renewable Project* funds municipal distributed energy resource projects, such as solar installations.
- The *San Francisco Police Academy Solar Carport Project* includes a 150-kilowatt solar carport and battery storage system at the San Francisco Police Academy. Additional analysis will be performed to determine the feasibility of expanding the functionality of this renewable system into an islanding microgrid with electric vehicle charging.
- *Distributed Energy Resource Project Development* funds initial project scoping and development of potential new advanced energy assets.
- *Utility Field Services Project Support* funds the support of existing solar electric assets in Power's project portfolio.

Each year, the transportation providers that generate LCFS credits are required to report back to CARB on their use of revenue from the sale of credits. The 2022 reporting year is the most current year that has been submitted. For the 2022 reporting year, SFMTA reported out the following to CARB:

> SFMTA operates the nation's largest fleet of electrically-operated trolley buses as well as the nation's 3rd busiest light-rail vehicle fleet. Together with the SFMTA's hybrid electric bus fleet, SFMTA provides low/no emission public transportation options for approximately 700,000 daily riders. All LCFS proceeds go towards supporting LCFS program goals and advancing San Francisco's ambitious climate action goals for the transportation sector: (1) shift 80 percent of all trips to sustainable modes by 2030 and (2) eliminate citywide GHG emissions by 2050. A number of initiatives across a suite of strategy areas help to progress these goals and SFMTA's efforts to expand and/or improve access to electrified public transportation and alternative modes of travel like walking and biking. Examples include, supporting replacement of our hybrid bus fleet with all-electric vehicles and investments in our electric-operated right of way infrastructure like Central Subway. Central Subway entered revenue service January 7, 2023. Additionally, the SFMTA's Bus Rapid Transit corridor began revenue on April 1, 2022.

Since Port sold LCFS credits for the first time in the most recent fiscal year, they have not been required to report back to CARB yet on expenditures. Port will report out their use of the proceeds to CARB for the 2023 reporting year. This will be included in next year's LCFS Sales Memo.

Should you have any questions, please contact Barbara Hale, SFPUC Assistant General Manager, Power, at BHale@sfwater.org and 415-613-6341.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	8 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:37:00 PM
Attachments:	8 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for 8 approved requests to waive 12B requirements.

Requester: Leon Ho
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000003079
Requested total cost: $6,627.07
Short Description: Purchase OEM parts from STERIS CORPORATION for equipment preventive maintenance

Requester: Cristina Alderman
Department: MTA
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000015211
Requested total cost: $4,100,000.00
Short Description: Procurement of ticket vending machines/fare gates for Central Subway Project

Requester: Annyse Acevedo
Department: ADM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000018965
Requested total cost: $7,000,000.00
Short Description: 21.16 Industrial Supplies Citywide Agreement. 1 of 5 Industrial Supplies contracts, Supplier: White Cap LP - TC74106C

Requester: Annyse Acevedo
Department: ADM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000042333
Requested total cost: $7,000,000.00
Short Description: 21.16 Industrial Supplies Citywide Agreement. 1 of 5 Industrial Supplies contracts, Supplier: Global Industrial - TC74106E

Requester: Annyse Acevedo
Department: ADM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000052786
Requested total cost: $7,000,000.00
Short Description: 21.16 Industrial Supplies Citywide Agreement. 1 of 5 Industrial Supplies

contracts, Supplier: Fastenal - TC74106B

Requester: Swati Patel
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000042765
Requested total cost: $75,000.00
Short Description: Quva: Outsourced Sterile Compounding Services

Requester: Sherri Li
Department: CON
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000028248
Requested total cost: $820.34
Short Description: Button Making Supplies

Requester: Sanly Kai Jing Guan
Department: PUC
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000030287
Requested total cost: $9,787.50
Short Description: Requesting 12B Waiver for OSHA 3015 Training 11/27/23 to 11/29/23

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003037 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (PUC) Department Head (Wendy Macy)
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 5:08:15 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003037 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (PUC) Department Head (Wendy Macy).

Summary of Request

Requester: Sanly Kai Jing Guan
Department: PUC
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000030287
Requested total cost: $9,787.50
Short Description: Requesting 12B Waiver for OSHA 3015 Training 11/27/23 to 11/29/23

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4608002_aWrxV67TNhldxPpMse7J

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003041 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (CON) Department Head (Michael Lambert)
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:02:58 AM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003041 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (CON) Department Head (Michael Lambert).

Summary of Request

Requester: Sherri Li
Department: CON
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000028248
Requested total cost: $820.34
Short Description: Button Making Supplies

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4606068_kxCTek7Qq20QROSw9HNw

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003047 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 1:16:19 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003047 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Swati Patel
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000042765
Requested total cost: $75,000.00
Short Description: Quva: Outsourced Sterile Compounding Services

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4602747_USnf7QNdCemePrrOHh15

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003040 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella)
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 12:22:58 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003040 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella).

Summary of Request

Requester: Annyse Acevedo
Department: ADM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000052786
Requested total cost: $7,000,000.00
Short Description: 21.16 Industrial Supplies Citywide Agreement. 1 of 5 Industrial Supplies contracts, Supplier: Fastenal - TC74106B

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4602560_Z3JW1xeMhLJ2NHQdCVYW

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003044 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella)
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 12:22:25 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003044 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella).

Summary of Request

Requester: Annyse Acevedo
Department: ADM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000042333
Requested total cost: $7,000,000.00
Short Description: 21.16 Industrial Supplies Citywide Agreement. 1 of 5 Industrial Supplies contracts, Supplier: Global Industrial - TC74106E

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4602555_HBBGyThDiKi8x8cschSD

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003046 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella)
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 12:22:22 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003046 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella).

Summary of Request

Requester: Annyse Acevedo
Department: ADM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000018965
Requested total cost: $7,000,000.00
Short Description: 21.16 Industrial Supplies Citywide Agreement. 1 of 5 Industrial Supplies contracts, Supplier: White Cap LP - TC74106C

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4602553_McAvxPNt7Iewc1sCZVik

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003042 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (MTA) Department Head (Trinh Nguyen)
Date:	Thursday, October 26, 2023 2:24:29 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003042 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (MTA) Department Head (Trinh Nguyen).

Summary of Request

Requester: Cristina Alderman
Department: MTA
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000015211
Requested total cost: $4,100,000.00
Short Description: Procurement of ticket vending machines/fare gates for Central Subway Project

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4600009_T9izcvFYFknTbOqQsWmW

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0003036 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date:	Thursday, October 26, 2023 1:50:02 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003036 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Leon Ho
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000003079
Requested total cost: $6,627.07
Short Description: Purchase OEM parts from STERIS CORPORATION for equipment preventive maintenance.

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

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

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4599898_Q4MOKTXdi4fn5vrd2NV1

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Notice of Proposed Emergency Regulations - White Sturgeon Fishery
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 4:48:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from the California Fish and Game Commission regarding a notice of proposal for emergency regulations regarding the White Sturgeon Fishery.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: California Fish and Game Commission <fgc@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:55 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of Proposed Emergency Regulations - White Sturgeon Fishery

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

View as a webpage / share

Banner with Fish and Game Commission seal on the left and mountain landscape on the right.

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Emergency Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposal for emergency regulations regarding the White Sturgeon Fishery has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2023-New-and-Proposed#WS-E.

Sincerely,

Jenn Bacon
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, California, CA 95814

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	48 Letters regarding File No. 230985
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:23:09 AM
Attachments:	48 Letters regarding File No. 230985.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 48 letters regarding File No. 230985, which is Item No. 1 on today's Rules Committee agenda.

> **File No. 230985 -** Charter Amendment - Minimum Police Department Staffing and Five-Year Annual Funding Requirement (Dorsey, Engardio, Mandelman)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Brian Wachowicz
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:22:26 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Brian Wachowicz, brian_wachowicz@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: David English
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:16:24 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: David English, cobweb_isle0r@icloud.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Diane Janakes-Zasada
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:04:11 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Diane Janakes-Zasada, djanakes@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Brad Green
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 7:36:42 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Brad Green, bradg@5ht.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: George Consagra
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 7:32:05 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: George Consagra, gconsagra@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: renee tannenbaum
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 7:19:06 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: renee tannenbaum, reneetbaum@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Michael Arredondo
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 6:27:55 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michael Arredondo, Marredondo@attglobal.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Sasha Mitchell Soheili
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:33:33 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sasha Mitchell Soheili, sasha.soheili@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Bernadette Lussier
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:16:51 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Bernadette Lussier, lussierbm@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Susan Lee
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 3:52:45 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Susan Lee, jeunglee.susan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Linda R Miller
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 2:06:55 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Linda R Miller, millerlr@mac.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Stephen Ernst
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 12:10:52 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Stephen Ernst, steve.ernst@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Nick Podell
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 11:59:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nick Podell, nick@podell.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Leslie Boin Podell
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 11:58:53 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Leslie Boin Podell, leslie@podell.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Traci Lee
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 11:12:57 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Traci Lee, trace125@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Mary Innes
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:41:48 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mary Innes, metuvilla@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Jane Smalley
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:35:13 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jane Smalley, janesmalley1@juno.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Karen Schwartz
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:32:48 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karen Schwartz , kielygomes@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: JOHN CERVANTES
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:26:08 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: JOHN CERVANTES, city10s@pacbell.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Francesca Pastine
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 8:46:41 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Francesca Pastine, francesca@pastineart.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD. It is time we stop the victimization of our citizens by criminals. Please support Dorsey's charter amendment to fully staff the SFPD.

Best,

Francesca Pastine,
President of the Inner Mission Neighborhood Association

From: GREG DANIEL
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 8:20:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: GREG DANIEL, gregdaniel@mac.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Tom Rapkoch
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 8:16:35 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Tom Rapkoch, trapkoch@hotmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Bill Jackson
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 7:39:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Bill Jackson, bjacksonsf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Karen Eggert
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 6:24:51 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karen Eggert, keggertsf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Dara Zandanel
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 5:28:08 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Dara Zandanel, dzlaw415@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I FO NOT support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. San Francisco has too many poorly trained police officers who think that they are immune from consequences. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop while they continue to poorly perform their duties since they do not have any consequences to poor performance. When and if they will agree that they exist to serve the people of San Francisco without qualified immunity or criminal indemnification, then we can move forward and reform the current institution.

San Franciscans prioritize public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

More funding leads to more military grade hardware, which we do not need. And more staffing will happen with better educated, and trained officers who seek to serve the residents of San Francisco.

From: Justin Cherniak
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 5:00:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Justin Cherniak, justin.cherniak@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Maryanne Razzo
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 4:53:52 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Maryanne Razzo, mvrazzo@sonic.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: David Chesnosky
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 4:41:49 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: David Chesnosky, dcrevp@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Nancy Gilbert
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 12:54:36 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nancy Gilbert, nancygilbert333@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Denise Gelis
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:48:23 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Denise Gelis, dedegelis@hotmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Elizabeth Townsend
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Saturday, October 28, 2023 4:43:36 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Elizabeth Townsend, inclinebeth@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Peter Hall
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Saturday, October 28, 2023 3:28:33 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Peter Hall, grumpyhall@me.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Philip healy
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 3:37:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Philip healy, lfchere@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Claire Alt
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 9:37:58 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Claire Alt, clairekalista@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: HILARY ARMSTRONG
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 8:08:16 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: HILARY ARMSTRONG, hilaryarmstrong747@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Jen Rinehart
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 7:05:13 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jen Rinehart, jdolinsf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Mary Erikson-Ishisaki
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 2:38:45 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mary Erikson-Ishisaki, b1m2hec3@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Eleanor Bigelow
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 10:19:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Eleanor Bigelow, eleanor@websterpacific.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Rebecca Saroyan
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 8:49:17 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Rebecca Saroyan, rebecca.saroyan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Gregory Leung
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 6:54:37 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Gregory Leung, leungmangregory@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Martha Ehmann Conte
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 6:36:15 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Martha Ehmann Conte, martha@ehmannconte.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Ray Kwong
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 4:36:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ray Kwong, raykwong7@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Amy Kong
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 4:35:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Amy Kong, amykong@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Ka Cheng
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 3:53:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ka Cheng, chengkayi@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Robert Zerbst
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 12:49:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Robert Zerbst, rzerbst201@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: anne zerbst
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 12:49:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: anne zerbst, azerbst@mindspring.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Kelvin Chan
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 12:19:14 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kelvin Chan, k.chan2424@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Minky Fang
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 12:11:00 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Minky Fang, m.fang@apaccsf.org

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	18 Letters regarding File No. 230985
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:12:00 AM
Attachments:	18 Letters regarding File No. 230985.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 18 letters regarding File No. 230985, which is Item No. 21 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 230985 -** Charter Amendment - Minimum Police Department Staffing and Five-Year Annual Funding Requirement (Dorsey, Engardio, Mandelman)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Spencer Lee
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:54:07 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Spencer Lee, sspence37@Yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Eric Roddie
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 11:22:11 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Eric Roddie, ericdotroddie@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Eric Roddie
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 11:10:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Eric Roddie, ericdotroddie@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Jane Perry
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 9:30:48 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jane Perry, janesjoint5@comcast.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Karin Flood
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 9:19:49 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karin Flood, karin@floodbuilding.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Karin Pond
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 9:14:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karin Pond, karin.pond@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Lenard Pond
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 9:05:04 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Lenard Pond, la_pond@hotmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: kristina cahojova
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 6:47:55 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: kristina cahojova, kristina.cahojova@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Erika Kim
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 6:29:40 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Erika Kim, e_kimch@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Eric Floyd
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:36:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Eric Floyd, floyderict@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Kristi Major
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:21:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kristi Major, kristilynmajor@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: lucy junus
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 4:32:38 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: lucy junus, lujunus@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: sloane conway
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 12:55:17 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: sloane conway, sloanelconway@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Janet Pond
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 12:21:53 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Janet Pond, pond.janet@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Preston Jeung
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 11:04:17 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Preston Jeung, prjeung@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: james delman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 10:19:52 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: james delman, jbentdel@comcast.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

SUPES" WORRY LESS ABOUT HOUSING AND CRAZY RENT CONTROL GUIDELINES AND GIVE AWAY "FREE HOUSING....' When everyone leaves SF, AND ALL THE SMALL BUSINESSES CLOSE WHO the hell is going to pay for all your freebies , subsidies, reparations, monitoring, and "give aways?"
CAN you convince SACRAMENTO TO subsidize our housing, so we can move to Hillsborough or Atherton? After all, if you endorse such absurd CONCEPTS
as "HOUSING IS A RIGHT"- It is a right if you can afford it, otherwise leave Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1840- "Property is Theft.".."What is P{property").
to the historical trash bin!

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

SUJPES" WORRY LESS ABOUT HOUSING AND CRAZY

RENT CONTROL GUIDELINES AND GIVE AWAY "FREE HOUSING....' When everyone leaves SF, AND ALL THE SMALL BUSINESSES CLOSE OR MOVE. who the hell is going to pay for all the new and proposed services monitoring, and "give aways?"
ses close?

From: Mary Harris
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 10:11:13 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mary Harris, Maryharris_sf@outlook.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: David Huey
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 9:49:16 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: David Huey, synergismpartners@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	110 Letters regarding File No. 230985
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:55:00 PM
Attachments:	110 Letters regarding File No. 230985.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 110 letters regarding File No. 230985.

> **File No. 230985 -** Charter Amendment - Minimum Police Department Staffing and Five-Year Annual Funding Requirement (Dorsey, Engardio, Mandelman)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Mikhail Kouznetsov
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:26:49 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mikhail Kouznetsov, mikhail.kouznetsov@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Steven Lee
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:10:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Steven Lee, bdlineman@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Kristap Baltin
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 12:34:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kristap Baltin, kballin@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 8

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Joan Barkan
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 12:03:15 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Joan Barkan, joan.b.barkan@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Flo Kimmerling
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:43:24 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Flo Kimmerling, geokimm@sbcglobal.net

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Paul Holzman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:19:09 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Paul Holzman, pbholzman@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Alan Burradell
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:14:46 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Alan Burradell, alanburradell@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 8

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Michael Goodwin
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 10:40:02 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michael Goodwin, sfhunggar@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 5

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Angela Tickler
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 10:28:20 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Angela Tickler, angela.tickler@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: O Donoghue John
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:40:23 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: O Donoghue John, johnod5274@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Mari Murayama
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:15:38 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mari Murayama, mdmurayama@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

Mari Murayama
District 1

From: Wilson Constantine
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:09:24 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Wilson Constantine , wconstantine@me.com

I am a resident of District 8

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Maria Cruz
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:03:39 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Maria Cruz, monica_dnc@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Tony Tran
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:03:37 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Tony Tran, tonyt813@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Margaret Parker
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:03:29 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Margaret Parker, parkmar@aol.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Nora Rooney
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:03:25 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nora Rooney, norarooney26@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Molly Elliott
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:00:51 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Molly Elliott, poncasue@aol.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Jay Elliott
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:00:15 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jay Elliott, jayelliott415@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Leanna Louie
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 8:39:49 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Leanna Louie, leannalouie28@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 11

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: solo zyscovich
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 8:36:59 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: solo zyscovich , zidsrudioz@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Rebecca Doherty
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 8:00:50 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Rebecca Doherty, rebeccadoherty@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Rebecca Doherty
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 7:45:19 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Rebecca Doherty, rebeccadoherty@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: victoire reynal
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 7:09:56 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: victoire reynal, victoirereynal@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Spencer Sherwin
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:30:22 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Spencer Sherwin, spencer.sherwin@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 5

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Maria Cruz
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:54:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Maria Cruz, monica_dnc@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Anjali Billa
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:24:36 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Anjali Billa, anjalibilla@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Tricia Young
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:21:40 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Tricia Young, hillmanranchgal@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Roberta Economidis
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:12:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Roberta Economidis , reconomidis@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 3

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Ann Marie Porter
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:09:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ann Marie Porter, porterssf@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Peter Elden
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:15:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Peter Elden, peterelden@sbcglobal.net

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Josie Su
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:15:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Josie Su, josiesu@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: William Dymek
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:06:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: William Dymek, bdymekster@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 8

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost. For example, the no-bid contracts awarded to Urban Alchemy. Ambassadors are not a substitute for academy trained police officers.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Jordan Pappas
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:01:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jordan Pappas, jordanjpappas@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 9

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Dearan Roche
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:39:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Dearan Roche, dearan.m.roche@tcu.edu

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Cullen Roche
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:39:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Cullen Roche, cullen.roche1992@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Eamon Roche
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:39:22 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Eamon Roche, eamon415roche@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Aislin Palladino
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:39:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Aislin Palladino, aislin.palladino@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Kevin Roche
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:35:40 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kevin Roche, krochemusic@aol.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Marina Roche
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:35:12 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Marina Roche, marinaroche@icloud.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Susan McDonough
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:31:15 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Susan McDonough, sdrcrm@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Zoe Fuentes
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 8:36:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Zoe Fuentes, travelzoe@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Leila Sen
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 8:31:40 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Leila Sen, leila@leilasen.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Liz Le
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 8:26:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Liz Le, lizetsyl@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Allene Jue
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 8:22:35 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Allene Jue, allenejue@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Doreen Horstin
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 7:45:50 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Doreen Horstin, doreen.horstin@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Edwin Gackstetter
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 7:24:47 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Edwin Gackstetter, hiedwin@duck.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

This is a disqualifier for Mayor. You have lost any chance to gain my vote.

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Cole Sapiro
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:56:50 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Cole Sapiro, hiatal-curly-0h@icloud.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Tessa Sapiro
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:56:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Tessa Sapiro, hiatal-curly-0h@icloud.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Eddy Sapiro
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:56:02 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Eddy Sapiro, hiatal-curly-0h@icloud.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Christina Pappas
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:18:22 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Christina Pappas, scoutca66@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Julie Fitzgerald
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:03:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Julie Fitzgerald, jafitz22@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Peter Lehman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:00:33 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Peter Lehman, plehman@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Chris Lehman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:00:33 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Chris Lehman, crlehman@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Andrew Lehman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:58:11 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrew Lehman, aclehman@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Carla Schlemminger
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:51:43 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Carla Schlemminger, carlas@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: RICHARD MANSO
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:41:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: RICHARD MANSO, rmanso2016@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Erin Murphy
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:23:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Erin Murphy, minimurph22@comcast.net

I am a resident of District 11

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Maria Aldaz
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:18:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Maria Aldaz, mealdaz58@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 9

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Andrew Wynn
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:15:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrew Wynn, andrew@useascend.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Álvaro schor
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:09:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Álvaro schor, alvaroschor@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: CAIR-SFBA
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: CAIR-SFBA Calls on Monterey County DA to Press Charges in Anti-Palestinian Hate Crime
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:06:07 PM

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

Stay In Touch With Us:

CAIR-SFBA Calls on Monterey County DA to Press Charges in Anti-Palestinian Hate Crime

(SANTA CLARA, CA - 11/1/2023) – The San Francisco Bay Area office of the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR-SFBA), the nation's largest Muslim civil rights and advocacy organization, today called on the Monterey County District Attorney to take action in response to an alleged hate crime that occurred more than two weeks ago and to file charges against the perpetrator.

The incident involved two Palestinian-American Muslim siblings and a Native American relative, who were at a beach in Sand City, Calif., when they were reportedly approached by a stranger, later identified as Max Steiner.

The three women were expressing their support for Palestine by writing *Free Gaza* in the sand when they were confronted by Steiner. He reportedly initiated an argument, vandalized their sand art, and, in an alarming turn of events, allegedly attempted choked the youngest woman, a 13-year-old, as he attempted to grab the phone she was using to record the encounter.

Although the argument was captured on video and shared on TikTok, the physical altercation itself was not recorded. Steiner admitted responsibility for the incident on social media, with the exception of the physical attack.

SEE: Man ruins “Free Gaza” message written in Sand City dunes by local Palestinian women, police are investigating

The victims and their family reported the hate-motivated incident to local law enforcement and have repeatedly expressed their desire to press charges and seek justice for the distressing violence they endured.

In response to this incident, **CAIR-SFBA Senior Civil Rights Attorney Jeffrey Wang** stated, *"This incident seems to be an example of a blatant hate-motivated assault, and the legal system must act swiftly to ensure that justice is served. It is imperative that the Monterey County District Attorney's office takes this matter seriously and files appropriate charges against the individual responsible. Hate incidents like this have no place in our society."*

CAIR-SFBA Executive Director Zahra Billoo added, *"Justice delayed is justice denied. This attack happened more than two weeks ago, and these young women's assailant has yet to be held accountable. The Monterey County District Attorney's office needs to take action quickly and ensure that alleged hateful people like Steiner, who would attack a group of young women, are not given a blank check to do so in our region."*

CAIR-SFBA stands in solidarity with the family, the Palestinian community, and their allies. We urge the community to remain vigilant, support peaceful expressions of free speech, and report any suspicious or hate-motivated activities to local authorities and CAIR-SFBA. It is only by working together that we can build a society that is free from discrimination, violence, and hate.

CAIR-SFBA is an office of CAIR, America’s largest Muslim civil liberties and advocacy organization. Its mission is to enhance understanding of Islam, protect civil rights, promote justice, and empower American Muslims.

END

CONTACT: CAIR-SFBA Senior Communications Coordinator Lorrie Adam, ladam@cair.com, 408.986.9874

CAIR-SFBA
3160 De La Cruz Blvd., Suite 110,
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Contact Us

Share This Email Share This Email Share This Email

CAIR-California | 3160 De La Cruz Blvd., #110, Santa Clara, CA 95054

Unsubscribe board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Update Profile | Constant Contact Data Notice

Sent by nocal@cair.com

From: Jiyeon Kim
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:03:38 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jiyeon Kim, nickkennedy112@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: jennifer Yan
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:00:06 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: jennifer Yan, jennifer.yan@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Danielle Wang
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:57:05 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Danielle Wang, daniellewy2012@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Ashley DeVore
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:39:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ashley DeVore, ashleycdevore@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 8

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Colton Weeks
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:36:33 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Colton Weeks, coltonw@msn.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Stephen Martin-Pinto
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:33:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Stephen Martin-Pinto, stephen@stephenmartinpinto.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Erin OGrady
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:28:47 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Erin OGrady, erogrady@pacbell.net

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Mitchell Smith
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:28:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mitchell Smith, htimsm1@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Sonny Lee
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:23:38 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sonny Lee, hobosf2@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Colleen Harvey
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:09:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Colleen Harvey , colleen.harvey@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Mark Felix
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:00:35 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mark Felix, mafelix86@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Angela Tickler
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:00:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Angela Tickler, angela.tickler@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Todd Davis
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:00:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Todd Davis, td@hoyablue.com

I am a resident of District 3

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Sara Starr
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:57:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sara Starr, sarastarr2r@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Roger Wong
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:54:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Roger Wong, outersunsetresi@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Jay Lnag
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:49:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jay Lnag, jim.lang.aa@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Patrick Bedwell
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:39:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Patrick Bedwell, pmbedwell@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 9

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Vikram Gupta
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:33:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Vikram Gupta, vkgsfca@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Victoria Barret
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:33:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Victoria Barret, vbarret@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: ANNIE WONG
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:29:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: ANNIE WONG, annie_wong29@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Angie Yap
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:22:50 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Angie Yap, ayhc69@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Jonathan Shulman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:19:57 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jonathan Shulman , shulman.j@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous. We already pay very high taxes.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Paul Morrison
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:09:15 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Paul Morrison, paulhm.sf@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 11

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Forrest Liu
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:06:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Forrest Liu, forrest.liu@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: William Brega
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:03:33 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: William Brega, willbrega36@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Karina Velasquez
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 3:03:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karina Velasquez, karinawinder@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Teresa Shaw
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:51:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Teresa Shaw, tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Dea Smeed
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:48:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Dea Smeed, dealazaro@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Shannon Thomson
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:48:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Shannon Thomson, thomsonshop1945@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 8

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Heather Kirkpatrick
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:45:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Heather Kirkpatrick, h.kirkpatrick3@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Kwabena Agyeman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:42:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kwabena Agyeman, kwagyeman@openmv.io

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Erica Sandberg
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:42:22 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Erica Sandberg, esandberg_2000@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 3

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Anthony Fox
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:39:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Anthony Fox, sftonyfox@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 5

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Andrew Klein
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:38:12 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrew Klein, andrew.e.klein@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Garry Tan
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:34:53 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Garry Tan, garrytan@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 8

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Theo Cincotta
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:34:13 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Theo Cincotta, theocincotta@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Nikhil Gowda
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:15:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nikhil Gowda, ngowda1223@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Kirill Skobelev
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:15:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kirill Skobelev, kskobelev@me.com

I am a resident of District 6

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Jan Diamond
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:06:33 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jan Diamond, janmdiamond@pacbell.net

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Stephanie Lehman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:58:37 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Stephanie Lehman, slehman21@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 1

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Ana Duffy
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:51:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ana Duffy, anaduffy14@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Michelle Quach
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:42:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michelle Quach, lobbieq@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Linda Mathews
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:36:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Linda Mathews, linda.mathews@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

Really? This is unbelievable. You want to increase our taxes because we want a fully staffed police force? We have a budget larger than entire states. You want to run for mayor and are asking to increase our taxes when we are asking for the BASIC services that a city should provide each and everyone on of their constituents? There is plenty of money in the budget. Please use it wisely and increasing taxes so the taxpayers can be provided with a fully staffed police force is unreasonable when we have a budget of 14.6 billion. I am 100 percent sure the money is there. We will remember this when it’s time to vote.

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider

ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Andrew Homan
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:33:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrew Homan, andrewhoman@mac.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Patrick Wolff
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:30:44 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Patrick Wolff, patrick@grandmastercap.com

I am a resident of District 4

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Stephen Wynne
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:27:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Stephen Wynne, stephenmwynne@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Anika Steig
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: I OPPOSE Safai"s charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:18:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Anika Steig, anika.steig@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 5

Message: I OPPOSE Safai's charter amendment to increase taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis.

Dear Supervisor Safai,

I am writing to vehemently OPPOSE your amendment to Supervisor Dorsey's SPFD staffing plan. Increasing our taxes to solve the SFPD staffing crisis is irresponsible and demonstrates a disregard for residents who struggle to afford to live in San Francisco, and who expect public safety and a fully staffed police department to be part of the basic city services we already pay for.

We need the restoration of public safety now so that residents and business owners can feel reasonably safe again. This is a top priority for the majority of San Franciscans, and a fully staffed police force is needed to do the work that is necessary.

The net amount needed to fund the ORIGINAL Dorsey Charter amendment is estimated to be $20M annually (after accounting for overtime savings).

We are hard-pressed to believe that the money couldn't be found in the city budget. Perhaps you should consider ending the funding of just one ineffective non-profit annually to cover that cost.

You have recently overseen a city budget that has DOUBLED since 2017, and you are telling the working residents of San Francisco that taxes must be raised for the city to provide basic law enforcement services and address a public safety crisis that city leaders should have handled long ago.

This is unacceptable and outrageous.

I do not support your amendment that guts Supervisor Dorsey's charter amendment for SFPD staffing and request that you withdraw it immediately or kill the bill entirely.

From: Stephen Wynne
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 7:18:54 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Stephen Wynne, stephenmwynne@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: Amy Winthrop
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 2:39:34 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Amy Winthrop, Awinthrop@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	23 Letters regarding File No. 230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 11:54:00 AM
Attachments:	23 Letters regarding File No. 230446.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 23 letters regarding File No. 230446, which is Item No. 4 on today's Land Use and Transportation Committee agenda.

> **File No. 230446 -** Planning and Subdivision Codes, Zoning Map - Housing Production (Mayor, Engardio, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	UPDATED PUBLIC SIGN-ON **GUT & REPLACE** 17 Orgs *OPPOSE* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 4:56:15 PM
Attachments:	SF_CEQA_Defenders_Sign-On_October-26-2023.pdf

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

UPDATED PUBLIC SIGN-ON **GUT & REPLACE**

17 Environmental, Environmental Justice & Community Organizations Join To Strongly *OPPOSE* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Constraints Reduction' 'Housing' Ordinance *(See updated sign-on below, and attached in PDF format.)*

IMPORTANT: WE DEMAND THAT SUPERVISORS *GUT AND REPLACE* the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance.

It is ***unacceptable*** that some supervisors continue to suggest 'negotiating' amendments with the Mayor's office, to this egregiously destructive ordinance. The text must be ***completely*** deleted and replaced with text drafted by supervisors on the Land Use and Transportation Committee and other environmental and affordable housing allies, with full community participation at the drafting table.

Here and attached is our updated sign-on letter.

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee

SPEAK Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

October 26, 2023
To: City and County of San Francisco Decision Makers - 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **OPPOSE** Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" ("Housing Production") **File #230446**
Dear San Francisco Decision Makers: The undersigned environmental, housing, economic justice, community, and climate crisis response organizations write to voice our ***strong*** opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" ordinance. It would enact drastic and sweeping exceptions to San Francisco's environmental and community review of real estate projects and would undermine health, environmental, economic and neighborhood protections. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

-

The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Sincerely:

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee
California Alliance of Local Electeds Californians for Energy Choice Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Concerned Residents of the Sunset East Mission Improvement Association Extinction Rebellion SF Bay Area Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association Our City SF Our Neighborhood Voices San Franciscans for Urban Nature San Francisco Green Party San Francisco Tomorrow Save Our Neighborhoods SF Sunflower Alliance Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee

SPEAK SUNSET PARKSIDE EDUCATION AND ACTION COMMITTEE

October 26, 2023

To: City and County of San Francisco Decision Makers - 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **OPPOSE** Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" ("Housing Production") **File #230446**

Dear San Francisco Decision Makers:

The undersigned environmental, housing, economic justice, community, and climate crisis response organizations write to voice our ***strong*** opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" ordinance. It would enact drastic and sweeping exceptions to San Francisco's environmental and community review of real estate projects and would undermine health, environmental, economic and neighborhood protections.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is *not* affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 per year "affordable". We already have a 50% *oversupply* of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing *more* greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Sincerely:

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee
California Alliance of Local Electeds
Californians for Energy Choice
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Concerned Residents of the Sunset
East Mission Improvement Association
Extinction Rebellion SF Bay Area
Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Our City SF
Our Neighborhood Voices
San Franciscans for Urban Nature
San Francisco Green Party
San Francisco Tomorrow
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sunflower Alliance
Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	RL; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Cc:	Eric Brooks
Subject:	RE: OPPOSE THIS ORDINANCE: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 11:44:38 AM

We received it. I'll be adding it to the file later.

Thanks JEC

From: RL <redpl@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 10:34 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Eric Brooks <brookse32@sonic.net>
Subject: Fwd: OPPOSE THIS ORDINANCE: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

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

Dear Supervisors,

Sending this to you all from my personal email, as I wanted to make sure you received this letter. Not sure if Our Group email, SON-SF, would be accepted or go through.

Thank you,
Renee Lazear
D4 Resident
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

Begin forwarded message:

From: SON-SF SaveOurNeighborhoodsSF <info@sonsf.org>
Subject: OPPOSE THIS ORDINANCE: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446
Date: October 30, 2023 at 10:25:56 AM PDT
To: Aaron Peskin <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>, sunny.angulo@sfgov.org, peskinstaff@sfgov.org, Dean Preston <dean.preston@sfgov.org>, Kyle.Smeallie@sfgov.org, prestonstaff@sfgov.org, John.Carroll@sfgov.org, Alisa.Somera@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org, jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org, MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, Connie Chan <connie.chan@sfgov.org>, Kelly.Groth@sfgov.org, ChanStaff@sfgov.org, rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org, mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org, adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org, Hillary Ronen <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>, ana.herrera@sfgov.org, ronenstaff@sfgov.org, Shamann Walton <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>, Percy.Burch@sfgov.org, waltonstaff@sfgov.org, Ahsha Safai <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>, jeff.buckley@sfgov.org, safaistaff@sfgov.org, Catherine Stefani <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>, Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org, stefanistaff@sfgov.org, Joel Engardio <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>, "Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS)" <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>, engardiostaff@sfgov.org, matt.dorsey@sfgov.org, Madison.R.Tam@sfgov.org, dorseystaff@sfgov.org, Bill.Barnes@sfgov.org, lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org, lila.carrillo@sfgov.org
Cc: Eric Brooks <brookse32@sonic.net>

Dear Supervisors,

I have written 2-3 other times and added my personal points / comments to the below letter so I will not be sending those same letters again. If you'd like to re-read them, they can be pulled from your records.

Please FORGIVE THE CAPS but felt needed to highlight points. Also, I may be repeating some of those points/comments

from previous letters but felt important to repeat and emphasize them.

1) There is NO reason to keep creating ordinances like this or any others. They will DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOODS for MANY reasons (e.g. INFRASTRUCTURE, TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT ETC.) as to BUILD ON EVERY CORNER / 4 PLEXES ON EVERY SFR LOT REGARDLESS OF THE HEIGHT BUT ESPECIALLY DO NOT BUILD OVER 2 STORIES

2) The POPULATION HAS & IS STILL DECLINING! There are ALREADY APPROXIMATELY 143,000 units (that will be, are & in the pipeline) AVAILABLE. The MATH is SIMPLE! 143,000 - 82,000 RHNA #'S = 61,000 LEFT. THERE ARE OTHER OPTIONS - AKA CONVERTING EXISTING UNITS/HOUSING!

3) There are NO reasons to BUILD MORE HOUSING when there are PLENTY VACANT UNITS (SFR/OTHER) that can be CONVERTED.

4) RHNA (HCD) has INCORRECTLY OVER-INFLATED THE # OF HOUSING WE NEED IN SF / CALIFORNIA. Support an AUDIT!

5) These type Ordianance will NOT BE FINANCIALLY BENEFICIAL TO THE PERSON SELLING THEIR HOME - EXAMPLES:

a) Owner(s) will have to pay CAPITAL GAINS - CREATING LESS FINANCIAL POWER/FREEDOM available to Owner(s)
b) Will NEED most likely to RENT somewhere while unit is being constructed and will DEPLETE THEIR FUNDS
c) CREATES STRESS & COSTS OF MOVING OUT & BACK IN INTO A UNIT ONCE BUILT/AVAILABLE, which a UNIT MAY NOT EVEN BE AVAILABLE to the Owner(S) who sold property to build one of these NEW Housing Units/Projects
d) Owner will have GONE THROUGH MORE FUNDS and have LESS FUNDS AVAILABLE TO THEM.
e) WILL NOT have an ASSET TO LEAVE TO THEIR HEIRS

6) Here is what is going to happen, some of you may remember GENEVA TOWERS, some of you may have heard about it, but at any rate, this is URBAN RENEWAL 2.0! These will SIT VACANT & BECOME A BLIGHT ON THE COMMUNITY because they WILL NOT SELL. Projects like this are FOLLOWING THE SAME TRAJECTORY!
A current perfect example of this is THE WESTERLY @ 2800 SLOAT / WAWONA. This complex has been completed for 5 years and believe only 1/3 are sold at present (mostly to speculators). It appears a small percentage of these are actually owner occupied . Most seem to be occupied by renters or Airbnb which may NOT be allowed by the Complex By-laws. The REST SIT VACANT! The BUILDING has been FALLING APART ALREADY and they are STRIPPING DOWN THE SIDING THAT WAS FALLING APART and CONSTRUCTED POORLY.
This is a BLIGHT on the NEIGHBORHOOD.

7) If this Ordinance passes, it most likely will be MANAGED by a Non-Profit. We ALL know the ISSUES and how BADLY the NON-PROFITS MANAGE ANYTHING IN THIS CITY !

8) We should NOT allow DEVELOPERS, the CITY or the STATE to CREATE BILLS OR ORDINANCES TO BUILD UNDER THE GUISE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING. IT'S ANYTHING BUT AFFORDABLE, IT'S SUBSIDIZED HOUSING TO FUND DEVELOPERS, REAL ESTATE SPECULATORS & RETIREMENT FUNDS.

9) Finally, as much as I adore Paris, we are NOT PARIS! We are SAN FRANCISCO & UNIQUE! Please do NOT DESTROY our SFR NEIGHBORHOODS!

Please READ the LETTER below from The Coalition with ALL OTHER IMPORTANT POINTS.

Thank you.
Renee Lazear
D4 Resident
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

It is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!
This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.
- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving

more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!**

Thank you,
Renee Lazear
D4 Resident
SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

From:	Iris Biblowitz
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Fw: Please vote NO on "Housing Production", Land Use Committee - 10/30/23
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 11:27:16 AM

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

Dear Supervisors -

I would like to add that we need to produce 100% of real affordable housing for families that are struggling to survive in San Francisco, and the city needs to fully protect all current S.F. laws that ensure environmental and community notices, discretionary review, demolitions, conditional use permits, and appeal hearings. Removing these protections would put a lot of San Franciscans at risk of losing their housing, especially communities that I mentioned in my 10/2/23 letter.

Thank you - Iris Biblowitz, RN

From: Iris Biblowitz
Sent: Sunday, October 1, 2023 12:56 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; dean.preston@sfgov.org <dean.preston@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please vote NO on File #230446 - "Housing Production", agenda item 4, Land Use Committee - 10/2/23

Dear Supervisors of the Land Use Committee -

Please deliver a strong rebuke of this plan that will give the green light to destroy environmental and community protections for real affordable housing and as well as allow corporate real estate deals that have had extremely harmful effects on our communities for over 2 decades,. especially on Black and Latinx families, and seniors and people with disabilities. Gentrification has been devastating in my neighborhood in the Mission, and this proposal would increase the risks of losing large amounts of affordable rent-controlled housing. We know that there's about 30% of the needed affordable housing in SF now (from the Housing Element), and over 100% of needed market-rate housing. We also know that 70% of people who are unhoused did have housing in the past several years.

I can only see harm that comes from this latest proposal. The streets are filled with people

struggling to survive. We need real affordable housing, increased dignified SROs (where there are many vacant rooms), to open up many of the 40,000 (isn't that the latest number?) of vacant units in SF, and focus on the commitment to build 100% real affordable housing.

As a nurse, I've documented the health effects of people dealing with evictions and threats of evictions. The results are upsetting, with increases in strokes, cardiac issues, anxiety, insomnia, depression, increase in Parkinson's symptoms, high blood pressure and blood sugars. This plan will only increase these risks. The same communities who were most severely affected by COVID will be most affected by this plan for dramatic waivers of local environmental, community, and demolition reviews, and will have a destructive effect on communities that are desperate for real affordable housing. The scenes on the streets of SF tell the story. We need to act fast to reject this latest proposal and find humanitarian policies that work to house people and keep communities alive.

Haven't we learned anything in the past 20+ years?

Sincerely - Iris Biblowitz, RN

From:	Kathy Howard
To:	ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); info@engardio.com; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	File 230446: Please vote down this housing ordinance
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 11:04:03 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I oppose this legislation. This legislation will have many adverse social, economic, environmental, and equity impacts, all of which have been outlined in the correspondence which you have received and in public testimony.

The ordinance is an extreme attack on community, on environmental review, and on affordable housing. It cannot be successfully amended and must instead be ***voted down***!

Thank you.

Katherine Howard
Outer Sunset
Long-time SF resident

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Thomas Soper AIA
Cc:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	RE: REPLACE with new legislation" Mayor-Engardio-Dorsey Attack on Environment & Affordable Housing
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:54:06 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: Thomas Soper AIA <tsarchaia@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 12:05 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar,

Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: REPLACE with new legislation" Mayor-Engardio-Dorsey Attack on Environment & Affordable Housing

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

Subject: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

Dear Supervisors,

As an Architect and Planner who has practiced over 40 years from this City and with this City and has experienced the mistakes of history and how rational and comprehensive Housing development serves each and all people of our society, this latest effort to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey Housing Ordinance is a new mark of desperation. What is going on is likened to painting a fractured bike frame instead of rebuilding it but proposing it will now be of benefit. This is pure oversimplification. I experienced the death of Detroit firsthand in the late 1970's, its reasons for failure and that is why we came here to rebuild a new life. But this latest issue is the symptom of the lack of knowledge in Detroit's tragedy, its demise. It is time to be candid about a City that has lost its way.

The first step is that it is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year but will uniquely recognize the needs of homeless as a separate medical solution as the medical profession recommends.. One model is 833 Bryant but specifically other variations on this are available. Please feel free to discuss.

2) concentrate on the restoration of the downtown core as New York City is doing. The West side is a strategy that many political and historical figures have been distracted by and it is a blunder as it has resulted in disasters in the past. The Downtown is an economic reality and imperative that we focus on and not oversimplify. The range of income this ordinance focuses on is manageable through better legislation as recommended by this consensus to scrap the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey band-aids..

3) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings. You are undermining American democracy and without having the skills to manage and integrate local concerns it is apparent to you that you must force this issue.. Please feel free to discuss.

Specifically, this ordinance is not like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in unintended consequences like Detroit and serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and the elusive goal of affordable housing. Let's not throw out what we have learned from this Country's Housing think-tanks.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen the multiple crises our City faces due to:

- **An Inadequate and outdated Decision Making Process** - Our decision-making processes have always been liberal but never under such circumstances as 4 Existential crisis happening simultaneously. Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely uninformed process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year. This means identifying a model. What is that?

- **Corporate Housing Involvement** - The problem is with Below Market Rate housing (BMR), not Market rate housing so focus on the BMR problem. The State and City have not been candid about this. History demonstrates this. The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Local developers admit they can't pencil out BMR housing. They have never been interested in how to design Social housing. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable particularly for those with incomes above SF AMI. . It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built “mostly” for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels! Are you not aware of what RHNA’s criteria that is distorting this reality? “Mostly” is the marketing “spin” which many of your constituents resent because the problem has been oversimplified.

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The conspicuous tragedy of this crisis is very similar to Detroit, not identical in cause but in misery of life. But the gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the City, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, some of them *far* overpriced, some of them left vacant due to economic infeasibility. We also have at least 35% empty office space. Architects know how they can be converted into thousands more apartments. We need to restore our tax base as a supreme priority. We do not need more new housing construction due to several other reasons stated herein, we need to make our existing housing space affordable! But equally so, this problem needs to simultaneously address the climate crisis demands which it is failing to do. Examples available.

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up" or toxic sites like 2550 Irving.

- **The Global Warming Crisis** - This ordinance ignores the environment. We cannot allow this need for affordable housing to also threaten our lives, Nation and State. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with out-of-reach priced condo and rental densification the way Asian countries do is tragic (if you have seen the examples abroad), We need a new resolution that demands all new or renovated housing contruction to be made out of Typr 3, 4, or 5 Construction depeding on the scale of the development with concrete limited to foundational below grade use as concrete is the most deleterious construction material known to cause green-house gase erosion of our atmosphere. Check the experts.

This ordinance would build housing for the upper class, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally incompetent and a by-product of economic naivete and corporate real estate speculators promoting a fix.

Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Thomas Soper

Thomas Soper AIA
Architect
P 1.415.902.9457
F 1.415.566.0465

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Jean Barish
Cc:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446 Public Comment - Do Not Approve
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:53:47 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: Jean Barish <jeanbbarish@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2023 11:47 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar,

Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446 Public Comment - Do Not Approve

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

Dear President Peskin and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to oppose the proposed Engardio-Breed-Dorsey “Housing Production Ordinance.” San Francisco has been my home for decades. Never before have I felt that it is under threat as I feel it is now. Please GUT & REPLACE this misguided legislation with a rewritten Ordinance that will appropriately deal with San Francisco's housing, homelessness, and environmental crises.

A rewritten Ordinance must do the following:

1) Create badly needed 100% affordable housing for all families making less than $80,000 per year, and;

2) Retain all current San Francisco laws that guarantee environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

But instead of meeting these needs, the proposed Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" Ordinance contains unprecedented and unacceptable citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review, all in the name of producing “affordable” housing. Yet most of that housing would be for wealthy families making over $230,000 per year! This Ordinance reads as though it was written by developers, not by legislators with input from community stakeholders.

This Ordinance will have the following consequences:

It will fail to provide 100% affordable housing for low-income families, while allowing the demolition and gentrification of neighborhoods throughout the city,

- It will not deter corporate housing takeovers. The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are of no concern to corporate housing speculators for whom a five-year investment cycle is acceptable. There must be at least a ten-year prohibition on corporate housing speculation which would apply to all housing, not just rent-controlled housing,

- It will promote the construction of more market rate housing, not affordable housing. San Francisco does not need more housing for people earning over $230,000. There is already an oversupply of housing for high earners. This ordinance does nothing to slow down that kind of development,

- It will push most rents throughout the city even higher, driving more middle-, working- and lower-class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment,

- It will eliminate environmental and community review protections, and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island,

- It will exacerbate the climate crisis. Sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey “Housing Producing Ordinance” is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators that will not meet San Francisco’s needs for affordable housing, and will create more homelessness. It must be defeated, and replaced with an ordinance that meets the needs of all San Franciscans.

Please, act in the best interest of your constituents. Do not approve this fatally flawed legislation. *GUT & REPLACE* this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity.

San Francisco's future is depending on you.

Thank you,

Jean
Jean B Barish
D1 Resident
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	aeboken
Cc:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Strongly OPPOSING [Planning and Subdivision Codes, Zoning Map - Housing Production] File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:53:44 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2023 9:14 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Strongly OPPOSING [Planning and Subdivision Codes, Zoning Map - Housing Production] File #230446

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

cc: Clerk of Land Use and Transportation Committee

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

RE: [Planning and Subdivision Codes, Zoning Map - Housing Production] File #230446

Position: Strongly OPPOSING as currently drafted and strongly urging gut and replace.

Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK) is strongly OPPOSING this ordinance as currently drafted.

SPEAK believes that this ordinance is beyond redemption and should either be tabled or amended with a gut and replace strategy.

A gut and replace ordinance should include the following:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year.

This proposed ordinance would worsen the following:

- A bad decision making process.

- The corporate housing takeover.

- The unaffordable housing crisis.

- The homeless crisis.

- The vacant housing crisis.

- The environmental justice and equity crisis.

- The climate crisis.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Geo Kimmerling
Cc:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Engardio-Breed-Dorsey Housing Production ordinance
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:53:35 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: Geo Kimmerling <geokimm@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2023 12:42 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar,

Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Engardio-Breed-Dorsey Housing Production ordinance

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

Hello. My name is Flo Kimmerling andI am a long time resident of San Francisco. I believe the above named ordinance needs to be rethought so that it truly encourages affordable housing for those who need it in this city. That means families with incomes beneath $80,000.00 per year. In addition, I feel we need to protect the laws that ensure environmental review and community noticing. This includes discretionary review, demolition, construction permits , conditional use, and all appeals hearings. Every member of the community has a right to be engaged in a process that could create major changes in the neighborhood.

Good intentions can have some very negative consequences for a community. I am asking you to think about this possibility and do all you can to prevent those negative consequences, by allowing the community to be engaged throughout the demolition and building process.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.
Sincerely,
Flo Kimmerling
1282 26th Ave.

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Kathleen Kelley
Cc:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); nenstaff@sfgov.org; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	RE: PUBLIC COMMENT: SUPERVISORS GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:53:31 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: Kathleen Kelley <kks2200@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2023 12:33 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar,

Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; nenstaff@sfgov.org; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kathleen Kelley <kks2200@gmail.com>
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT: SUPERVISORS GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

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

Subject: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

Dear Supervisors,

Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

It is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.

- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal

agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Kathleen Kelley
San Francisco Resident

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Susan Kahn
Cc:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:53:27 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: David Kaskowitz <dkasko@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2023 10:23 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar,

Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

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

Subject: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446
Dear Supervisors,

I have been a resident and a voter in San Francisco for over 30 years and I worry about its future because of the lack of affordable housing. We urgently need to address this issue, but the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance is not the solution.

It is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!
This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.

- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!**

Thank you,

Thank you,

David Kaskowitz
306 Park St.
San Francisco, CA

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Robert Hall
Cc:	Eric Brooks; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	RE: OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:53:23 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: Robert Hall <bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2023 9:38 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar,

Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Eric Brooks <brookse32@sonic.net>
Subject: OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

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

Dear Supervisors:

Please oppose the onerous Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance. It's unworkable and needs to be tossed out. Instead, move quickly to implement the SF Climate Action Plan because we're in the midst of a worsening climate crisis. Then, turn your attention to reimagining the moribund Financial District with all those concrete towers sitting there vacant. The concrete has already been poured. The carbon from cement-making has already been released into the atmosphere. Instead of a place designed for commuters consider a new renaissance neighborhood where people live and gather. One that is more resilient to the boom and bust gold rush mentality that San Franciscans experience. I would even be in favor of tax incentives to make this happen.

In the meantime, please have every supervisor respond to why they'd want an ordinance designed like this?

-
-
- **A Bad Decision**
- **Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap
- this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for

families making less than $80,000 per year.

-
-
-
-
- **Corporate Housing**
- **Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a
- neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to
- *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
-
-
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis**
- - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for
- those income levels!
-
-
- **The**
- **Homelessness Crisis**
- - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health,
- street crime, and underemployment.
-
-
-
-
- **The**
- **Vacant Housing Crisis** -
- San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far*
- overpriced.
- We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
-

-
-
- **The**
- **Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** -
- This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and
- radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
-
-
-
-
- **The**
- **Climate Crisis** -
- This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more
- greenhouse gases, not less.
-

It’s time to think bigger than the unaffordable towers this ordinance seeks to create.

Bob Hall
1946 Grove St. Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	blair@drlapin.org
Cc:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Public Comment re: SF affordable housing: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:53:17 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

I am adding your commentary to the file for this ordinance matter, on agenda for consideration during the October 30, 2023 regular meeting.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our Legislative Research Center by following the link below:

- Board of Supervisors File No. 230446

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

From: blair@drlapin.org <blair@drlapin.org>
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2023 6:19 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar,

Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment re: SF affordable housing: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

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

Dear Supervisors,

I have lived in San Francisco for almost 40 years. I am almost 70 years old. I am writing to you because my daughter and many friends call San Francisco home, and because I hope to live here for the rest of my days.

It is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!
This ordinance would worsen:

-
-
- **A Bad Decision**
- **Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap
- this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.
-
-
-
-
- **Corporate Housing**
- **Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a
- neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to
- *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
-
-
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis**
- - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for
- those income levels!
-
-
- **The**
- **Homelessness Crisis**
- - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health,
- street crime, and underemployment.
-
-
-
-
- **The**
- **Vacant Housing Crisis** -

- San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far*
- overpriced.
- We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
-
-
-
- **The**
- **Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** -
- This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and
- radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
-
-
-
-
- **The**
- **Climate Crisis** -
- This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more
- greenhouse gases, not less.
-

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. **Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!**

Thank you,

Dr. Blair Sandler, Ph.D., J.D.
1742 Newcomb Ave. SF CA 94124

From: Steve Ward
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS)
Subject: Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 7:56:48 PM

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

Dear Leaders,

Reject Housing' ordinance File #230446 gutting environmental and community protections against bad real estate development in San Francisco.

SF has the most density west of New York. Look how affordable NYC is. Adopting this ordinance amounts to abandoning your duty to protect quality of life and the beauty and character of San Francisco. Instead of capitulating to Sacramento extortion and encouraging corporate real estate dominance, fill 60,000 empty housing units and 51 million square feet of vacant Office Space 'BEFORE' we allow developers and density advocates to undermine environmental values, quality of life, aesthetic continuity and the character of our neighborhoods while making the people who live here voiceless.

There are sensible alternatives,
Remember the Fontana Building Revolt of the sixties,
Reject Ordinance 234460 and support " Our Neighbor Voices Initiative" to admend the state constitution. The majority of Californians do.

Steve Ward
2nd generation resident
(multiple local group memberships)

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Eric Brooks
Cc:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	RE: UPDATED PUBLIC SIGN-ON **GUT & REPLACE** 17 Orgs *OPPOSE* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance - BOS File No. 230446 - LUT October 30, 2023
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 5:08:48 PM

Thank you for your comment letter. I've added your comments to the ordinance file.

Best to you,
John Carroll

From: Eric Brooks <brookse32@sonic.net>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 4:54 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: UPDATED PUBLIC SIGN-ON **GUT & REPLACE** 17 Orgs *OPPOSE* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Constraints Reduction' 'Housing' Ordinance

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

UPDATED PUBLIC SIGN-ON **GUT & REPLACE**

17 Environmental, Environmental Justice & Community Organizations Join To Strongly *OPPOSE*

Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Constraints Reduction' 'Housing' Ordinance *(See updated sign-on below, and attached in PDF format.)*

IMPORTANT: WE DEMAND THAT SUPERVISORS *GUT AND REPLACE* the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance.

It is ***unacceptable*** that some supervisors continue to suggest 'negotiating' amendments with the Mayor's office, to this egregiously destructive ordinance. The text must be ***completely*** deleted and replaced with text drafted by supervisors on the Land Use and Transportation Committee and other environmental and affordable housing allies, with full community participation at the drafting table.

Here and attached is our updated sign-on letter.



Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee

SPEAK Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

October 26, 2023

To:
City and County of San Francisco Decision Makers - 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Re:
OPPOSE
Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" ("Housing Production") **File #230446**

Dear San Francisco
Decision Makers:
The undersigned environmental, housing, economic justice, community, and climate crisis response organizations write to voice our
strong opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" ordinance. It would enact drastic and sweeping exceptions to San Francisco's environmental and community review of real estate projects and would undermine health, environmental, economic and neighborhood protections.
The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable**
- **Housing Crisis** -
- This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income
- levels!

- **The Homelessness**
- **Crisis** -
- The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health,
- street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing**
- **Crisis** -
- San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far*
- overpriced.
- We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental**
- **Justice & Equity Crisis** -
- This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and
- radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

-
-
-
- **The Climate Crisis**
- - This ordinance
- is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases,
- not less.
-

This
ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental,
economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Sincerely:

Bayview Hunters Point
Mothers & Fathers Committee
California
Alliance of Local Electeds
Californians
for Energy Choice
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Concerned Residents
of the Sunset
East Mission
Improvement Association
Extinction
Rebellion SF Bay Area
Greenaction
for Health & Environmental Justice
Mid-Sunset
Neighborhood Association
Our City SF
Our Neighborhood
Voices
San Franciscans
for Urban Nature
San Francisco
Green Party

San Francisco
Tomorrow
Save Our Neighborhoods
SF
Sunflower
Alliance
Sunset Parkside
Education & Action Committee

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	Joseph Smooke
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Gluckstein, Lisa (MYR); Hillis, Rich (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Diamond, Sue (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Ruiz, Gabriella (CPC); housingelements@hcd.ca.gov; tyrone.buckley@hcd.ca.gov; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Letter from REP-SF re: Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production"
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 5:03:27 PM

Thank you for your comment letter. I've added your comments to the ordinance file.

Best to you,
John Carroll

From: Joseph Smooke <joseph@peoplepowermedia.org>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 2:13 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Gluckstein, Lisa (MYR) <lisa.gluckstein@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Braun, Derek (CPC) <derek.braun@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Sue (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Ruiz, Gabriella (CPC) <gabriella.ruiz@sfgov.org>; housingelements@hcd.ca.gov; tyrone.buckley@hcd.ca.gov
Subject: Letter from REP-SF re: Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production"

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

Dear Chair Melgar and the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

Please find the attached letter from the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF) regarding Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production," which is on the Land Use and Transportation Committee agenda this coming Monday, October 30th.

Respectfully,
Joseph Smooke
on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition

co-founder of People Power Media

Creators of PRICED OUT

See the animation that will change the way you think about housing!

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	6 Letters regarding File Nos. 230446 and 231142
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:43:00 PM
Attachments:	6 Letters regarding File Nos. 230446 and 231142.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 6 letters regarding File Nos. 230446 and 231442.

File No. 230446 - Planning and Subdivision Codes, Zoning Map - Housing Production (Mayor, Engardio, Dorsey)

File No. 231142 - Planning and Subdivision Codes, Zoning Map - Housing Production (Mayor, Engardio)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Joseph Smooke
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; Gluckstein, Lisa (MYR); Hillis, Rich (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Braun, Derek (CPC); Diamond, Sue (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Ruiz, Gabriella (CPC); housingelements@hcd.ca.gov; tyrone.buckley@hcd.ca.gov
Subject:	Letter from REP-SF re: Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production"
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 2:17:01 PM
Attachments:	REP Letter to Supervisors re Housing Element Streamlining Legislation 27Oct23.pdf

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

Dear Chair Melgar and the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

Please find the attached letter from the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF) regarding Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production," which is on the Land Use and Transportation Committee agenda this coming Monday, October 30th.

Respectfully,
Joseph Smooke
on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition

co-founder of People Power Media
Creators of PRICED OUT
See the animation that will change the way you think about housing!

27 October 2023
Chair of the Land Use & Transportation Committee, Supervisor Melgar
Land Use & Transportation Committee Members, Supervisors Peskin and Preston

Re: Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production"

Dear Land Use & Transportation Committee Chair Melgar and Supervisors Peskin and Preston:

Despite amendments having been incorporated into this legislation, and new amendments to be introduced on Monday, October 30, this legislation still fails to address the housing that is required by the Housing Element and by the vast majority of San Franciscans--housing that is truly affordable.

Therefore, the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition of San Francisco (REP-SF), strongly urges the Land Use & Transportation Committee to reject this legislation and take up new legislation that:

- Puts affordable housing first;
- Protects tenants against displacement;
- Values and retains the voices and aspirations of historically marginalized communities in project approval processes with significantly shorter durations;
- Expands and modifies the Priority Equity Geographies SUD (PEG-SUD), and provides additional protections and opportunities to Cultural Districts and people who live within the expanded PEG-SUD.
- Complies with the Housing Element mandate to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.

Earlier this week, the State's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) published a "report" titled "San Francisco Housing Policy and Practice Review" which we have read and analyzed. Regarding the report, please consider and incorporate the following in your deliberations:

- The "report" from HCD is full of factually incorrect statements and appears to be heavily politically motivated. The "report" does not acknowledge all the legislation already passed and in process to reduce constraints:
    - The City has already passed several significant measures intended to "reduce constraints" for market rate housing. These include:
        - File #230026: Creates the Family Housing Opportunity Special Use District.
        - File #230374: Cuts more than a year off the site permit and building permit process.
        - File #230764 and File #230769: Reduces impact fees paid by market rate developers.
        - File #230855: Reduces inclusionary housing requirement for market rate developers.

        - File #230732: Streamlines commercial properties converting to residential.
    - The City has also proposed other measures that are still pending Committee action, including:
        - File #230734: Replaces residential density limits in Certain Neighborhood Commercial Districts.
        - File #230735: Removes residential density limits in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.
        - File #230372: Exempts projects from impact fees that convert from commercial to residential
- The "report" ignores the market realities of high interest rates and other development costs that are completely independent of San Francisco's approval processes. The fact that few permit applications were filed over the past several months reflects this market reality and the fact that developers build in order to make a profit.
    - For-profit developers don't build or propose to build in order to meet RHNA "supply" goals, or to bring the price of housing down, or to house those who are homeless.
- The "report" fails to acknowledge that tens of thousands of units have been approved by our Planning Dept - and that these units are not proceeding into construction because of developers' business decisions, not due to any bureaucratic failings.
- Public policy interventions are better placed with 100% truly affordable housing because public policy and public investment in truly affordable housing result directly in housing being built.
- The "report" ignores all of the equity and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) -oriented actions in the Housing Element that HCD approved in January.
    - With its "report", HCD has basically written its own Housing Element for San Francisco - ignoring AFFH and dozens of implementing actions that would move the Housing Element toward racial and social equity. This is an important part of HCD's legal charge as a department, yet they are neglecting their own civil rights obligations.
    - The "report" fails to understand the complexity of San Francisco's dense urban context - by far the most densely populated major City in the State, and its recommendations threaten to inflict even more trauma and displacement on historically marginalized communities than has already been experienced in prior Housing Element cycles.
    - The "report" fails to acknowledge the Statewide legal obligation for all cities, including San Francisco to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing pursuant to AB 686. Nothing in HCD's report moves in the direction of AFFH - none of it helps affordable housing. This "report" simply resorts to threats rather than taking any initiative to provide resources for affordable housing.
- The "report" threatens to silence communities - denying us of our constitutional rights to due process and freedom of expression.
    - As such, the State HCD threatens to abuse and overreach its police powers by denying our communities of our constitutional rights.
- The "report" fails to address corruption that has tainted the project approval process.
- HCD's "report" threatens the Board of Supervisors to pass this legislation, File #230446, but it is the power of our own legislature to consider and act on legislation as it sees fit.

REP-SF expects our State government to support our City's efforts to enact policies that work for people most in need rather than silencing our communities, denying our self-determination, while transferring that power to developers who only have their own profits as their goal.

If the city bows to the state's pressure on October 30th and passes this additional piece of legislation to further "reduce constraints"--despite the fact that **San Francisco already has a backlog of tens of thousands of already-entitled market rate developments, and more than 60,000 vacant market rate units**--this would would be a denial of our City's legal obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) and policy objectives to prioritize racial and social equity.

As policymakers, we urge you to ask, with the legislative decisions you make, "who are we as a City building for?". This article from the San Francisco Chronicle, "SF's luxury condo market is cooling. Here's why it might be a good time to buy" on October 10, 2023 indicates that most of the condo buildings being built in San Francisco are largely vacant, and that the market for these units is foreign investors. There isn't any discussion in this article among developers about making these units available or affordable to San Francisco's low to moderate income households either in the short or long term. This article underscores the fact that in order to provide housing that very-low, low, and moderate income households can truly afford, we need to prioritize other Implementation Actions from the Housing Element that focus on truly affordable housing.

Conclusion
Despite past and newly proposed amendments from Supervisors and the Mayor, and despite the recent, misguided pressure from the State, this legislation must be rejected as it fundamentally moves our City in entirely the opposite direction of racial and social equity with an approach that silences our communities, encourages demolitions of existing housing and displacement of tenants throughout vast areas of the City, while providing no resources or meaningful benefits for affordable housing.

REP-SF requests that the Land Use & Transportation Committee reject this legislation, and commence working with low income and people of color communities throughout the City to move forward legislation that implements the Housing Element to affirmatively further fair housing and center racial and social equity. REP-SF looks forward to working with you all on new legislation to reorient the priorities of Housing Element implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Smooke
on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, San Francisco

From:	Mary OConnor
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 5:12:23 PM

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

October 31, 2023

Subject: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

Dear Supervisors,

It is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and**

gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.

-
-
- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. **We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing**.
-
-
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". **We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!**
-
-
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
-
-
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - **San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!**

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
-

- **The Climate Crisis** - **This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.**

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,
Mary Ellen O'Connor - zip code: 94122

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

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

Review AMENDMENTS #1 Housing Sufficiency File 250868 and Planning Commission

Dear Supervisors:

There are so many reasons to oppose this measure and ask you to reject it, or if necessary replace it. After these expressed important reasons to do this, but I would like to focus on the IMMIGRANT in the measure.

The supposed improvements in case of housing would be disproportionately distributed by the loss of housing for those and the most insecure.

Please reject, or if necessary replace this measure which would disproportionately harm a desirable and less resourced residents of San Francisco in favor of shifting housing benefits (increasingly to wealthier, less vulnerable people, including non residents.

Sincerely yours,

[redacted]

Sent with [Proton Mail](redacted) secure email.

From:	bronwen lemmon
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Cc:	Kathleen Kelley
Subject:	Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 1:24:05 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I join my friends and neighbors in communicating our side of this important conversation with all of our city supervisors.

In a world where force and action is increasing daily, it is even more vital that we retain our ability to talk about difficult things. This means remaining human within this increasingly complex and impersonal system.
These are difficult conversations for everyone. It is stressful. That is the truth. It can only work when we remain in contact with each other as individuals, human beings who all want the same thing, or at least I hope we do, which is to live free of unnecessary and inhumane suffering.

Your project has an expected goal of helping those who suffer the most in our society, those of severely limited means, without good housing and with the lowest incomes. Yet, my neighbors and friends find this goal is far from overtly explained and even erroneous. Is the new low income qualification really up to $230K? Surely this is a typo that needs to be corrected.
We have no issue supporting low income housing. That is great!

My neighbors and I do not understand how making an amendment to this particular ordinance, as laid out, can honestly work.
We really appreciate the efforts of Aaron Peskin –whose father was my mentor and professor at SFSU– and Supervisor Dean Preston. We kindly request that they reconsider their views of the amendment vis a vis the calibre of the ordinance. Do they believe in their amendment? We believe that they will see how an amendment to a troubled ordinance can't help. Please, may the ordinance receive a Gut & Replace.

Yours sincerely,

Bronwen Lemmon

October 30, 2023

Subject: Public Comment: GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

Dear Supervisors,

It is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.
-
-
- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five

year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.

-
-
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
-
-
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
-
-
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
-
-
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more

homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,
[Your Name]

From:	Art Persyko
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Regarding Ordinance File #230446 (on the agenda of the Land Use & Transportation Committee today): OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 1:21:16 PM

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

October 30, 2023

To: The SF Board of Supervisors and the Land Use & Transportation Committee

From: Art Persyko, SF Gray Panthers Board member

Regarding Ordinance File #230446 (on the agenda of the Land Use & Transportation Committee today)

Dear SF Board of Supervisors and the Land Use & Transportation Committee:

Please do not support streamlining the demolition of rent-controlled housing in SF. Why in the world should you, SF's civic leaders allow speculators to profit from tearing down down existing rent-controlled housing in our city? And we should certainly not do so without any meaningful community input or oversight from San Franciscans. Don't let the private market steamroll you, the SF Board of Supervisors, to get you to enable lining the pockets of developers, who only have allegiance to their bottom line, and do so at at the expense of the best interests of the people of SF, i.e. which would be preserving and building TRULY affordable housing in SF. So:

Please STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance; and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is not like the previous Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!
This ordinance would worsen:

-

A Bad Decision Making Process - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.

- Corporate Housing Takeovers - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need ten year prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to all housing, not just rent controlled housing.

- The Unaffordable Housing Crisis - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- The Homelessness Crisis - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- The Vacant Housing Crisis - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them far overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- The Climate Crisis - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Again: Do not support streamlining the demolition of rent-controlled housing. Why in the world should we allow speculators to profit from tearing down down existing rent-controlled housing and we should certainly not do so without any meaningful community input or oversight? Don’t let the private market steamroll you, the Board of Supervisors to enable lining the pockets of developers, who only have allegiance to their bottom line, and do so at at the expense of the best interests of the people of SF, i.e. which would be preserving and building truly affordable housing in SF.

Thank you,

Sincerely, Art Persyko
SF Gray Panthers Board member
94109

From:	Grace Turkis
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	GUT & REPLACE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 12:10:56 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing as a concerned San Franciscan. It is imperative that you STOP seeking to negotiate amendments to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing' Ordinance and instead move to fully GUT & REPLACE the text with a new ordinance that will:

1) produce 100% truly affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year, and

2) fully protect all current San Francisco laws ensuring environmental and community noticing, as well as Discretionary Review, Demolition, Conditional Use, and Appeal hearings.

This ordinance is *not* like the previous, very limited Melgar 'Family Housing' ordinance. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey ordinance is far more sweeping and destructive. 'Negotiations' would result in serious damage to San Francisco, its neighborhoods, and affordable housing.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production Ordinance" contains unprecedented citywide waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over $230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and two Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while we grasp at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than $80,000 per year.

- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over $230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and

is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please GUT & REPLACE this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Grace

Zip: 94122

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Teamster Letter Re: Fleet Charging Legislation
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 4:53:00 PM
Attachments:	Fleet Charging Letter.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for communication from Teamsters Local Union No. 665 regarding File No. 231080.

File No. 231080 - Planning Code - Fleet Charging (Peskin, Chan).

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Mark Gleason <mark@norcallabor.com>
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 3:23 PM
To: Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>
Cc: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Dennis-Phillips, Sarah (ECN) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Taupier, Anne (ECN) <anne.taupier@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Braun, Derek (CPC) <derek.braun@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Sue (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Ruiz, Gabriella (CPC) <gabriella.ruiz@sfgov.org>; Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>; Sider, Dan (CPC) <dan.sider@sfgov.org>; boardofappeal@sfgov.org; ZAMORA, LUIS (CAT) <Luis.A.Zamora@sfcityatty.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Teamster Letter Re: Fleet Charging Legislation

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

Please find the attached letter.

General Truck Drivers, Automotive and Allied Workers. General jurisdiction in Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino and Lake Counties and Automotive in San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Benito Counties, California

TEAMSTERS LOCAL UNION No. 665

AFFILIATED WITH THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS
& TEAMSTERS JOINT COUNCIL No. 7

Tony Delorio
Principal Officer
Secretary-Treasurer

Michael Yates
President
Business Agent

Florencio Sinogui
Vice President
Business Agent

Juan Gallo
Recording Secretary
Business Agent

Robin Terrell
Trustee

Will Thomsen
Trustee

Arthur Hilmoe
Trustee

Joe Matekel
Business Agent

Mark Malouf
Business Agent

Tom Woods
Business Agent

Peggy Condori
Member Services

Jennifer Godsey
Office Manager
Bookkeeper

Carla Wong
Titan Operator

David Svoboda
Titan Operator

October 30, 2023
Rich Hillis
Director of Planning
San Francisco Planning Dept.
SENT VIA EMAIL: rich.hillis@sfgov.org

Dear Mr. Hillis:

As you are aware Board of Supervisor's President Aaron Peskin has introduced legislation intended to amend the Planning Code to require Conditional Use authorization prior to converting Private Parking and Vehicle Storage Lots in PDR districts for Fleet Charging.

This loophole was created unintentionally. Allowing companies to exploit the loophole to create Fleet Charging uses without a CUA goes against the intent of the original legislation.

Our Trade Union strongly supports this legislation. The introduction of this Ordinance follows the Planning Department allowing the use of this loophole several times since the creation passing of the initial legislation. The loophole has been used at multiple sites including:

- 485 Irwin Street
- 140 14th Street
- 241 Loomis Street

Considering the recent history of Conditional Use fleet charging violations in PDR districts, and in anticipation of pending legislative remediation, the Teamsters call on the Planning Department to pause all processing of applications on sites attempting to use this loophole while Supervisor Peskin's legislation to close it makes it's way through the legislative process.

Thank you for your consideration of our position.

Tony Delorio
Principal Officer
Teamsters Local Union No. 665

Main Office
150 Executive Park Boulevard, Suite 4400, San Francisco, CA 94134 415-347-7406 Email: memberservices@teamsters665.org

Tony Delorio
Principal Officer
Secretary-Treasurer

Michael Yates
President
Business Agent

Florencio Sinogui
Vice President
Business Agent

Juan Gallo
Recording Secretary
Business Agent

Robin Terrell
Trustee

Will Thomsen
Trustee

Arthur Hilmoe
Trustee

Joe Matekel
Business Agent

Mark Malouf
Business Agent

Tom Woods
Business Agent

Peggy Condori
Member Services

Jennifer Godsey
Office Manager
Bookkeeper

Carla Wong
Titan Operator

David Svoboda
Titan Operator

CC
Mayor London Breed
City Attorney David Chiu
Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission
Board of Appeals
Department of Building Inspection Director Patrick O'Riordan
Office of Economic and Workforce Development Executive Director Sarah Dennis Phillips
Office of Economic and Workforce Development Director of Joint Development Anne Taupier
Planning Chief of Staff Daniel Sider
Zoning Administrator Corey Teague

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: File No. 231076
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:24:00 AM
Attachments:	Corresp..pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Wynship Hillier regarding File No. 231076.

> **File No. 231076 -** Administrative Code - Composition of Behavioral Health Commission (Dorsey)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Wynship Hillier <wynship@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:34 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; info@sfstandard.com
Subject: File No. 231076

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

Dear Madam, Mx., or Sir:

Please associate the attached correspondence with File No. 231076.

Very truly yours,
Wynship Hillier

Wynship W. Hillier, M.S.

3562 20th Street, Apartment 22
San Francisco, California 94110
(415) 505-3856
wynship@hotmail.com

October 30, 2023

Matt Dorsey, Chair
Rules Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, California 94102

Sent via email to bos@sfgov.org

RE: VOTE NO ON FILE NO. 231076, "ADMINISTRATIVE CODE—COMPOSITION OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION"!

Honorable Committee Chair Dorsey:

File No. 231076 will harm the Behavioral Health Commission by making it too small, badly hampering its ability to carry out its work.

This proposed legislation would reduce the Commission's size by six seats or roughly 1/3 its current size, from 17 to 11 members, the absolute minimum prescribed by state law for San Francisco and one more than the minimum for any county in the State. But San Francisco is the thirteenth largest of 58 counties and devotes tremendous General Fund and special tax resources to its Behavioral Health Services, the division over which the Commission is charged with oversight. This division has an annual budget of $600M, far more than the amount per-capita of other counties. It has appx. 150 subcontractors and a patient population of 30,000, over 3% of the population of the City and County. There are appx. an additional 10,000 people in its target mental health population who are not patients. The division is subject to a combined total of 334 pages of mental health performance contracts with the state, directly or indirectly, all of which contracts the Commission is responsible for reviewing. The Commission is additionally charged with review and evaluation of the City and County's behavioral health needs, services, facilities, and special problems, review and approval of the procedures used to ensure citizen and professional involvement at all stages of the planning process for behavioral health services provided as part of the San Francisco Mental Health Plan, a $100M contract with the State accounting for 198 of the aforementioned 334 pages of performance contracts, and monitoring of the division's compliance and oversight over the division's compliance program therewith. The

Commission has fulfilled none of these obligations in the last 30 years. If the proposed legislation passes, it will make it still more difficult for the Commission to perform these duties and could make it impossible. San Francisco needs and deserves a local mental health board substantially larger than those of small counties like Sierra and Alpine to deal with its far larger and more diverse target population and far larger and more complex division!

A Poorly-Researched News Article Has Distorted the Issues in This Proposed Legislation.

The proposed legislation is related to a newspaper article that came out a week before the proposed legislation was introduced. The *San Francisco Standard* published "San Francisco Drug Crisis Commission Doing Nothing for Lack of Members" by David Sjostedt on October 10, mentioning the proposed legislation. Not only did this article badly mischaracterize the Commission's purpose in the headline, the title is otherwise misleading and the article rife with inaccuracies. The misnaming of the Commission is especially egregious because the Commission is San Francisco's local mental health board, mandated by state law 65 years ago. State law allows the Board of Supervisors to graft extra duties onto the Commission, but it has not always done so in an intelligent way. In 2019, the Board changed the Commission's name from "Mental Health Board" to "Behavioral Health Commission" and wherever the word "mental" appeared in its powers and duties, put the word "behavioral" its place, thus seeming to add oversight of overdose prevention, etc., to its mental health treatment oversight responsibilities. This ignored that the Commission's core, nitty-gritty functions that no one currently on it wants to do, such as reviewing 334 pages of performance contracts and oversight responsibilities related to the Plan no one wants to read, pertain only to the mental-health side of behavioral health, not the substance-abuse side. As such, the Commission's added powers and duties are like inviting your already-very-bad plumbing contractor to also dabble in electrical work.

Furthermore, it is not the case that the Commission is "Doing Nothing *for Lack of Members*," and this error is repeated in the body of the article:

> *"There are currently six active members on the 17-member Behavioral Health Commission . . .*
>
> *"Because there are fewer than nine active members, the commission lacks a quorum and hasn't been able to wield much of its power or hold meetings since February."*

There are currently *ten* active members on the Commission, i.e., more than a quorum. Thus, the Commission's inability to meet is due at least in part to Commissioners not showing up to meetings, not a lack of members alone. The attribution of inability to meet solely to lack of members is disingenuous because, while there are only six members with current appointments, the article elsewhere admits that members continue to serve, i.e., be "active" and contribute to quorum, after their appointments have expired. They often do so for periods longer than their

original appointments, which are for three years! Currently, four members are serving beyond their original appointments, bringing the total number of active members to ten. It is strictly illegal for members to serve beyond their appointments, but this illegality is supported by long-standing citywide custom, and the Behavioral Health Commission is not careful about legality.

While it was true that the Commission had not met with quorum since February when this article was written, the Commission did not meet during nearly half of the intervening months due to factors other than quorum. In March, unconstitutional interference by Behavioral Health Services caused a cancellation. In August, the Commission observed its customary recess. In July, the regular meeting was canceled due to "ongoing security concerns and inability to make quorum." It is not clear whether the "inability to make quorum" was due to more than one Commissioner expressing that they would not be able to attend the meeting that month or general discouragement due to inability of the Commission to attain quorum at its previous three regular meetings.

As for this lack of quorum preventing the Commission from doing their work, this too is misleading. If this had been the case, there would have been a backlog of resolutions on the agenda to be proposed at the Commission's regular monthly meeting on October 19. There was none, and the two members of the Commission who were interviewed for this article both asked to leave the meeting (which did draw a quorum – see below) early because they had other and presumably more important engagements to which to attend. (Mr. Grier was never a member of the Commission.) "People's lives are at risk" indeed!

Furthermore, if lack of quorum at meetings could be attributed to lack of appointments to the Commission rather than Commissioners just not showing up to meetings, then the committees of the Commission, *which have been fully appointed all year long*, would have been able to meet and prepare resolutions for the Commission to pass. They have not done so. In the six months immediately before Mr. Sjodedt's article came out, these committees noticed twelve regular meetings. Of these twelve, quora *of the committees* attended but five or less than half of them, causing the majority of meetings of committees in this period to be adjourned immediately. Resizing the Commission would have done nothing to avert this!

In fact, the Commission has made only a single advisory resolution in the past two-and-a-half years, during much of which it has been better appointed. This resolution was so appallingly bad that the Commission omitted it from their Annual Report and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors refused to even put it on the public record, such that I had to append it to my lengthy letter lampooning it. Jan. 25, 2022, "THE SAN FRANCISCO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION HAS PASSED A RESOLUTION", pp. 175-87 in file no. 220118, communications packet for the Feb. 8, 2022, meeting of the Board of Supervisors, available here: https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10504772&GUID=4AB1E2DE-B3DE-4465-B0C4-C472F0EDAEB9. The Commission has also conducted a pittance of site visits during the same period, the reports of which it is illegally withholding from the public even while it complains to the press about being denied information by the Department!

Shortly after this article was published and the proposed legislation introduced, the Commission met on October 19 with ten members present and conducted business normally, raising the question of whether the earlier failures had been planned all along to develop false momentum for this proposed legislation.

The Commission's Membership Requirements Are Not the Problem.

The article then correctly mentioned the eight pending applications to the Commission but reported that "Victor Young [staff with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors charged with oversight of the Commission – WH] . . . said it's difficult to find qualified members of the Commission due to the types of expertise needed for each seat." I have spoken with Mr. Young about this quotation and he said that he had been misquoted. He affirmed that membership requirements are not currently associated with specific seats. No legislative action regarding this is needed or appropriate!

In addition, the complex requirements in current legislation cannot be the cause of the current lack of appointments because the small number of current appointments relaxes the constraints posed by these requirements. Furthermore, both of the mental health professional seats and one of the two child/adult advocate requirements are currently filled, eliminating these particular requirements from the consideration of future applications. The remaining three members with current appointments are evenly distributed between a consumer, a family member of a consumer, and an interested member of the public. This means that, of the ten seats on the Commission currently available to non-Supervisors, three or four are available to consumers (because one seat may go to either a consumer or a family member of a consumer), two to four are available to family members of consumers (because of the previous ambiguity as well as uncertainty as to whether the current child/older adult advocate is a family member of a consumer or an interested member of the public), and four or three are available to interested members of the public, with the additional constraint that one of the available family-member-of-a-consumer or interested-member-of-the-public seats must go to a child/older adult advocate. While this highly complex arrangement is of doubtful utility and may make appointing members to the Commission administratively more difficult, it provides no legal constraint that would bar all eight currently-pending applicants from service, thus to continue current pressure on the quorum requirement (as if this was even the real problem)!

In further addition, and again as the article mentions, a member of the Board of Supervisors has not been appointed to the Commission, as required by law, in over a year and a half! The article failed to mention that neither of the two most recent Supervisor members attended even a single meeting of the Commission in person, a requirement under parliamentary rules. The problem in both seated Supervisor and non-Supervisor cases is that the Board and individual Supervisors are not making the needed and required appointments. Even when they do, the appointed members do not attend! Legislation shrinking the size of the Commission is not the correct response.

The proposed legislation would make it administratively more difficult to appoint new Commissioners in a different way. *S.F. Charter* § 4.101(a) requires that the composition of the Commission be "broadly representative of the . . . neighborhoods . . . of the City and County . . ." This is currently guaranteed by the requirement that each Supervisor appoint a member of the Commission, provided that they make their appointment from among their constituents. If all of the Commissioners are appointed by the Board, per the proposed legislation, then this committee will have to look at street addresses of the homes of individual Commissioners as well as applicants, determine what districts each live in, and make sure that there are not any other current appointments from a district before making an appointment from it.

Conclusion

In sum, the only result that the new legislation is sure to have besides allocating the necessary veteran seat is that it will freeze the current membership of the Commission and present a clear and insurmountable bar to any new appointments being made. Given the current lackadaisical attitude of current Commissioners, the intent seems to be to hobble the Commission by making sure that 30,000-patient, 150-contrator, and $600M/year Behavioral Health Services has an oversight board the same size as those in California's smallest counties, where patient populations are well under 100, contractors are nonexistent, and budgets far below $10M!

Very Truly Yours,

/s/
Wynship Hillier

cc: Editor, San Francisco Standard
Victor Young

Item 35

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	19 Letters regarding File No. 230986
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:08:00 AM
Attachments:	19 Letters regarding File No. 230986.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 19 letters regarding File No. 230986, which is Item No. 18 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

File No. 230986 - Charter Amendment - Mayor Approval Required for Certain SFMTA Budget Proposals (Safai, Peskin, Ronen)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Kristina Pappas
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SFLCV strongly opposes proposed charter amendment limiting SFMTA authority
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 2:37:59 PM
Attachments:	10-30-23 Oppose Peskin_Safai ballot measure.pdf

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

Hello, please find attached our letter of opposition.

Kristina Pappas
President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

--
Kristina Pappas
415.812.3128

San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

October 30, 2023

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

RE: Opposition to Proposed Charter Amendment Limiting SFMTA Board Authority

Dear President Peskin and Supervisors:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters (SFLCV) urges the Board to reject the proposed charter amendment to limit the authority of the SFMTA Board to change fares and to change maximum parking meter rates and hours of enforcement. By making those changes, but no others, contingent on prior mayoral approval, the charter amendment will make it more politically difficult for SFMTA to raise revenue to fund Muni service. This is deeply concerning given the serious fiscal challenges Muni faces over the next several years due to a steep drop in traditional downtown commuting trips.

Although ridership on Muni lines focused on serving downtown has dropped since the pandemic, ridership on many other lines that serve non-downtown neighborhoods is approaching – and in some cases even exceeding – pre-pandemic levels. The kinds of service cuts that Muni will need to impose if it does not secure additional non-fare revenue will be devastating to neighborhood commercial districts throughout San Francisco. There has been much scaremongering about how expanding the hours of parking meter enforcement may affect small businesses, but parking meters promote parking turnover, which is actually good for business.

Moreover, we are facing a climate emergency. Scientists have sounded the alarm bells that to reduce carbon emissions we must make immediate transformational changes to our transportation systems. We must dedicate more funding to walking, biking and public transit, making these options safer, faster and more convenient. The charter amendment would do the opposite, crippling future transit budgets and preferencing free or cheap parking for private car owners. The charter amendment perversely prioritizes gasoline-fueled transportation over the city's fleet of clean buses and active transportation.

Many San Francisco residents cannot afford cars and many of our seniors also rely on transit. Equity requires that we increase funding for the transportation services these lowest income residents depend on. This proposed charter amendment would effectively do the opposite by adding a new layer of Mayoral veto power over revenue proposals.

Finally, the proposed charter amendment is directly contrary to the City's Transit First policies, the Board's Climate Emergency Declaration, and the City's Climate Action Plan, which calls for 80 percent of all trips to be low-carbon trips by 2030. By prioritizing free private vehicle storage while making it more difficult for SFMTA to raise revenue, the proposed charter amendment would help perpetuate the automobile-focused transportation system that we desperately need to move away from.

This is an important vote that reflects the commitment of the Board of Supervisors to a sustainable future for San Francisco and as such will factor significantly into SFLCV's future candidate endorsement decisions.

Please reject the proposed charter amendment.

Sincerely,

Kristina Pappas
President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

From:	Peter Lee
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject:	I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 9:43:27 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Peter Lee, peterboothlee@hotmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Nancy Zerner
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:55:03 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nancy Zerner, nancyfancypants@yahoo.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Viktoria Kolesnikova
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:31:38 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Viktoria Kolesnikova, vxk.viktoria@gmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Elizabeth Clark
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:22:25 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Elizabeth Clark, swimeclark@gmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Grant Ingram
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:11:22 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Grant Ingram, grant.ingram@yahoo.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Nina Steinman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 6:21:32 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nina Steinman, ninasteinman@yahoo.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Alissa Anderson
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:27:46 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Alissa Anderson , alissa@foggy-notion.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

As a businesses owner in the Inner Richmond, extending the time/days on meters would negativity impact our business. We also need a solution for all day employee parking not at meters or residential spaces, for our workers that need to drive to work.

From: Diana Dubash
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 4:09:46 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Diana Dubash, dirus@pacbell.net

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Helen Collaco
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:06:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Helen Collaco, helencollaco@sbcglobal.net

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: james zucherman
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:06:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: james zucherman, zuchermanj@aol.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Norah Uyeda
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:03:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Norah Uyeda, yuenuyeda@hotmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Helen Collaco
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:51:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Helen Collaco, helencollaco@sbcglobal.net

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Casey Larson
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:51:22 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Casey Larson, caseyeagan@hotmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From:	Stephen Somerstein
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject:	I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date:	Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:42:37 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Stephen Somerstein, ssomerstein@gmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Rick Lee
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:42:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Rick Lee, glock226@yahoo.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Karen Schwartz
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:36:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karen Schwartz , kielygomes@yahoo.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Dennis Lim
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:19:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Dennis Lim, Faydoy356@yahoo.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Thomas Henderson
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 3:36:45 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Thomas Henderson, t.stephen.henderson@gmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	3 Letters regarding File No. 230986
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:05:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding File No. 230986.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding File No. 230986.

> **File No. 230986 -** Charter Amendment - Mayor Approval Required for Certain SFMTA Budget Proposals (Safai, Peskin, Ronen)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Sara Greenwald
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	350SF Coordinating Committee
Subject:	Fwd: Oppose File 230986, Charter Amendment
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:01:14 PM
Attachments:	Oppose File 230986, Charter Amendment.docx

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

To: **Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board**
Dear Ms. Calvillo,
Please include the attached letter (also below for your convenience) in the packet for the next Board of Supervisors meeting.
Thank you,
Sara Greenwald
350 San Francisco

Re: Oppose File **230986,** Charter Amendment

Dear Supervisors,
Please vote against placing on the ballot the Charter amendment introduced by Supervisor Safai, that would require mayoral approval of SFMTA budgets that

- Increase the hours or days of parking meter operation
- Increase the maximum meter fee rate that can be charged
- Change Muni fares in any way, up or down

The amendment undercuts the political independence created by 1999 Prop E, which guards against serious service disruptions caused by budgetary interventions by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. Since it does not require the Mayor to make any statement, much less suggestions about alternative ways SFMTA might raise revenue, it also does not succeed in holding the Mayor accountable for its result.

Sponsors Safai and Peskin have say their goal is to increase mayoral accountability for the SFMTA budget, but their proposal requires a Mayoral statement only if the budget includes a change to fares, parking rates or parking hours. There is no accountability if SFMTA cuts Muni service or downfunds some lines to preserve others. Returning the budget to SFMTA would force only the removal of the change to fares, parking rates or hours - not make the Mayor accountable beyond that. Clean, safe, reliable, safe Muni service should be a priority, but the proposed amendment makes it an afterthought.

San Francisco is failing to meet its environmental goals. SFMTA's most recent proposed Climate Roadmap projects the city is two decades behind on reducing greenhouse emissions from vehicles (Climate Roadmap for a Healthier San Francisco; https://www.sfmta.com/projects/climate-roadmap-healthier-san-francisco; pages 14, 48-49. Note that the original goal, 80% of trips by carbon-neutral modes, is not projected to be hit until after 2050, over two-decades late.) The percentage of the city's greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles – largely private cars – has gone up from 33% in 1990 to 47% in 2019, the last

year with published comparable data (San Francisco's Carbon Footprint; https://sfenvironment.org/carbonfootprint). The city's goal of 80% sustainable trips has been weakened to 80% "low-carbon" trips, and yet we sit at under 50% of that goal, having backslid over the last 3 years (Climate Roadmap for a Healthier San Francisco; page 15.)

One reason the city is not inducing drivers to switch to Muni for even some of their trips within the city because we subsidize parking. It is estimated that charging the real cost of parking would reduce emissions by 2040 more than four times more than any other change studied by SFMTA (Climate Roadmap for a Healthier San Francisco; page 30-31, 36-41).

The city needs to be focused on sustainable transportation, and that means properly funding SFMTA and Muni. It is vital that we build a transit system that gets most of us where we need to go without the need to drive.

For these reasons, we ask you to vote against bringing their amendment before the voters. The city ballot is long enough.

Sincerely,
350 San Francisco Coordinating Committee

November 1, 2023

Re: Oppose File 230986, Charter Amendment

Dear Supervisors,

Please vote against placing on the ballot the Charter amendment introduced by Supervisor Safai, that would require mayoral approval of SFMTA budgets that

- Increase the hours or days of parking meter operation
- Increase the maximum meter fee rate that can be charged
- Change Muni fares in any way, up or down

The amendment undercuts the political independence created by 1999 Prop E, which guards against serious service disruptions caused by budgetary interventions by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. Since it does not require the Mayor to make any statement, much less suggestions about alternative ways SFMTA might raise revenue, it also does not succeed in holding the Mayor accountable for its result.

Sponsors Safai and Peskin have say their goal is to increase mayoral accountability for the SFMTA budget, but their proposal requires a Mayoral statement only if the budget includes a change to fares, parking rates or parking hours. There is no accountability if SFMTA cuts Muni service or downfunds some lines to preserve others. Returning the budget to SFMTA would force only the removal of the change to fares, parking rates or hours - not make the Mayor accountable beyond that. Clean, safe, reliable, safe Muni service should be a priority, but the proposed amendment makes it an afterthought.

San Francisco is failing to meet its environmental goals. SFMTA's most recent proposed Climate Roadmap projects the city is two decades behind on reducing greenhouse emissions from vehicles (Climate Roadmap for a Healthier San Francisco; https://www.sfmta.com/projects/climate-roadmap-healthier-san-francisco; pages 14, 48-49. Note that the original goal, 80% of trips by carbon-neutral modes, is not projected to be hit until after 2050, over two-decades late.) The percentage of the city's greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles – largely private cars – has gone up from 33% in 1990 to 47% in 2019, the last year with published comparable data (San Francisco's Carbon Footprint; https://sfenvironment.org/carbonfootprint). The city's goal of 80% sustainable trips has been weakened to 80% "low-carbon" trips, and yet we sit at under 50% of that goal, having backslid over the last 3 years (Climate Roadmap for a Healthier San Francisco; page 15.)

One reason the city is not inducing drivers to switch to Muni for even some of their trips within the city because we subsidize parking. It is estimated that charging the real cost of parking would reduce emissions by 2040 more than four times more than any other change studied by SFMTA (Climate Roadmap for a Healthier San Francisco; page 30-31, 36-41).

The city needs to be focused on sustainable transportation, and that means properly funding SFMTA and Muni. It is vital that we build a transit system that gets most of us where we need to go without the need to drive.

For these reasons, we ask you to vote against bringing their amendment before the voters. The city ballot is long enough.

Sincerely,
350 San Francisco Coordinating Committee

From:	Philip Bowles
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject:	I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 4:11:07 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Philip Bowles , cottonboll@gmail.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

From: Michelle Cody
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 1:45:09 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michelle Cody, wise8689@yahoo.com

Message: I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment that would give Mayoral approval over parking meter and other transportation fees and fares.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Safai's Charter Amendment for the March 5, 2024 election that would require the Mayor of San Francisco to approve any proposed increases to SFMTA fares, parking meter maximum rates, and hours or days of operation.

No single unelected city department head should have the sole authority to increase our parking or fare rates. To correct this, the proposed Charter Amendment requires the Mayor to approve any fare, parking, or MUNI rate increases put into the SFMTA budget, placing the authority back on elected leaders. Transportation fees significantly impact the lives of residents, and businesses, particularly those in lower-income areas, and when fees need to be changed, this decision should be made by our mayor, who can take all factors and constituents into consideration.

Please vote to support this Charter Amendment.

Item 36

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: 2045 RWS demand could be down to 141 mgd
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:42:00 PM
Attachments:	2045 SFPUC RWS demand could be down to 141 mgd.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached regarding the 2045 SFPUC RWS.

From: Dave Warner <dwar11@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2045 RWS demand could be down to 141 mgd

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

Hi,

Would you distribute the attached letter to the Supervisors?

Kind regards,

Dave Warner

November 1, 2023

Re: 2045 SFPUC RWS demand could be down to 141 mgd, more than 20% below today's demand

Dear Commissioners, General Manager Herrera and Assistant General Manager Ritchie,

Commissioner Ajami has spoken about the potential for a decentralized water supply, where not just places like the Salesforce tower or SFPUC headquarters recycle water, but where that style of recycling could extend to the home. Through your innovations program you are likely aware that at least one product is already on the market to meet this need. It's about the size of a household water heater, priced at $4,000 and supposedly can recycle up to 45% of a household's water use.[1] And there's research underway to make water recycling even easier and cheaper. This is an example of how innovation can reduce our long-term water demand.

The above example supports the long-term trend analyses previously provided to you and BAWSCA.[2] The analyses used an industrial process methodology and water demand since 1990 to project gross per capita demand to 2045, which continues its downward trend.

The table below shows that using the trended 2045 GPCD projections and the California Department of Finance population projections, total Regional Water System (RWS) demand would be 141 mgd in 2045, well below today's demand and 40% below demand projections used in the 2045 Draft Alternative Water Supply Plan. The advent of home water recycling systems contributes to this trend.

Regional Water System (RWS) Systemwide Demand Derivation

	Reference	Projected GPCD	2045 Population Projections (000's)		2045 RWS Demand Based on Trended GPCD (mgd)		Reference
	2020 RWS demand (mgd)	2045 Based on trend	From 2020 UWMP	Based on CA Dept. of Finance	**Using 2020 UWMP population Prtojections**	**Using Ca Dept of Finance Prtojections**	2045 demand from AWS Plan (mgd)
San Francisco	67	46	1,251	847	**57.5**	**39.0**	73.5
BAWSCA	132	79	2,439	1,929	**128.5**	**101.6**	170.6
Combined	199		3,690	2,776	**186.1**	**140.6**	244.1

Note: BAWSCA 2045 RWS demand is calculated as two thirds of total BAWSCA 2045 demand

Such a low level of demand/water sales has immense implications on multiple critical areas, including water and sewer rates, capital budgeting, debt management, alternative water supply planning, environmental damage and the Bay Delta Plan, and individual BAWSCA members developing their own less expensive supplies.

As low and surprising 2045 RWS demand of 141 mgd seems, it's not far-fetched. Back in 2000 when demand was 261 mgd and our served population was 2.4 million, who would have imagined that in 2020 that our demand would drop to 199 mgd, more than 20% below 2000 demand while our population increased to approach 2.8 million?

Until now the SFPUC has only projected growing total demand/water sales. Please include declining demand scenarios in all of your analyses and materials where changes in demand affect outcomes and decisions.

Best regards,



Dave Warner

Cc: Nicole Sankulla, BAWSCA CEO
BAWSCA Board of Directors
SFPUC Citizen's Advisory Committee
Lisa Bilir and Karla Dailey, Palo Alto Utilities

[1] See promotional materials for Hydraloop H600.

[2] See attached letter dated July 12, 2021 to the commissioners and the attached slide deck dated May 26, 2021 provided to BAWSCA.

July 12, 2021

President Sophie Maxwell and Commissioners
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
525 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email

Dear President Maxwell and Commissioners,

In anticipation of your July 16 demand workshop, you may find it interesting to view San Francisco's retail water demand in the context of an industrial process. The idea is that changes in demand are driven by process variables and assuming there are no substantial changes to the process, the changes in demand should continue, within a range of "control limits".

A statement in the draft urban water management plan alludes to such an industrial process:

> "Both total consumption and per capita water use (i.e., gallons of water consumed per person per day [GPCD]) have been on a general decline since the mid-1970s. Many factors have contributed to this reduction in water use, including significant changes to the mix of industrial and commercial businesses and their associated water demand, and the general characteristics of water use by San Franciscans. In particular, the severe droughts of 1976-77 and 1987-92, changes in plumbing codes, and conservation programs (either voluntarily embraced by residents and businesses or mandated by the City) have affected water demands. During the most recent drought in 2012 – 2016 per capita water use further declined."[1]

The actions mentioned in the excerpt will continue.

Applying industrial process methodology[2] results in the following table:



[1] From first paragraph in section 4.1.1 of the *2020 Urban Water Management Plan Public Review Draft, April 2021*
[2] Source used for industrial process methodology: Joiner, Bryan L. (1994). *Fourth Generation Management.* R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company, pages 148-149. Note that an exponential trend line was used in place of the author's average trend line.

The black line reflects actual gross per capita demand in five-year increments from 1990 to 2020.[3] The yellow dashed line is the associated trend line. The blue dashed lines are the "control limits" as determined by the industrial process methodology. The control limits are determined such that it is highly unlikely (99.7% confidence interval) that the process will yield results outside the control limits.

Extrapolating the process to 2045, it projects GPCD to then be 46 gallons down from 76 gallons today (with a possible range of 28 to 64 gallons).

The thought of San Francisco's gross per capita water demand dropping from 76 gallons today to 46 gallons in 2045 might take one's breath away. Imagine 25 years ago in 1995. GPCD then was 116 gallons and had dropped from 137 gallons 5 years earlier. Who then could have imagined that demand 25 years later, in 2020, would be 76 gallons? As the draft UWMP alluded, there will be more conservation measures, changes in building codes, and more droughts in the next 25 years. Industrial process methodology indicates that the trend will continue.

The red dashed line in the above chart is the draft UWMP's projected GPCD to 2045, when it hits the upper control limit of the process chart. It's possible that GPCD could be 64 gallons in 2045, but a lower GPCD is more likely. Looking at 1990-2020, actual GPCD never reached the control limit. The closest point was in the year 2000 when GPCD was 121 gallons and the upper control limit was 130 gallons.

Please consider having the SFPUC use an industrial process methodology as a means for evaluating demand projections.

Sincerely,



Dave Warner

[3] 1990 and 1995 GPCD figures were estimated from Figure 6 in the SFPUC's final 2005 Urban Water Management Plan. 2000 GPCD was calculated using total retail demand of 93.6 mgd (from table 5A of the same 2005 UWMP) and San Francisco's population from the 2000 census.

BAWSCA Demand Projection Analysis

May 26, 2021



Projections consistently overestimated demand

* The 2009 projection reflects a reduction of 5 to 12.5 mgd for active conservation savings as discussed in Sept 2009 Water Conservation Implementation Plan



The size of the demand overestimate increased the further out demand was projected



- Projected GPCD was overestimated similarly to total demand (removing the effect of population growth)



Using industrial process methodology, a trend can be plotted bounded by a 99% confidence interval, which assumes no significant process changes. For example people continue to implement conservation and droughts continue to occur, which people respond well to.

This process chart projects that in 2045 likely BAWSCA GPCD will be 79 gallons per day and will fall between 44 and 115 gallons per day.

Source used for industrial process methodology/formula:
Joiner, Bryan L. (1994) . *Fourth Generation Management*. R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company

Projected GPCD Decline Compared to San Francisco



Given San Francisco's low GPCD, one might have imagined that BAWSCA's GPCD would decline more than San Francisco's

Comparing BAWSCA's Projected GPCD and SF's rate of Decline



- At 2045 GPCD of 105 gallons per day, BAWSCA's projection is 33% above the likely trended GPCD
- If BAWSCA used San Francisco's rate of decline in GPCD, BAWSCA's 2045 GPCD would be 92 gallons per day
- A GPCD of 92 gallons per day would still be 16% higher than target
- At a GPCD of 92 gallons per day, BAWSCA's total 2045 demand would be 224.3 mgd, down 30 mgd from the current projection

A Big Downside to Overestimating Demand

- Higher demand reduces supply reliability
- Overestimating demand gives the appearance of reduced supply reliability
- Overestimating demand creates unneeded costs in developing unneeded supplies
- Overestimating demand increases harm to the environment

At a minimum, a similar comparative analysis to this one should be completed prior to finalizing the next demand study, if such an analysis is not already done.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: San Francisco Rent Board's Housing Inventory and Fee
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:27:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Norma Yee regarding Rent Board fees.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: norma yee <norma.yee@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:17 PM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Rent Board's Housing Inventory and Fee

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

dear mayor and sfbos

here are my thoughts on the separate SFRB fee's:

- waste of resources to mail out notices for all property owners, rather than to larger rental property owners
- waste of time for owner occupied units to apply for exemption
- another method to degrade the privacy of SF citizens
- how did sfrb get the authorization to include smaller properties, single family homes & condo's.

stop the overreach of our private property.

unhappy sf native/sf voter,
-norma

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	6 Letters regarding File No. 230973
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 1:47:00 PM
Attachments:	6 Letters regarding File No. 230973.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 6 letters regarding File No. 230973.

File No. 230973 - Administrative Code - Monitoring of Nonprofits that Contract with the City (Stefani)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: krsimmons@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Simmons
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 8:55:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends $1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Karen Simmons
San Francisco, CA 94117

From:	rima_chadha@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rima Chadha
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 5:30:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends $1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Rima Chadha
San Francisco, CA 94118
(415) 725-0419

From: pablo.gersberg@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Pablo Gersberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:11:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends $1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Pablo Gersberg
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: anjulinadesai@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anjulina Desai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:11:18 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends $1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Anjulina Desai
San Francisco, CA 94118

From:	morgenhumes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Morgen Humes
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 5:11:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends $1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Morgen Humes
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: breauxaw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Breaux Walker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Monday, October 30, 2023 5:09:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends $1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Breaux Walker
San Francisco, CA 94118
(415) 283-7656

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	3 Letters regarding File No. 231016
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:10:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding File No. 231016.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding File No. 231016, Resolution No. 481-23

> **File No. 231016, Resolution No. 481-23 -** Urging the MTA to Prohibit Right Turns on Red (Preston)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	kooshajahani@yahoo.com
To:	mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); MOD, (ADM); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; MDC (ADM); Youthcom, (BOS); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject:	Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date:	Monday, October 30, 2023 3:11:35 PM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for November 7th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORsf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution

is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for November 7th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

From: titus.p.ponrathnam@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 10:20:37 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

I myself have been almost run over by motorists three times on Ocean Ave itself. Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

titus.p.ponrathnam@gmail.com
160 Aptos Ave
San Francisco, California 94127

From:	Lucas Neumann
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, October 26, 2023 4:59:40 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Lucas Neumann
lucasneumann.fau@gmail.com
1240 Bush st
San Francisco, California 94109

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Mayor Breed: San Francisco"s 10 million for APEC must be used for those who are most endangered: elderly and persons with disabilities
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:15:00 PM
Attachments:	f3a46787.png

Hello,

Please see below for communication from the San Francisco Gray Panthers regarding File No. 231086.

> **File No. 231086 -** Prioritizing and Protecting Impacted Communities during APEC Summit (Chan, Ronen, Preston, Dorsey, Walton, Safai, Melgar)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: graypanther-sf <graypanther-sf@sonic.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2023 11:59 AM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Mariano, Eileen (MYR) <eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org>; Power, Andres (MYR) <andres.power@sfgov.org>
Cc: EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Lopez-Weaver, Lindsey (BOS) <Lindsey.Lopez@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>; Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>; Souza, Sarah (BOS) <sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org>; Lerma, Santiago (BOS) <santiago.lerma@sfgov.org>; Carrasco, Imelda (BOS) <Imelda.Carrasco@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Berenson, Samuel (POL) <sam.berenson@sfgov.org>; Donovan, Dominica (BOS) <dominica.donovan@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS)

<ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Mayor Breed: San Francisco's 10 million for APEC must be used for those who are most endangered: elderly and persons with disabilities

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

To: Mayor Breed

cc: Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the board: please place in correspondence file: File No. 231086

Mayor Breed:

We are an organization that advocates for the well being of people who are elderly and disabled, and it is quite obvious that the security arrangements for APEC will endanger the ability of frail people living in the area to receive services that are essential in their homes & to access essential transportation.

The SF 10 million must go to those endangered by the security zone. Please demonstrate your care and concern for those whose basic needs will be most affected by the limitations imposed in the security zone.

The $10 million in reserve funds set aside for the APEC conference MUST BE USED to inform and assist seniors and people with disabilities as well as families living in the area. Their needs and services should be our primary concern.

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer and Art Persyko, San Francisco Gray Panthers Board Members on behalf of San Francisco Gray Panthers

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	4 Letters regarding Algal Bloom in the San Francisco Bay
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:31:00 PM
Attachments:	4 Letters regarding Algal Bloom in the San Francisco Bay.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 4 letters regarding algal bloom in the San Francisco Bay.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	info@baykeeper.org on behalf of news@baykeeper.org via San Francisco Baykeeper
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills
Date:	Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:16:31 AM

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

To: Mayor London Breed
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Last summer, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes,

sadly, the new normal." It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Alameda, CA

From:	info@baykeeper.org on behalf of news@baykeeper.org via San Francisco Baykeeper
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills
Date:	Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:16:31 AM

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

To: Mayor London Breed
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Last summer, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes,

sadly, the new normal." It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Alameda, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of news@baykeeper.org via San Francisco Baykeeper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 3:39:53 PM

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

To: Mayor London Breed
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Last summer, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes,

sadly, the new normal." It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

San Anselmo, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of news@baykeeper.org via San Francisco Baykeeper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 3:39:52 PM

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

To: Mayor London Breed
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Last summer, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes,

sadly, the new normal." It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

San Anselmo, CA

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Letters regarding Homelessness
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:33:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding Homelessness.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding homelessness.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Elizabeth
To:	kfagan@sfchronicle.com
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Homeless Website!!!
Date:	Friday, October 27, 2023 9:15:39 AM

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

Thank you for your Chronicle article about the homeless one site that is being developed to coordinate all the resources available!

I can't believe the City Supervisors, Mayor, Homeless Commissions and non-profits NEVER developed this even though we are the center of the computer entrepreneurs in the world! They are bureaucrats !

Let's hope there is some incentive **for those running for election to streamline this major issue in San Francisco!**

Elizabeth Stahl
San Francisco

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: Legal Advertisement Meeting Call Interpretation on Item 6 for Historic Pole and Lantern, 1st Cycle Review
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:54:47 PM

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

ENGLISH

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 10:42:25 PM

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

ENOUGH!!!!!

Impossible to pass, except walking in the dirt at the bottom of that tree, or walking in the middle of Van Ness, despite high traffic.

GET THESE F***** TENTS OUT OF HERE!! NOW!!!



From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	10 Letters from Monica D.
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:38:00 PM
Attachments:	10 Letters from Monica D..pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 10 letters from Monica D., regarding various topics.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Safai needs to go
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:01:40 AM

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

When businesses have left and are continuously leaving, residents are either leaving or are afraid to step outside, useless woke ass Safai wants to tax us some more so that we can have more funding from short staffed SFPD so that we can finally have more public safety protection and live our lives (AND SPEND MONEY) in SF.

You're a fuckin moron, Safai. The community is talking about you. You are going to be voted out next!

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Newsom in China
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:15:45 AM
Attachments:	Gavin Newsom and Xi Jinping.png

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

Newsom is such a clown. What the hell is a "governor" doing photo ops in China???? Oh we know, he wants to be president in case Biden finally goes to a dementia care home. What Newsom does not realize is he's a FAILURE in CA. Why the hell would the rest of America vote for him???? No thanks to Big Tent USA run by Mexican cartels and drug dealers from Honduras and Venezuela! We ain't stupid!

Newsom needs to visit CA more!



Newsom defends China trip that California Republican calls 'another grandstanding moment'
amp.sacbee.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: Monica D
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Newsom
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:57:52 AM
Attachments: e523711446444d808a8328b9a8eb1d6a_xl.png

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

But of course they did. Newsom and the woke Dems (yes, woke Board of Supes) love to drive up cost of living and taxes in CA (SF). Then he and woke Dems (and yes woke BoS) complain and virtue-signal (for votes from dumbasses) that "we need more affordable housing, etc etc!" You are the culprits. You are WHY it is expensive to live here!

McDonald's & Chipotle Raising Menu Prices In California After Minimum Wage Increase
tmz.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Drug Epicenter
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:45:41 AM

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

And add Biden's open border to this, woke BoS refusing to deport drug dealers (kudos to Matt Dorsey for having common sense), Newsom for signing woke laws making CA a sanctuary state protecting drug dealer migrants.

And here you are telling your workers to not show up to work at the Federal Building (oh wait, is it called Pelosi Building now ?) and yet you don't give a shit about the citizens (aka taxpayers/voters = your bosses) walking around there. You should get SUED for negligence and endangering people's lives!

And NO, we won't be voting for Biden, Newsom, or any woke Dem. We are not risking this country to become the next Mexico - a third-world country run by drug cartels!

Fuck you Dem Party!
THIS IS TREASON! TRANSpartying.



In Pictures: A San Francisco Corner And The City’s War on Drugs
sfstandard.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Drug Epicenter
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:45:07 AM

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

And add Biden's open border to this, woke BoS refusing to deport drug dealers (kudos to Matt Dorsey for having common sense), Newsom for signing woke laws making CA a sanctuary city protecting drug dealer migrants.

And here you are telling your workers to not show up to work at the Federal Building (oh wait, is it called Pelosi Building now ?) and yet you don't give a shit about the citizens (aka taxpayers/voters = your bosses) walking around there. You should get SUED for negligence and endangering people's lives!

And NO, we won't be voting for Biden, Newsom, or any woke Dem. We are not risking this country to become the next Mexico - a third-world country run by drug cartels!

Fuck you Dem Party!
THIS IS TREASON! TRANSpartying.



In Pictures: A San Francisco Corner And The City’s War on Drugs
sfstandard.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Drug Epicenter
Date:	Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:41:26 AM

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

And add Biden's open border to this, woke BoS refusing to deport drug dealers (kudos to Matt Dorsey for having common sense), Newsom for signing woke laws making CA a sanctuary city protecting drug dealer migrants.

And here you are telling your workers to not show up to work at the Federal Building (oh wait, is it called Pelosi Building now ?) and yet you don't give a shit about the citizens (aka taxpayers/voters = your bosses) walking around there. You should get SUED for negligence and endangering people's lives!



In Pictures: A San Francisco Corner And The City’s War on Drugs
sfstandard.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: Monica D
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Drug Epicenter
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:34:29 AM

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

And here you are telling your workers to not show up to work at the Federal Building (oh wait, is it called Pelosi Building now ?) and yet you don't give a shit about the citizens (aka taxpayers/voters = your bosses) walking around there. You should get SUED for negligence and endangering people's lives!

In Pictures: A San Francisco Corner And The City's War on Drugs
sfstandard.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Safai and Walton
Date:	Tuesday, October 31, 2023 8:26:12 PM

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

Safai, you will NEVER be mayor! Walton, move back to Vallejo!

SF leaders divided on how to recruit more cops
sfexaminer.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: Monica D
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Biden's open border = terrorists
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 8:36:18 PM

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

Venezuela's worst criminals and gangs cross border into US cities
dailymail.co.uk

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: Mira Martin-Parker
To: tips@sfstandard.com; Tim Redmond; tips; tips@missionlocal.com; tips@sfist.com; michaelshellenberger@proton.me; editor@sfbayview.com; Michael Durand; blogger@nakedcapitalism.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); letters; letters; emobley@sfchronicle.com
Subject: French Laundry in China
Date: Sunday, October 29, 2023 6:35:01 PM

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

Newsom Gives Not-So-Subtle Signal of San Francisco "Partnership" as He Wraps Up China Trip

Written by The Standard StaffPublished Oct. 29, 2023 • 11:36am

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	4 Letters regarding Quality of Life Concerns
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:42:00 PM
Attachments:	4 Letters regarding Quality of Life Concerns.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 4 letters regarding quality of life concerns.

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From:	Mark Andrews
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Lerma, Santiago (BOS)
Cc:	Azevedo, Kaitlyn (ADM); Jason Schlachet; Monica Blaylock; Emily Kurland
Subject:	Fwd: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors
Date:	Sunday, October 29, 2023 12:20:37 PM

Board of Supervisors, Hillary Ronen and Santiago Lerma,

I would like to object to the license granted to the nightclub operating as Echo at 2565 Mission St, San Francisco, CA 94110 [formerly called Arena SF]. '

Summary of the problem:

- My neighbors and I live at 662 Capp St, directly behind Echo, separated by a yard of about 50 feet in length.
- Echo has been **predominantly unresponsive to neighbor complaints about excessive noise** emanating from their premises on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights.

Specific details about the problem:

- The club now **constantly exceeds noise levels** that are permitted in San Francisco.
  - I measured **82dB on October 22nd, and 78.3dB last night from our building.**
  - When I measure ambient noise, it is typically below 59dB (and this is a generous ambient level).
- Note: **city permitted noise is no more than 8dB emanating from the property plane**. Echo now **always far exceeds** the permitted noise levels.
  - City rules state, "**The standard in Section 2909(b), eight dBA above the ambient at any point outside of the property plane, is the maximum allowable cumulative level of exterior noise**, produced from any combination of mechanical device(s) and implied sound systems(s) originating from an exclusively commercial or industrial property or from or serving a commercial use located within a mixed use property. For a licensed Place of Entertainment or a Limited Live Performance Locale (or other venues enforced by the Entertainment Commission), this standard applies to both A-weighted and C-weighted measures."
  - In their **liquor license application**: https://www.abc.ca.gov/licensing/license-lookup/single-license/?RPTTYPE=12&LICENSE=523547 "Arena SF" [former name prior to renaming as Echo] -- **"No noise shall be audible beyond the area under the control of the licensee as depicted on the most recently certified ABC-257."**
  - Further, Arena claimed, "Arena SF is part of the Arena Nightlife Group which owns music venues in San Francisco, Orange County, Los Angeles, and Mountain View. Arena SF has been well-managed and non- problematic since 2019. **There have been no noise complaints** and minimal police issues since the business opened four years ago. My client will continue with this new ABC music venue license to be respectful to the neighborhood and to its customers. Arena SF is committed to providing a welcoming atmosphere, top-notch music, and great service. Foremost, they will be Good Neighbors"
    - https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6179845&GUID=CAF9D327-1CB4-42D5-835C-E41463DACD26
    - **This is simply <u>not</u> true**, we have made many noise complaints over the past 5 years about excessive sound. The operators of Arena SF and Echo [new name] were *quite reasonable* in the past, adjusting the system appropriately. Further, even the **Entertainment Commission caught them on several occasions exceeding the interior sound levels**.

No matter which way you look at this, the business is causing problems. We can't sleep Thursday nights with the issue, and even on the weekend, we are denied the quiet enjoyment of our homes until after 2am. One night, on August 27th, they played past 4am [Ref: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yZce7HzQxFg]!

I would appreciate your help **<u>enforcing reasonable sound limits</u>** on this business, as they are flagrantly breaking several laws and rules that are in place for the protection of the community who live here.

Thank you,
Mark Andrews, on behalf of neighbors on the 600 Block of Capp Street.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mark Andrews** <mark@planetandrews.com>
Date: Sun, Oct 29, 2023 at 11:42 AM
Subject: Re: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors
To: Jason Schlachet <jss@offramp.org>
CC: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com <662capphoa@googlegroups.com>, Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org>, Monica Blaylock <monica.blaylock@gmail.com>

Hi Kaitlyn,

It is shameful that the owners/operators of Echo are completely non-responsive to neighbors. I've contacted them several times to no avail. They only responded to me and Jason once and are completely ignoring us now.

I will note that their liquor license application says, "Arena SF (their former name, prior to renaming as Echo) is part of the Arena Nightlife Group which owns music venues in San Francisco, Orange County, Los Angeles, and Mountain View. Arena SF has been well-managed and non- problematic since 2019. There have been no noise complaints and minimal police issues since the business opened four years ago. My client will continue with this new ABC music venue license to be respectful to the neighborhood and to its customers. Arena SF is committed to providing a welcoming atmosphere, top-notch music, and great service. Foremost, they will be Good Neighbors."

https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6179845&GUID=CAF9D327-1CB4-42D5-835C-E41463DACD26

The last sentence is a complete joke, they are extremely reckless and negligent when it comes to being good neighbors given their lack of due care to engage with the neighbors and ignoring the problem they are causing and have the capability to resolve. Further, there have been many complaints about noise over the years as your records can attest. The difference now, is they are not adjusting the sound appropriately when we contact them.

I want to state very clearly that come Feb 2024, I do not want the city to renew their license because of the complete disregard for the community in which they operate.

They are clearly disinterested in playing a reasonable role as a business operator within the community.

Who can I appeal to about their license at this point? I'd appreciate your help.

Thanks,
Mark, on behalf of neighbors on the Capp 600 block

On Thu, Oct 26, 2023 at 10:36 PM Jason Schlachet <jss@offramp.org> wrote:

> I could hear the Carlos Santana sample in a DJ Khaled song playing at Echo just now.
>
> I know we live in a city, and night clubs can't be far away from residences, but when i can hear the bass down the hall inside my home and identify the song from my bedroom, it seems like it's too loud.
>
> jason

From: Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2023 10:11:40 PM
To: Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org>
Cc: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com <662capphoa@googlegroups.com>; Jason Schlachet <jss@offramp.org>; Monica Blaylock <monica.blaylock@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors

Hi Kaitlyn,

The beat of music is irritating again tonight - we shouldn't be forced to listen to this inside our own homes. They have to adjust the sound and fit sound abatement material to more of the building. The leakage is a big problem.

Best,
Mark

On Wed, Oct 25, 2023 at 1:05 PM Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org> wrote:

> Hi Mark,
>
> No problem – and since I called you, I heard back from an owner. They confirmed they did move their upstairs sound equipment downstairs, so now we are scheduling the sound test but noting for this group that my Senior Inspector who does the tests (usually during the weekday so as not to disrupt business operations) is out sick and this testing likely won't occur until next week when he's back.
>
> In the meantime, please continue to use 311 as needed and one of my inspectors will respond if they are in the field.
>
> Best,
>
> Kaitlyn
>
> **Kaitlyn Azevedo** (she/her)
>
> Deputy Director
>
> San Francisco Entertainment Commission
>
> 49 South Van Ness, Suite 1482
>
> San Francisco, CA 94103
>
> 628-652-6038 (direct line) | 628-652-6030 (EC main line)
>
> Kaitlyn.Azevedo@sfgov.org
>
> Facebook | Website
> EC Blog | Instagram
> *Sign up for the Entertainment Commission e-mail list*
>
> 
>
> Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the Entertainment 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 Social Security numbers and phone numbers, will be redacted.
>
> **From:** Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com>
> **Sent:** Wednesday, October 25, 2023 12:41 PM
> **To:** 662capphoa@googlegroups.com
> **Cc:** Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org>; Jason Schlachet <jss@offramp.org>; Monica Blaylock <monica.blaylock@gmail.com>
> **Subject:** Re: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors
>
> Hi Kaitlyn,
>
> Thank you very much for your voicemail earlier. We really appreciate the follow-up. Looking forward to seeing this resolved acceptably soon.
>
> Best,
>
> Mark

On Mon, Oct 23, 2023 at 12:38 PM Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com> wrote:

> Hi Kaitlyn,
>
> I left you a voicemail just now, I'd appreciate your feedback when you get a chance.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Mark
>
> On Sun, Oct 22, 2023 at 1:07 PM Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com> wrote:
>
> > To contrast, with **ambient noise today (even with a commercial aircraft flying overhead just now), the level is 59dB, last night I measured 82dB**.
> >
> > San Francisco law states: (b) Commercial And Industrial Property Noise Limits. No person shall produce or allow to be produced by any machine, or device, music or entertainment or any combination of same, on commercial or industrial property over which the person has ownership or control, **a noise level more than eight dBA above the local ambient at any point outside of the property plane**. With respect to noise generated from a licensed Place of Entertainment, licensed Limited Live Performance Locale, or other location subject to regulation by the Entertainment Commission or its Director, **in addition to the above dBA criteria a secondary low frequency dBC criteria shall apply to the definition above**. No noise or music associated with a licensed Place of Entertainment, licensed Limited Live Performance Locale, or other location subject to regulation by the Entertainment Commission or its Director, shall exceed the low frequency ambient noise level defined in Section 2901(f) by more than 8 dBC.
> >
> > Echo is clearly in violation of this law.
> >
> > The manager responded tersely over text message to Jason and me stating, "We have had the sound inspector visit both nights due to sound complaints and have been told we are well within our legal operating limits, so unfortunately there is nothing more we can do to accommodate you". So it's clear they are unwilling to do anything further.
> >
> > I'd like you to follow up on the clear violation here. Echo may be within the limit inside the club, but they are well outside the limit outside the premises.
> >
> > Regards,
> >
> > Mark
> >
> > On Sat, Oct 21, 2023 at 11:49 PM Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com> wrote:
> >
> > > I'm contacting a lawyer on Monday because this is absolutely intolerable at this point. I took this reading earlier, standing over 50 feet away from Echo.
> > >
> > > 
> > >
> > >
> > > On Fri, Oct 20, 2023 at 10:48 PM Jason Schlachet <jss@offramp.org> wrote:

One last note from me tonight. For what it's worth — They have two rear doors, and the southern one is slightly ajar. We witnessed someone try to close it, but it didn't stay tightly closed. If you send out an inspector this weekend, have them check both of the rear doors. Thank you.

Jason

From: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com <662capphoa@googlegroups.com> on behalf of Jason Schlachet <jss@offramp.org>
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2023 10:35:05 PM
To: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com <662capphoa@googlegroups.com>; Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org>

Cc: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com <662capphoa@googlegroups.com>; Monica Blaylock <monica.blaylock@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors

I just want to add, tonight we listened to the club behind our building (directly behind the Venue) and from on top of our building. It seemed "ok", but inside our bedrooms, where there is far less ambient noise, all I can hear is the baseline to the music they're playing. It may be low dB, but it is irritating. If I listen to it purposefully, my mind concentrates on it and sometimes I get a headache. Should I be able to hear it at all? It would be hard to measure, but subjectively it sticks out.

Jason

From: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com <662capphoa@googlegroups.com> on behalf of Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com>
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2023 10:28 PM
To: Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org>
Cc: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com <662capphoa@googlegroups.com>; Monica Blaylock <monica.blaylock@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors

Hi Kaitlyn,

What can we do about having them adjust their sound equipment to reduce the bass? They do appear to have turned off speakers upstairs which is helping with some sound issues, but the bass is disturbing us still.

Thanks,

Mark

On Wed, Oct 18, 2023 at 2:00 PM Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com> wrote:

> Hi Kaitlyn,
>
> There should also be a measurement behind the premises with normal sound system operation. There is quite a lot of leakage and that's what's causing the problem in our building. I think there needs to be perhaps, also adjustment of their sound proofing.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Mark
>
> On Wed, Oct 18, 2023 at 12:25 PM Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org> wrote:
>
> > Hi Folks,
> >
> > Thanks for the added context here. I've reached out to Echo's ownership team to check in about any modifications they've made to the sound system as indicated below. I'm also inquiring as to why sound is being heard after 2am, as they only have a Place of Entertainment (POE) permit and therefore entertainment must end by 2am. I will note, some venues play prerecorded music as employees close down for the night, but I'm not sure that's the case here.
> >
> > I'll send my inspector, Mike, out again this weekend to touch base with management and take internal sound recordings. Mike is familiar with the situation and has spoken with Mark in the past.
> >
> > As always, please use 311 to lodge sound complaints so they come into our enforcement queue in real time and an inspector will respond if they are in the field. This also helps us track complaint history over time.
> >
> > Best,
> >
> > Kaitlyn

Kaitlyn Azevedo (she/her)

Deputy Director

San Francisco Entertainment Commission

49 South Van Ness, Suite 1482

San Francisco, CA 94103

628-652-6038 (direct line) | 628-652-6030 (EC main line)

Kaitlyn.Azevedo@sfgov.org

Facebook | Website
EC Blog | Instagram
Sign up for the Entertainment Commission e-mail list



Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the Entertainment 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 Social Security numbers and phone numbers, will be redacted.

From: Monica Blaylock <monica.blaylock@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 5:48 PM
To: 662capphoa@googlegroups.com
Cc: Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors

hi Kaitlyn,

I am the owner of APT 2 in 662 Capp ST and my tenants have reported on more than one occasion that the sound of the club is audible in our unit.

This, without a doubt violates the noise restrictions and I ask the Entertainment commission to work with us and the club to enforce the law.

Thanks,

Monica

On Mon, Oct 16, 2023 at 4:28 PM Jason Schlachet <jss@offramp.org> wrote:

> Kaitlyn,
>
> I live upstairs from Mark and just wanted to corroborate his claims. It is loud. I can sometimes hear their music through my pillow (it is actually louder when my ear is in contact with my bed), meaning there is definitely a good amount of vibration in our building from Echo. The only thing I agree with the venue is that nothing has changed - it was too loud then, it is too loud now.
>
> To demonstrate this, on August 27th, I was woken up and heard music from this venue at 4am. I grabbed an extra phone and recorded the noise from my bedroom patio, with the clock of the other phone for reference. It is so loud, my phone was able to identify it as "I Wanna be Down" by Brandy.
>
> Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yZce7HzQxFg
>
> Is it reasonable that their music shouldn't be so loud that I can identify the song? If this isn't a demonstration of the nuisance, I don't know what is.
>
> The operating restriction on their ABC license says, "Entertainment provided shall not be audible beyond the area under the control of the licensee(s) as depicted on the most recently certified ABC-257." So I would like to know what the bounds of that area is, and challenge the assertion.
>
> Thanks,
> Jason
>
> > On Oct 16, 2023, at 3:48 PM, Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com> wrote:
> >
> > Hi Kaitlyn,
> >
> > Thanks for your response.
> >

> The issue has been persisting since the club reopened as Echo SF. It may be the same management, but a few things I noticed changed:
> •
> a) The sound blankets which were on the skylights on the roof of the building were removed
> • b) The bass used to almost exclusively be the problem, but now, I note that higher frequencies are very audible where I can hear the lyrics of music when all my windows are closed (and I have triple glazing with quiet rock drywall)
> I would appreciate it if they checked the sound proofing, as a) above has definitely changed, and I'm wondering if they adjusted anything else with the premises.
>
> We shouldn't be able to audibly hear anything inside our building with all the windows closed, as per the sound regulations in San Francisco.
>
> Thanks,
> Mark
>
> On Mon, Oct 16, 2023 at 2:43 PM Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org> wrote:
> Hi Mark,
> Thanks for reaching out. We visited Echo on 9/23 at 11:15pm and my inspector spoke with management who said the business was under the same ownership and no changes to their sound system had been made, but I'm happy to have someone visit again this weekend. Please feel free to use 311 to lodge a sound complaint so my inspector may respond in real time if they are in the field.
> Best,
> Kaitlyn
> Kaitlyn Azevedo (she/her)
> Deputy Director
> San Francisco Entertainment Commission
> 49 South Van Ness, Suite 1482
> San Francisco, CA 94103
> 628-652-6038 (direct line) | 628-652-6030 (EC main line)
> Kaitlyn.Azevedo@sfgov.org Facebook | Website
> EC Blog | Instagram
> Sign up for the Entertainment Commission e-mail list<image001.jpg> Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the Entertainment 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 Social Security numbers and phone numbers, will be redacted.
> From: Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com>
> Sent: Sunday, October 15, 2023 12:12 AM
> To: Entertainment Enforcement (ADM) <entertainment.enforcement@sfgov.org>
> Subject: Fwd: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors
> This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
> Hi folks,
> Can you please help us with this issue?
> Thank you,
> Mark
> ---------- Forwarded message ---------
> From: Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com>
> Date: Sun, Oct 15, 2023 at 12:10 AM
> Subject: Fwd: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors
> To: 662CappHOA <662capphoa@googlegroups.com>, Savino, Antonio (ADM) <antonio.savino@sfgov.org>
> Tony, do you still work in the Entertainment Commission? The sound from Echo SF is ridiculous- I can hear it as if it were playing inside my own home. I'm not sure what happened the sound proofing but it appears to have been removed or damaged and they're definitely not operating within the legal limits.
> Thank you,
> Mark
> ---------- Forwarded message ---------
> From: Mark Andrews <mark@planetandrews.com>
> Date: Sun, Oct 15, 2023 at 12:03 AM
> Subject: Music is far too loud and disturbing neighbors
> To: <info@echosfc.com>
> CC: 662CappHOA <662capphoa@googlegroups.com>
>
>
> Folks,
> The music coming from your club is far too loud. The law states that it should not be audible outside the building. We live on Capp Street behind your building and we can hear it very clearly indeed.
> https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/ehsdocs/ehsnoise/guidelinesnoiseenforcement.pdf
> Previous club operators adjusted the sound to fall within permitted levels and had sound proofing installed. Has something happened the sound proofing in the building, because both the bass and higher frequencies are very audible indoors with all the windows closed (through triple glazing)?
> Please check your sound configuration and adjust it so it does not disturb the neighborhood.
> Thank you,
> Mark
>
> --
>
> ---
> You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "662CappHOA" group.
> To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to 662capphoa+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
> To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/662capphoa/CAHV2yVk_bh_SFefWCEhz3DTuBQE-43D8cqEmXVY1pPr877Xw1w%40mail.gmail.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "662CappHOA" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to 662capphoa+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/662capphoa/D236A2D2-2968-4A63-8288-B34D1FDB0788%40offramp.org.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "662CappHOA" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to 662capphoa+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/662capphoa/CAHV2yV%3D0dzew-

5AwaGFB1mpR%2B%2BQXVBywCyiYuwUnJ-39p6ct_w%40mail.gmail.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "662CappHOA" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to 662capphoa+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit
https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/662capphoa/BYAPR18MB2533C6D6E8244BA62BA709E7A5DAA%40BYAPR18MB2533.namprd18.prod.outlook.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "662CappHOA" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to 662capphoa+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit
https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/662capphoa/BYAPR18MB2533EA3A5EB19D72E5ED2F57A5DAA%40BYAPR18MB2533.namprd18.prod.outlook.com.

From:	Richard Skaff
To:	Richard Skaff
Cc:	Bohn, Nicole (ADM); Kaplan, Debby (ADM); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Administrator, City (ADM); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); California Department of Justice
Subject:	Housing Code Violations That No One Is Doing Anything To Resolve!
Date:	Sunday, October 29, 2023 10:37:18 AM

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

Hello.

How can the City of San Francisco (and other California cities and counties) allow the conditions described in this article by a resident who is a senior with a disability? Apparently, she must walk down nine (9!) fights of stairs to use the lobby toilet because even after repairs, her toilet won't flush!

https://www.sfpublicpress.org/after-massive-renovations-code-violations-rise-steeply-in-subsidized-housing/

This is one of an overwhelming number of code violations that exist throughout California because local code permit/enforcement agencies aren't doing their job. Who were the licensed architect and contractor that designed and built the repairs described in the story? Will they or anyone, for that matter, be held responsible for these outrageous conditions the State's poorest and most vulnerable must experience? Or do we just not give a damn about them? And, by the way, what happened to our compassion?

What will the California Department of Justice (Attorney General Bonta) do about this unacceptable condition thats leaving vulnerable seniors and people with disabilities (people first, please!) with inhumane living conditions?

Richard Skaff, Executive Director
Designing Accessible Communities
Email: richardskaff1@gmail.com
Cell: 707-755-1681
“Get in good trouble, necessary trouble, and redeem the soul of America”
A statement made by civil rights leader, John Lewis.
"Fighting Hate,
Teaching Tolerance,
Seeking Justice" | The
Southern Poverty Law Center

From: Philip Cropp
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: SFPD, Chief (POL)
Subject: SF offices
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 10:27:30 AM

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

Wonder why?



San Francisco | Bay Area

Science, Tech & Medicine

San Francisco's Expensify Lounge Shuts Down, the Office is Dead According to Company's Wild Experiment



By **Eileen Vargas**
Published on October 26, 2023

The Expensify Lounge, an

From: Matthew Healy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stolen Bikes/Garage Broken Into
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 12:53:19 PM

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

Hello,

I'd like you to please note that this week my home was broken into in lauren heights and my bikes were stolen. This behavior seems to be normalized in San Francisco because of the shortfalls of our local government. I'd like to ask that you please keep your regular citizens in mind when creating laws. Crime is not okay - please don't try and normalize it.

Sincerely,

One of many concerned SF citizens

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Some final thoughts on remote testimony
Date:	Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:46:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Joe Kunzler regarding File No. 231020, Motion No. M23-129.

> **File No. 231020, Motion No. M23-129 -** Amending the Rules of Order - Limiting Remote Public Comment Opportunities (Peskin)

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Joe A. Kunzler <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2023 12:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Some final thoughts on remote testimony

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

Dear Supervisors,
J News lacked room for this so here you go.
Additionally, I'm going to wax philosophical for a moment after the past week or so: I can't get enough people to care about restoring remote testimony down there and too many outside of Clerk Angela's/City Hall want to be chiefs versus team players. Do their own thang for anti-social media and bait the SFBOS President, I guess. Especially as some expect and gain more attention & publicity from their in-person performances that President Peskin is selectively giving. It's a right-wing *thang* and I'm a Stefani Fighter-Attack Wing guy. Politics is a team sport.
One last thing, just for the record: There are and were several "correct" answers for Supervisor Stefani's vote. I'll let Supervisor Stefani explain in her own words due to these unique concepts called *respect* and *mutual*

admiration.
I am too busy fighting Avrum (Alex) Tsimerman in my part of the world to concern myself too much with a SF that does not want to save thyself together in action and brotherhood. SF's about to lose your "Maverick" to Sacramento barring a serious last-minute candidate...
Onward;
JOE

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **J Website** <webcontact@jweekly.com>
Date: Tue, Oct 24, 2023 at 11:11 PM
Subject: New submission from Letters to the Editor
To: <growlernoise@gmail.com>

Hi Joe, here's a copy of the information you submitted. We will reach out to you if we need further information.

Name
Joe Kunzler
Email
growlernoise@gmail.com
Letter
As one of the proponents of Washington State's 2022's HB 1329 that made oral remote testimony required alongside in-person testimony and also having a Jewish relative plus some contacts in the Bay Area, I follow with equal parts interest and horror the closing of the skies to remote testimony such as Emma Goss' "More Bay Area governments end remote comments to stop antisemitic rants". The Brown Act, a 1953 law since amended, apparently needs a full renovation for the 2020s. But fret not; renovating the Brown Act can be done. See what this open government advocate did in Washington State was politely ask now-former Representative Emily Wicks to legislate making remote testimony law and other necessary fixes to our Open Public Meetings Act like how to have remote meetings in an emergency law. It took two legislative sessions and compromises to win allyship of local government lobbyists, but we did protect remote testimony. I am confident that if California could create a posse of local government lobbyists, voices for inclusion, and a few empathetic legislators – civility and inclusion could return to California skies. The Brown Act should state that hate speech is disruptive by dissuading participation on public policy – which is the anti-thesis of open government law. Additionally, all remote callers should preregister and agree to a code of conduct that includes a one-year ban for two violations in a month. Tough but fair. I sincerely wish to help that posse. I have a very special reason why. I greatly enjoyed calling into the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to be a superfan of Supervisor Catherine "Maverick" Stefani. Catherine's an Italian Catholic ally of Jewry who fought with valor and defeated like a Zelensky the anti-Semitic attackers in her committee and plus is the best gun violence prevention advocate ever.