

FILE NO. 200745

Petitions and Communications received from July 1, 2020, through July 9, 2020, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on July 14, 2020.

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

From the Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.109, making the following appointment: Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- **Malia Cohen** - Police Commission - term ending April 30, 2024

From the Department of Public Health, submitting the Contingency Usage Report, FY2019-2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the City Administrator, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 3.21, submitting the General Fund Department Capital Budget FY2021 and FY2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, submitting a copy of their complete application packet for Edward Byrne Memorial JAG funding. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Office of the Controller, submitting the City and County of San Francisco's Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund. Copy Each Supervisor: (5)

From the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor, submitting a follow up report on the 2016 Audit of the Payroll and Disbursements Process for the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Human Rights Commission, submitting updates and deliverables from the Office of Racial Equity, dated June 30, 2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Office of the Controller, submitting their annual report of Municipal Code-Mandated Fee Reviews and Schedules - FY2020-2021 and FY2021-2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the Juvenile Probation Department, submitting their semi-annual report on Civil Detainers, dated June 30, 2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor, submitting a memorandum on its assessment of the Municipal Transportation Agency's Cable Car Fare Collection Monitoring Program in FY2019-2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the San Francisco Police Department, submitting the Annual Report on Gifts Received up to \$10,000. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Treasure Island Development Authority, pursuant to Resolution No. 153-19, submitting the Treasure Island Marina Annual Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From the Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee, regarding the proposed Charter Amendment - Department of Sanitation and Streets, Sanitation and Streets Commission, and Public Works Commission. File No. 200510. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From the Department of Human Resources, submitting two Administrative Code, Chapter 12B Waiver Requests. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From the California Public Utilities Commission, submitting notice of a project from Verizon Wireless. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Heidi Petersen, regarding Supervisors and other attendees turning off cameras during meetings. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Patricia Keenan, regarding a statue at the corner of Dolores Street and Market Street. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Colin Gallagher, regarding the proposed Ordinance - Health Code - Adult Sex Venue Health and Safety Standards. File No. 200141. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From concerned citizens, regarding MUNI service. 3 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Zach Karnazes, regarding deforesting San Francisco during the health pandemic. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Kyle Johnson, regarding illegal fireworks in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From James Vannucchi, regarding the origin of naming San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Planning Department's proposed Ordinance to streamline the CEQA process in San Francisco. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From concerned citizens, regarding evictions during the COVID-19 pandemic. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From concerned citizens, regarding the homelessness in San Francisco. 3 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From the Bar Association of San Francisco, regarding the proposed Charter Amendment - Police Department Staffing Levels. File No. 200515. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From concerned citizens, regarding issues associated with COVID-19. 6 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Eileen Boken, submitting public comment on various items. File Nos. 200654, 191283, 200487, 200516. 4 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Hearing - Police Department - Budget Analyst. File No. 200531. 89 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From the Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee, regarding proposed Charter Amendment - Department of Sanitation and Streets, Sanitation and Streets. File No. 200510. 92 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From concerned citizens, regarding proposed Ordinance - General Obligation Bond Election - Health and Recovery - Not to Exceed \$438,500,000. File No. 200478. 7 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Emergency Ordinance regarding the Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings. File No. 200638. 316 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From Alvin Ja, regarding public comment on files relating to the proposed Balboa Reservoir. File No. 200422, 200423, 200635. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From Jordan Davis, regarding Rocky Chau and the Animal Welfare Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From concerned citizens, regarding proposed Ordinance - Police Code - Discriminatory Reports to Law Enforcement. File No. 200735. 9 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From concerned citizens, regarding Caltrain and the proposed 1/8 cent sales tax ballot measure. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From Francisco G. Delgadillo, regarding an open letter to Larry Ellison and Safra Catz. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From Robin Krop, regarding cutting economic ties with the Chinese government. Copy: Each Supervisor. (38)

From John Q Public Affairs, regarding T-Mobile, 5G technology and San Francisco.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Ronen, Hillary](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: 7/7 Police Commission Appointment
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 5:56:26 PM
Attachments: [Malia Cohen.zip](#)

Dear Board Members,

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.109, please find the Mayors nomination of Malia Cohen (State BOE Member) to the Police Commission. The Mayor's nomination shall be the subject of a public hearing and a vote within 60 days. If the Board fails to act on a Mayoral nomination within 60 days of the date the nomination is transmitted to the Clerk of the Board, the nominee shall be deemed confirmed. This nomination will be referred to the Rules Committee and a file will be opened on the matter. If you have any questions, please contact Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy at alisa.somera@sfgov.org.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Peacock, Rebecca (MYR) <rebecca.peacock@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 5:25 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Tom, Risa (POL) <risa.tom@sfgov.org>; Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Subject: 7/7 Police Commission Appointment

Clerk Calvillo and Deputy Clerk Somera,

Please see attached Police Commission nomination:
Malia Cohen, for a four-year term ending April 30, 2024 to the seat formerly held by Robert Hirsch.

Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!

Rebecca Peacock ([they/she](#))
(415) 554-6982 | Rebecca.Peacock@sfgov.org
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City & County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Nomination of Appointment

July 7, 2020

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Charter §4.109, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

Malia Cohen, for appointment to the Police Commission for a four-year term ending April 30, 2024 to the seat formerly held by Robert Hirsch.

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

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this appointment nomination. Should you have any question about this appointment nomination, please contact Rebecca Peacock in my office at 415-554-6982.

Sincerely,

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

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

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Annual DPH FY19-20 Contingency Usage Report
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:48:00 PM
Attachments: [DPH FY19-20 Contingency Report BOS.pdf](#)

From: Ruggels, Michelle (DPH) <michelle.ruggels@sfdph.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 4:23 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Annual DPH FY19-20 Contingency Usage Report

Hi,

As a result of a BLA recommendation many, many years ago when contingencies in contracts were new, we had the submission of an annual report on contingency usage (of BOS approved contracts) tacked onto an item. So, here it is.

Thanks, Michelle

Director, DPH Business Office
415 255-3404



City and County of San Francisco

London Breed
Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health

Grant Colfax, MD
Director of Health

DATE: June 30, 2019
TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Michelle Ruggels, Director of the DPH Business Office *MR*
RE: FY19-20 Contingency Usage Report, Department of Public Health

As required under Board of Supervisors' adopted Resolution 563-10, enclosed is the Department's FY19-20 annual Contingency Usage Report.

If you have any questions on this report, please contact me at (415) 255-3404.

Attachment

cc: Grant Colfax, Director of Health
Greg Wagner, Chief Financial Officer

2019-20 Annual Contingency Usage Report for Contracts Approved by the Board of Supervisors
 Department of Public Health
 submitted 6/30/20

Agency	BOS Resolution	Not-to-Exceed Amount	Contingency Amount	Contingency Used in FY19-20	Sources and Uses for Increase
ART dba BAART	250-18	\$35,952,000	\$3,852,000	\$246,771	FY19-20: Cost of Doing Business
Baker Places	330-18	\$55,471,545	\$5,943,765	\$206,256	FY19-20: \$103,370 Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO) and \$102,886 additional .05% CODB
Cerner Health Services Inc. (formerly Siemens Medical Solutions, USA Inc.)	261-13	\$87,478,859	\$2,431,625	\$0	No Contingency used in FY19-20
Community Awareness and Treatment Services_Med Respite	176-19	\$23,186,919	\$1,986,744	\$764,116	FY19-20: \$39,823 CODB; \$352,590 security services enhancement; \$371,703 for one-time HVAC expenses
Conard House	121-19	\$44,862,764	\$4,806,725	\$0	No Contingency used in FY19-20
Crestwood Behavioral Health Services	202-18	\$77,280,000	\$8,280,000	\$500,000	Note: Contingency in FY18-19 reported as None. However, after report submitted, the contract was modified to add the SF Healing Center, located at Dignity Health in the amount of \$2,273,950. In FY19-20, an additional \$500k was added to expand census at a separate facility.
Edgewood Center for Children and Families	307-18	\$24,224,508	\$2,595,483	\$223,455	FY19-20 Net Change: (1) \$220,614 Annual Cost of Doing Business Increases, (2) \$54,999 MediCal enhancement to BH Outpatient and other programs (3) \$36,740 MCO increase, (4) \$55k reduction for closure of Kinship Program, (5)\$30,594 reduction in misc. workorders, and (5) \$3,304 reduction in MHSA/PEI funding.
EPIC City Government Contract	430-17	\$167,384,597	\$17,934,064	\$435,641	Product and services enhancements to support the SFDPH Electronic Health Records project to meet reporting requirements.
Family Service Agency	346-18	\$36,533,164	\$3,914,268	\$13,847	FY19-20 Net change of \$13,847 due to increase of \$74,942 in CODB funding, offset by a net reduction of \$61,905 due to misc. changes, primarily the net decrease of one-time funding added in FY18-19.
Health Advocates	388-18	\$18,014,546	\$1,555,478	\$0	FY19-20: No Contingency Used
HealthRIGHT360 (Reg-AARS)	332-18	\$84,064,915	\$9,006,955	\$2,805,746	FY19-20: \$534,620 CODB allocation; \$296,757 expansion of residential step down funding with State ERAF funding; \$852,610 annualization of Outpatient/Intensive Outpatient with State ERAF funding; \$500,000 ODS Waiver funding for Withdrawal Management; \$568,406 Drug MediCal for Intensive Outpatient; \$130,322 one-time start-up funding; and net reduction of \$76,969 of misc. changes.
HealthRIGHT360 (check writing)	232-19	\$100,947,391	\$4,559,043	\$1,382,506	FY19-20: \$1,262,650 rate increase for long term care beds; \$54,000 for pre-trial diversion stabilization rooms; \$50,000 increase to FMP wrap services, and net \$15,856 of multiple misc. other changes.
HealthRIGHT360 (fiscal intermediary)	426-18	\$79,058,563	\$3,881,094	\$1,099,937	FY19-20 \$325,000 one-time Enhancement for Street Violence Intervention Project, including Bereavement expenses; \$200,000 one-time Enhancement to Project Homeless Connect; \$529,313 Enhancement to Black Infant Health using one-time grant funding; \$45,624 misc. increases.
MedImpact Healthcare Systems, Inc. (BHS)	260-13	\$21,593,120	\$54,000	\$0	FY19-20: No Contingency Used
Instituto Familiar de la Raza	19-0488	\$28,795,894	\$3,085,274	\$223,140	FY19-20:\$7,150 increase for MCO; \$200,000 CYF Outpatient increase; \$5,000 SAMHSA grant increase, \$27,236 workorder changes, and net reduction of \$16,248 reflecting multiple smaller changes.
McKesson	20-0012	\$381,382,991	\$30,353,486	\$0	FY19-20: No Contingency Used
McKesson Plasma and Biologics	20-0013	\$295,934,790	\$24,256,862	\$0	FY19-20: No Contingency Used
Positive Resource Center	306-18	\$18,075,044	\$785,421	\$45,399	FY19-20: CODB Increase
Progress Foundation	427-18	\$94,523,518	\$10,127,520	\$2,890,521	FY19-20: \$553,118 CODB; \$283,202 Dore Urgent Care expansion-GF; \$233,330 Minimum Compensation Ordinance funding and \$1,820,871 State ERAF funding for residential treatment expansion
Regents of the University of California (Citywide Case Mgt.)	293-18	\$22,811,510	\$2,444,090	\$1,587,094	FY19-20: \$489,056 Homeless Mentally Ill Outreach and Treatment (HM/IOT) Grant-increase and \$330,000 Federal MediCal to match the HM/IOT grant funding; \$434,265 DHS Pre-Trial Diversion Program; \$250,000 HSH W/O increase for Citywide Roving Team; \$17,571 Cost of Doing Business funding and \$62,592 net reduction to NOVA grant work/order funding from Sheriff.
Regents of the University of California (SPR)	19-0516	\$49,275,951	\$4,249,227	\$0	No Contingency used in FY19-20
Richmond Area Multi-Services (RAMS) (Vocational)	3-18	\$20,739,037	\$1,478,237	\$0	No Contingency used in FY19-20
RAMS (Peer to Peer)	19-0672	\$28,388,060	\$1,425,326	\$337,790	FY19-20:\$350,000 new Wellness in the Streets MHSA program, offset by a reduction of net \$12,210 misc. changes.
Richmond Area Multi-Services (RAMS) (Adult)	20-0164	\$23,467,824	\$2,246,891	\$289,932	FY19-20: \$273,182 SAMHSA Grant enhancement; and \$7,210 MCO allocation
Richmond Area Multi-Services (RAMS) (CYF)	20-0165	\$26,069,776	\$2,441,606	\$0	FY19-20: No contingency used
San Francisco AIDS Foundation	167-19	\$35,608,160	\$2,845,290	\$821,078	FY19-20: \$41,650 CODB; \$772,500 BOS Addback to enhance Syringe pick-up programming; and \$6,937 new workorder for syringe disposal at Veterans Memorial building.
Seneca Center	331-18	\$40,529,444	\$4,342,440	\$1,974,198	\$833,265 H SA workorder and \$833,264 Federal Medical for new Hub program; \$193,539 for annualization of TAY Full Service Partnership; \$97,155 FFP MediCal enhancement to DBT program and \$16,974 net misc. changes.
Toyon Associates	425-18	\$10,051,977	\$541,646	\$0	No Contingency used in FY19-20
Westside Community Mental Health Center	105-19	\$23,347,118	\$2,501,647	\$483,833	FY19-20: \$457,151 in General Fund to maintain children's program that had been scheduled to end; \$26,682 misc. adjustments.
Total				\$16,331,260	

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: BOS Submission for Capital Planning Commission
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:58:00 PM
Attachments: [CPC BOS Memo 2020-6-29.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached the memo from the Capital Planning Committee.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
 Board of Supervisors
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
 San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
 Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Khaw, Lynn (ADM) <lynn.khaw@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:27 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: Joshi, Nishad (ADM) <nishad.joshi@sfgov.org>; Green, Heather (ADM) <heather.green@sfgov.org>; Rivoire, Heidi (ADM) <heidi.rivoire@sfgov.org>; Quetone, Tal (ADM) <tal.quetone@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: BOS Submission for Capital Planning Commission

Hello Eileen: I wasn't sure where to sent the attached submission, so I sent it to you. Today, I just realized I should have sent it to your office's email instead, so I am resending this.

To BOS Legislation: Please see attached submission and return to me with a stamped receipt. I originally sent it to Eileen on 6/29/20—see email below.

Thanks,
 Lynn

From: Khaw, Lynn (ADM)
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 4:35 PM
To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: Joshi, Nishad (ADM) <nishad.joshi@sfgov.org>; Allen, Samantha (ADM) <samantha.allen@sfgov.org>; Green, Heather (ADM) <heather.green@sfgov.org>; Rivoire, Heidi (ADM) <heidi.rivoire@sfgov.org>; Quetone, Tal (ADM) <tal.quetone@sfgov.org>; Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>

Subject: BOS Submission for Capital Planning Commission

Hello Eileen,

Attached, please see a memo from the Capital Planning Committee for submission to the BOS.
Please confirm with a stamped receipt.

Thank you,
Lynn

Lynn Khaw, CPPO, CPPB, C.P.M.
Executive Assistant to the City Administrator
Office of the City Administrator
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, RM 362, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
lynn.khaw@sfgov.org | Tel. 415.554.6296 | Fax 415.554.4849




Capital Planning Committee

Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator, Chair

MEMORANDUM

June 29, 2020

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors 
From: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair
Copy: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Capital Planning Committee
Regarding: (1) FY2021 & FY2022 General Fund Department Capital Budget

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on June 29, 2020, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) approved the following action items to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The CPC's recommendations are set forth below.

1. Board File Number: TBD

Approval of the FY2021 and FY2022 General Fund Department Capital Budget totaling not to exceed \$281 million.

Recommendation:

Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Capital Budget.

Comments:

The CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 9-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor:
Naomi Kelly, City Administrator; Ashley Groffenberger, Mayor's Budget Office; Jen Low, Board President's Office; Anna Van Degna, Controller's Office; Alaric Degrafinried, Acting Director, Public Works; Ivar Satero, Director, San Francisco International Airport; Phil Ginsburg, General Manager, Recreation and Parks Department; Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA; Rich Hillis, Director, Planning.

From: [Dawson, Jasmine \(CHF\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DIETTERLE, COLLEEN \(CAT\)](#); [McGRATH, AILEEN \(CAT\)](#); [EISENBERG, SARA \(CAT\)](#); [Shou, Brandon \(CHF\)](#); [Adao, Prince \(CHF\)](#); [Payton, Denise \(CHF\)](#); [Taufic, Camilla \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Submission to: Petitions and Communications Section for Upcoming BOS meeting (CESF JAG FY20-21)
Date: Thursday, May 28, 2020 5:45:27 PM
Attachments: [CCSF - FJAG20 Application.zip](#)

Hello Angela and Alisa,

I hope that you are both well. Each year our office issues a notice of our intention to apply for Edward Byrne Memorial JAG funding. In order to fulfill our local governing body review requirement I have enclosed a packet that we would like to share for the Petitions and Communications section of the upcoming Board of Supervisor's meeting.

Enclosed please find:

- Cover letter to the Clerk of the Board
- Application materials (Budget Detail Worksheet, Intergovernmental Review, Program Narrative, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities, Financial Capability Questionnaire)
- Local Solicitation Application

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Thank you,
Jasmine

Jasmine Dawson
Program and Planning Manager
San Francisco Department of Children, Youth & Their Families
1390 Market Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-8482 (remote tel. 510-393-7736)
(415) 554-8965 fax
jasmine.dawson@dcyf.org
www.dcyf.org



Maria Su, Psy.D.
Executive Director



London N. Breed
Mayor

May 27, 2020

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlet Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance is seeking applications for funding under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne JAG) Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding (CESF) Program Formula Grant Solicitation FY 2020. Department of Children, Youth and Their Families is leading in partnership with Adult Probation Department, the District Attorney's Office, the Police Department, the Public Defender's Office, and the Sheriff's Department, and intends to apply for these Federal grant funds to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus.

A complete copy of the Byrne CESF FY 2020 Formula Grant Solicitation and CCSF's application is attached. Please note the following requirements.

Governing Body Review

Byrne JAG CESF FY 2020 grant applications are due May 29, 2020, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance requires the applicant agency to make the grant application available for review by the governing body not fewer than 30 days before the application is submitted. When this requirement cannot be met at the time the application is submitted, BJA will add a withholding of funds special condition to the award, which can be cleared once we confirm the governing body review requirement has been satisfied.

In accordance with this requirement, we respectfully request that you disseminate a copy of this correspondence along with the attached Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding (CESF) Program Formula Grant Solicitation FY 2020 and CCSF's application to each member of the Board of Supervisors for review, and include this application on the next posting of City Petitions and Communications.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this matter. Department of Children, Youth and Their Families and all of our City partners are committed to complying with all lawful applicable requirements pertaining to the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant. If you have any

Department of Children, Youth and Their Families

1390 Market Street Suite 900 * San Francisco, CA 94102 * 415-554-8990 * www.dcyf.org

questions, please contact me at (415) 554-8482 (remote tel. 510-393-7736) or at jasmine.dawson@dcyf.org.

Jasmine Dawson
Department of Children Youth and Their Families

Budget Detail Worksheet

OMB Approval NO.: 1121-0329


Expires 11/30/2020

For a 508 compliant, accessible version of the Budget Detail Worksheet, use the following link:

<https://oip.gov/funding/Apply/Forms/BudgetDetailWorksheet/BDW508.pdf>

Worksheet Instructions

Note: This document requires macros be enabled to work properly. Please ensure that macros are enabled before entering any data. You may be able to enable macros by choosing the "Enable this content" option from the Security Warning Ribbon above.



If the ribbon is not visible you may have been prompted to enable macros when you opened the document as pictured here. If you elected to disable macros,

Budget Sheet Instructions

Microsoft Office Excel Security Notice
? X

Microsoft Office has identified a potential security concern.

Warning: It is not possible to determine that this content came from a trustworthy source. You should leave this content disabled unless the content provides critical functionality and you trust its source.

File Path: CtasBudgetWorksheet

Macros have been disabled. Macros might contain viruses or other security hazards. Do not enable this content unless you trust the source of this file.

[More information](#)

Enable Macros
Disable Macros

please close the document and reopen it with macros enabled.

Purpose:
 The Budget Detail Worksheet is provided for your use in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. All required information (including the budget narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be left blank. Indicate any non-federal (match) amount in the appropriate category, if applicable.

How to use this Workbook:
 The workbook includes several different worksheets. The first worksheet (this one) is an instruction sheet; the next worksheet includes the budget detail worksheet and narrative for year 1. There are duplicates of this worksheet for years 2-5 that can be completed as necessary. The last worksheet is a Budget Summary. It compiles all of the relevant budget information into a single location and should be reviewed for correctness before the workbook is uploaded to the GMS application.

- Step by Step Usage:**
1. Please read and print this instruction page. It can be used as a reference while completing the rest of the document.
 2. For each budget category, you can see a sample by viewing the 'Budget Detail Example Sheet'.
 3. The 'Definitions' tab explains terms used in the instructions for the various budget categories.
 4. **Record Retention:** In accordance with the requirements set forth in 2 CFR Part 200.333, all financial records, supporting documents, statistical records, and all other records pertinent to the award shall be retained by each organization for at least three years following the closure of the audit report covering the grant period.
 5. The information disclosed in this form is subject to the Freedom of Information Act under U.S.C. 55.2.

Budget Point of Contact Information:

Contact Name:	Last:		First:		Middle:	
Contact Phone:		Contact Fax:		Contact Email:		

Worksheet Index:

Tab
Budget Detail - Year 1
Budget Detail - Year 2
Budget Detail - Year 3
Budget Detail - Year 4

Budget Sheet Instructions

Budget Detail - Year 5	
Budget Summary	
Example - Budget Detail Sheet	
Definitions	
Budget Category Descriptions:	
<i>Personnel</i>	List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization. In the budget narrative, include a description of the responsibilities and duties of each position in relationship to fulfilling the project goals and objectives. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.
<i>Fringe Benefits</i>	Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an approved negotiated rate by a Federal agency. If not based on an approved negotiated rate, list the composition of the fringe benefit package. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in the budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.
<i>Travel</i>	Itemize travel expenses of staff personnel (e.g. staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Describe the purpose of each travel expenditure in reference to the project objectives. Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and the unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known; or if unknown, indicate "location to be determined." Indicate whether applicant's formal written travel policy or the Federal Travel Regulations are followed. Note: Travel expenses for consultants should be included in the "Consultant Travel" data fields under the "Subawards (Subgrants)/Procurement Contracts" category.
<i>Equipment</i>	List non-expendable items that are to be purchased (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy for classification of equipment should be used). <u>Expendable</u> items should be included in the "Supplies" category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technological advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the "Contracts" data fields under the "Subawards (Subgrants)/Procurement Contracts" category. In the budget narrative, explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project, and describe the procurement method to be used. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.
<i>Supplies</i>	List items by type (office supplies, postage, training materials, copy paper, and expendable equipment items costing less than \$5,000, such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.
<i>Construction</i>	Provide a description of the construction project and an estimate of the costs. Minor repairs or renovations may be allowable and should be classified in the "Other" category. OJP does not currently fund construction programs. Consult with the program office before budgeting funds in this category. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.

Budget Sheet Instructions

<p><i>Subawards (Subgrants), Procurement Contracts, & Consultant Fees</i></p>	<p>Subawards (see “Subaward” definition at 2 CFR 200.92): Provide a description of the Federal award activities proposed to be carried out by any subrecipient and an estimate of the cost (include the cost per subrecipient, to the extent known prior to application submission). For each subrecipient, enter the subrecipient entity name, if known. Please indicate any subaward information included under budget category G. Subawards (Subgrants)/Procurement Contracts by including the label “(subaward)” with each subaward entry.</p> <p>Procurement contracts (see “Contract” definition at 2 CFR 200.22): Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Indicate whether the applicant’s formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulation is followed. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding procurement contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold set in accordance with 41 U.S.C. 1908 (currently set at \$150,000).</p> <p>Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Consultant fees in excess of the DOJ grant-making component’s maximum rate for an 8-hour day (currently \$650) require additional justification and prior approval from the respective DOJ grant-making component. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.</p>
<p><i>Other Costs</i></p>	<p>List items (e.g., rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, or provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.</p>
<p><i>Indirect Costs</i></p>	<p>Indirect costs are allowed only if: a) the applicant has a current, federally approved indirect cost rate; or b) the applicant is eligible to use and elects to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate described in 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f). (See paragraph D.1.b. in Appendix VII to Part 200—States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals for a description of entities that may not elect to use the “de minimis” rate.) An applicant with a current, federally approved indirect cost rate must attach a copy of the rate approval, (a fully-executed, negotiated agreement. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant’s cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant’s accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct costs categories. (Applicant Indian tribal governments, in particular, should review Appendix VII to Part 200—States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals regarding submission and documentation of indirect cost proposals.) Narrative for any indirect costs should clearly state which direct costs the indirect cost agreement is being applied to. All requested information must be included in the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative.</p> <p>In order to use the “de minimis” indirect rate an applicant would need to attach written documentation to the application that advises DOJ of both the applicant’s eligibility (to use the “de minimis” rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the de minimis method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as the applicant entity chooses to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.</p>

Budget Detail - Year 1

Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N
[\(DOJ Financial Guide, Section 3.10\)](#)

A. Personnel

Name <i>List each name, if known.</i>	Position <i>List each position, if known.</i>	Computation <i>Show annual salary rate & amount of time devoted to the project for each name/position.</i>						
		Salary	Rate	Time Worked <i>(# of hours, days, months, years)</i>	Percentage of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
DCYF Tanita Jasmine Dawson	Program and Planning Manager	\$68.76	hourly	2,808	40%	\$77,235	\$0	\$77,235
DCYF Prince Loirenz Adao	Accountant II	\$43.40	hourly	2,808	40%	\$48,747	\$0	\$48,747
Total(s)						\$125,982	\$0	\$125,982

Narrative

DCYF - Staffing and overtime for grant administration for Program and Planning Manager and Accountant II. Manager will direct reporting and coordination with partner departments and support coordination of services. Accountant II will support in fiscal management and reporting of the grant.

B. Fringe Benefits

Name <i>List each grant-supported position receiving fringe benefits.</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation.</i>				
	Base	Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
DCYF Jasmine Tanita Dawson	\$31,666.35	40.00%	\$12,667	\$0	\$12,667

Purpose Area #4

DCYF Prince Loirenz Adao	\$19,011.33	40.00%	\$7,605	\$0	\$7,605					
Total(s)			\$20,272	\$0	\$20,272					
Narrative										
DCYF - Staffing and overtime for grant administration for Program and Planning Manager and Accountant II. Manager will direct reporting and coordination with partner departments and support coordination of services. Accountant II will support in fiscal management and reporting of the grant.										
C. Travel										
Purpose of Travel	Location	Type of Expense	Basis	Computation						
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	<i>Lodging, Meals, Etc.</i>	<i>Per day, mile, trip, Etc.</i>	<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
				Cost	Quantity	# of Staff	# of Trips	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			N/A					\$0		\$0
Total(s)								\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative										

Purpose Area #4

D. Equipment					
Item	Computation				
<i>List and describe each item of equipment that will be purchased</i>	<i>Compute the cost (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
SHF 180 Tilting 360 Rotating 75/100 VESA Metal Mount for Desktop or Wall Mount	51	\$49.99	\$2,550	\$0	\$2,550
SHF Acer Iconia ONE 10 , Switch 10, Chromebook TAB 10 Security Wall Mount Metal Enclosure VESA Ready	51	\$119.99	\$6,120	\$0	\$6,120
SHF Acer NX.H0BAA.001 Chromebook Tab 10	50	\$238.68	\$11,934	\$0	\$11,934
SHF Ubiquiti Networks UAP-AC-PRO UniFi Access Point Enterprise Wi-Fi System	22	\$146.99	\$3,234	\$0	\$3,234
SHF Ubiquiti UniFi Professional Mounting System U-PRO-MP - wireless access point	22	\$9.99	\$220	\$0	\$220
SHF 15.6" Megatron – Complete unit	3	\$1,400.00	\$4,200	\$0	\$4,200
SHF 15.6" Megatron – Mobile unit	16	\$1,900.00	\$30,400	\$0	\$30,400

Purpose Area #4

SFPD Laptops to allow staff to work remotely	120	\$1,458.33	\$175,000	\$0	\$175,000
PDR County Jail Reporting Module	1	\$5,000.00	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
PDR Servers Hard Drives	1	\$22,000.00	\$22,000	\$0	\$22,000
APD Internal Solid State Drive	10	\$638.00	\$6,380	\$0	\$6,380
APD Hotspot 4G Devices	3	\$1,201.00	\$3,603	\$0	\$3,603
APD Cellphones	70	\$95.00	\$6,650	\$0	\$6,650
APD Laptos	51	\$1,400.00	\$71,400	\$0	\$71,400
APD Chromebooks	60	\$330.00	\$19,800	\$0	\$19,800
Total(s)			\$368,491	\$0	\$368,491
Narrative					
<p>SHF - Sheriff Department (SHF). During the early days of the current COVID-19 pandemic it became clear that the City and County, while having robust response plans, lacked certain critical pieces of response and mitigation equipment.</p> <p>The Sheriff's Office has reached out to phone service providers, including the Sheriff's Office current provider, Global Tel-Link (GTL). GTL has proposed to double video visitation terminals, increasing from twenty-one to forty, and to do so in a manner that reduces Sheriff's staff time to manage the video visitation system. GTL proposal provide additional infrastructure, hardware, and ongoing software and maintenance support. The equipment cost of this proposal is \$34,600 and the cost for software, support and services is \$88,742.</p> <p>First 5 line items listed above have already been purchased to support the "home grown" video visitation system. The last 2 line items are in support of the Global Tel-Link augmentation of the video visitation system.</p> <p>SFPD - San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) need laptops for investigators and support staff to work remotely from home to help mitigate the risk and transmission of COVID-19.</p> <p>PDR - SFPDR will also use the Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding (CESF) to obtain software, equipment and programming expertise to digitize the documents in its practice, convert in-person and in-office work into remote collaboration, and minimize its clients' exposure to the jails and the operations of the criminal justice system. It requires computers and</p>					

Purpose Area #4

server space to transfer and store the contents of physical disks to remote-accessible storage.

APD - Ninety percent of Adult Probation Department (APD) Staff are working remotely as a result of COVID-19. Although APD had a limited existing inventory of laptops and cellphones, new units are required in order to meet this unprecedented need. In addition, Wi-Fi activation devices and drive storage units are needed in order to make remote work possible securely.

E. Supplies					
Supply Items	Computation				
<i>Provide a list of the types of items to be purchased with grant funds.</i>	<i>Describe the item and the compute the costs. Computation: The number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item.</i>				
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
DAT Hewlett Packard 2TB SSD Hard Drives	36	\$375.00	\$13,500	\$0	\$13,500
DAT Sales Tax on \$13,500 (36 hard drives x \$375)	1	\$1,147.50	\$1,148	\$0	\$1,148
DAT Dell XPS 9300 Laptop	57	\$1,405.35	\$80,105	\$0	\$80,105
DAT Dell USB Slim DVD±RW drive	57	\$43.94	\$2,505	\$0	\$2,505
DAT Wireless Keyboard and Mouse Combo	57	\$65.97	\$3,761	\$0	\$3,761
DAT Wireless Keyboard and Mouse Combo	57	\$73.31	\$4,179	\$0	\$4,179
DAT Dell Adapter	57	\$54.98	\$3,134	\$0	\$3,134
DAT Dell Thunderbolt Dock	48	\$241.95	\$11,614	\$0	\$11,614
DAT Dell Power C-adapter	48	\$54.24	\$2,604	\$0	\$2,604
DAT California Recycle Fee	48	\$4.00	\$192	\$0	\$192

Purpose Area #4

DAT Sales Tax on \$110,565.18 (laptops & associated accessories)	1	\$9,199.00	\$9,199	\$589	\$8,610
PDR Document Scanners	5	\$3,500.00	\$17,500	\$0	\$17,500
PDR Document Management Software	200	\$165.00	\$33,000	\$0	\$33,000
PDR Collaboration Software	200	\$165.00	\$33,000	\$0	\$33,000
PDR Laptops	50	\$1,050.00	\$52,500	\$0	\$52,500
PDR Phones	22	\$400.00	\$8,800	\$0	\$8,800
PDR Video Conference Cameras	22	\$100.00	\$2,200	\$0	\$2,200
PDR Radios	10	\$100.00	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
APD Earbuds	50	\$30.00	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
APD Cellphone covers	70	\$10.00	\$700	\$0	\$700
APD Various wiring, lightning supplies, chargers, etc.	1	\$3,605.00	\$3,605	\$0	\$3,605
APD Laptop briefcase	80	\$30.00	\$2,400	\$0	\$2,400
Total(s)			\$288,146	\$589	\$287,557
Narrative					
<p>DAT - District Attorney's Office (DAT)The computers are being purchased to allow for the immediate and expanded work from home practices necessitated during this COVID-19 pandemic. Currently, many staff are working remotely using personal computers. Those who are issued City equipment are working with outdated equipment that is not conditioned to produce efficient and productive work product. With this purchase, the Department will be able to expand and upgrade its remote work capacity in a secured manner with up to date equipment. Laptops and associated accessories will allow employees to work within a standardized and secure environment. Furthermore, in going-paperless it is necessary to store files electronically. With the additional 36TB on-premise storage, we will address our current storage constraints and being that the data is FBI/CJIS derived data it is not authorized to be stored outside of the SFDA environment.</p> <p>PDR - SFPDR (San Francisco Public Defender) will apply CESF to obtain industrial document scanners and software to convert the high volume of paper in its practice to digital format. To protect its members and to reduce the risk of COVID-19, SFPDR needs laptops to allow its attorneys, investigators and members of the defense team to work remotely from home. This will increase the prevalence of social distancing, allow SFPDR to comply with Shelter-In-Place and minimize the need to commute. Acquired software will permit the defense team to collaborate remotely and access the scanned media.</p> <p>With cameras and smartphones obtain through CESF, SFPDR will provide its personnel and indigent clients with the ability to “zoom” into court and “meet” with each other over video</p>					

Purpose Area #4

contact. Where physical presence is absolutely required, two-way radios and smartphones can be implemented in court to allow for attorney client privileged communication from a distance. SFPDR will use CESF to acquire programming tools to provide case and demographic data of individuals in the jail population and advocate for early release or release pending trial.

APD - Ninety percent of Adult Probation Department (APD) Staff are working remotely as a result of COVID-19. The supplies listed above are needed in order to maintain regular operations remotely and to keep remote work equipment in optimal conditions.

F. Construction

Purpose <i>Provide the purpose of the construction</i>	Description of Work <i>Describe the construction project(s)</i>	Computation <i>Compute the costs (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
		# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

G. Subawards (Subgrants)

Description	Purpose	Consultant?	
-------------	---------	-------------	--

Purpose Area #4

Provide a description of the activities to be carried out by subrecipients.		Describe the purpose of the subaward (subgrant)		Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.																																																																									
				Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request																																																																							
APD Recovery Survival Network		Provide emergency housing to individuals released from jail prior to adjudication.		no	\$500,638	\$375,638	\$125,000																																																																						
DCYF Emergency Child and Youth Care Program		Prepare and respond to the emergency child and youth care needs and to provide a safe place for children of first responders, health care workers and essential City Employees		No	\$181,687	\$0	\$181,687																																																																						
				Total(s)	\$682,325	\$375,638	\$306,687																																																																						
Consultant Travel (if necessary)																																																																													
Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>		Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>		Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>		Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>																																																																							
				Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request																																																																				
							\$0		\$0																																																																				
				Total			\$0	\$0	\$0																																																																				
Narrative																																																																													
<p>APD -Recovery Survival Network, Inc. will block rent 51 hotel units to provide emergency housing to individuals released from jail prior to adjudication due to emergency bail schedule implemented by the California Judicial Council to safely reduce jail populations during the COVID-19 emergency. The term of the contract will be six months (May 2020 - October 2020). The cost was calculated as follows and it is below current market rates:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Type of Unit</td> <td>-</td> <td>Monthly Cost per Unit</td> <td>x</td> <td>Number of Units</td> <td>x</td> <td>Six Months Cost</td> </tr> <tr> <td>With bathroom</td> <td>-</td> <td>\$1,650</td> <td>x</td> <td>19</td> <td>x</td> <td>\$188,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Without bathroom</td> <td>-</td> <td>\$1,350</td> <td>x</td> <td>32</td> <td>x</td> <td>\$259,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="7">Other Costs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Utilities (Flat rate)</td> <td>-</td> <td>\$2,500</td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td>\$ 15,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maintenance (Flat rate)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td>\$ 10,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indirect at 6%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td>\$ 28,338</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost of Six-Month Block Rental</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td>\$500,638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Federal Contribution</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td>\$375,638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Federal Request</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td></td> <td>x</td> <td>\$125,000</td> </tr> </table>								Type of Unit	-	Monthly Cost per Unit	x	Number of Units	x	Six Months Cost	With bathroom	-	\$1,650	x	19	x	\$188,100	Without bathroom	-	\$1,350	x	32	x	\$259,200	Other Costs							Utilities (Flat rate)	-	\$2,500	x		x	\$ 15,000	Maintenance (Flat rate)			x		x	\$ 10,000	Indirect at 6%			x		x	\$ 28,338	Total Cost of Six-Month Block Rental			x		x	\$500,638	Non-Federal Contribution			x		x	\$375,638	Federal Request			x		x	\$125,000
Type of Unit	-	Monthly Cost per Unit	x	Number of Units	x	Six Months Cost																																																																							
With bathroom	-	\$1,650	x	19	x	\$188,100																																																																							
Without bathroom	-	\$1,350	x	32	x	\$259,200																																																																							
Other Costs																																																																													
Utilities (Flat rate)	-	\$2,500	x		x	\$ 15,000																																																																							
Maintenance (Flat rate)			x		x	\$ 10,000																																																																							
Indirect at 6%			x		x	\$ 28,338																																																																							
Total Cost of Six-Month Block Rental			x		x	\$500,638																																																																							
Non-Federal Contribution			x		x	\$375,638																																																																							
Federal Request			x		x	\$125,000																																																																							

Purpose Area #4

DCYF - Implementation and administration from the Department of Children Youth and Their Families to prepare and respond to the emergency child and youth care needs and to provide a safe place for children of first responders, health care workers, and essential City employees. This program began on March 16th and has the capacity to provide services at 28 sites for children in kindergarten to 8th grade and are equipped to support working 12-hour shifts. The ECYC is a partnership led by the Department of Children Youth and Their Families and the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. The ECYC program will remain open while the School District is closed and uses recreation centers and clubhouses to support kindergarten through 8th grade youth Monday – Friday and offers extended hours and early drop-offs. The sites offer dedicated professionals that provide homework help and a variety of indoor and outdoor activities, including sports, arts and STEM projects as well as offers three healthy meals per day. Includes cost of supporting childcare slots

H. Procurement Contracts

Description <i>Provide a description of the products or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the costs. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000).</i>	Purpose <i>Describe the purpose of the contract</i>	Consultant? <i>Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.</i>			
			<i>Total Cost</i>	<i>Non-Federal Contribution</i>	<i>Federal Request</i>
					\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0

Consultant Travel (if necessary)

Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>	Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>					
			<i>Cost</i>	<i>Duration or Distance</i>	<i># of Staff</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>	<i>Non-Federal Contribution</i>	<i>Federal Request</i>
						\$0		\$0
Total			\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0

Purpose Area #4

Narrative							
I. Other Costs							
Description <i>List and describe items that will be paid with grants funds (e.g. rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial, or security services, and investigative or confidential funds).</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation</i>						
	Quantity	Basis	Cost	Length of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
SHF Zoom FedRAMP business 350G named Host Annual	60	Per License	\$330.00	1	\$19,800	\$0	\$19,800
SHF Chrome OS Mgmt Console Perpetual Lic, Commercial	60	Per License	\$129.99	1	\$7,800	\$0	\$7,800
SHF Service - Implementation	19	Per Unit	\$150.00	1	\$2,850	\$0	\$2,850
SHF Service - Install/Infrastructure	19	Per Unit	\$2,252.47	1	\$42,797	\$0	\$42,797
DAT Strong Authentication (PingID Service) subscription-based	1	yearly	\$10,912.00	1	\$10,912	\$0	\$10,912
DAT Single Sign-On (PingFederate Software) subscription-based	1	yearly	\$10,912.00	1	\$10,912	\$0	\$10,912
APD Digital autostorage solution	1	annual	\$11,442.00	1	\$11,442	\$0	\$11,442
APD Zoom licenses	10	monthly	\$24.00	12	\$2,880	\$0	\$2,880
APD Cellphone services and hotspot activation	62	monthly	\$60.00	12	\$44,640	\$0	\$44,640
DCYF CBO Cleaning Services	1	Yearly	\$121,125.00	1	\$121,125	\$0	\$121,125
Total(s)					\$275,158	\$0	\$275,158
Narrative							

Purpose Area #4

SHF - Sheriff Department (SHF). Zoom and Chrome licenses support "home-grown" video visitation system
 "Service - Implementation/Install/Infrastructure" supports installation and set-up of Global Tel-Link augmentation of video visitation

DAT - District Attorney (DAT). Strong Authentication (PingID Service) subscription-based is charged at \$10,912 per year for 400 users.
 Single Sign-On (PingFederate Software) subscription-based is charged at \$10,912 per year for 400 users.

Currently, many staff are working remotely using personal computers necessitated during this COVID-19 pandemic. With these other costs, the Department will be able to expand and upgrade its remote work capacity in a secured manner. The Ping Identity Management software will allow secure in office applications to be accessed remotely with multi-factor authentication.

APD - Ninety percent of Adult Probation Department (APD) Staff are working remotely as a result of COVID-19. Monthly cellphone service and Wi-Fi service, as well as digital storage solutions are needed in order to maintain regular operations remotely. Remote meetings platforms such as Zoom will allow the department to continue conducting needed meetings and to continue offering group sessions and classes for its clients.

DCYF - Cleaning Supplies and services at nonprofit essential service sites if a staff member tests positive for COVID-19 (Department of Children Youth and Their Families). Includes cost of cleaning services for nonprofit community-based organizations.

J. Indirect Costs					
Description <i>Describe what the approved rate is and how it is applied.</i>	Computation <i>Compute the indirect costs for those portions of the program which allow such costs.</i>				
	<i>Base</i>	<i>Indirect Cost Rate</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>	<i>Non-Federal Contribution</i>	<i>Federal Request</i>
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative					

Purpose Area #4



Budget Detail - Year 2

Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N
[\(DOJ Financial Guide, Section 3.10\)](#)

A. Personnel

Name <i>List each name, if known.</i>	Position <i>List each position, if known.</i>	Computation <i>Show annual salary rate & amount of time devoted to the project for each name/position.</i>						
		Salary	Rate	Time Worked <i>(# of hours, days, months, years)</i>	Percentage of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
						\$0		\$0
Total(s)						\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

B. Fringe Benefits

Name <i>List each grant-supported position receiving fringe benefits.</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation.</i>				
	Base	Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

Purpose Area #4

C. Travel										
Purpose of Travel	Location	Type of Expense	Basis	Computation						
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	<i>Lodging, Meals, Etc.</i>	<i>Per day, mile, trip, Etc.</i>	<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
				Cost	Quantity	# of Staff	# of Trips	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			N/A					\$0		\$0
Total(s)								\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative										

Purpose Area #4

D. Equipment						
Item		Computation				
<i>List and describe each item of equipment that will be purchased</i>		<i>Compute the cost (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
		# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative						
E. Supplies						
Supply Items		Computation				
<i>Provide a list of the types of items to be purchased with grant funds.</i>		<i>Describe the item and the compute the costs. Computation: The number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item.</i>				
		# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative						

Purpose Area #4

F. Construction

Purpose <i>Provide the purpose of the construction</i>	Description of Work <i>Describe the construction project(s)</i>	Computation <i>Compute the costs (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
		# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

G. Subawards (Subgrants)

Description	Purpose	Consultant?	
-------------	---------	-------------	--

Purpose Area #4

Provide a description of the activities to be carried out by subrecipients.		Describe the purpose of the subaward (subgrant)		Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.		
				Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
						\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0
Consultant Travel (if necessary)						
Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>	Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>			
			Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost
						\$0
			Total			\$0
Narrative						
H. Procurement Contracts						
Description	Purpose		Consultant?			

Purpose Area #4

<p><i>Provide a description of the products or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the costs. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000).</i></p>		<p><i>Describe the purpose of the contract</i></p>		<p><i>Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.</i></p>							
							Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request		
									\$0		
Total(s)							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Consultant Travel (if necessary)											
Purpose of Travel		Location		Type of Expense		Computation					
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>		<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>		<i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>		<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>					
						Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
									\$0		\$0
Total							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Narrative											
I. Other Costs											
Description					Computation						

Purpose Area #4

<i>List and describe items that will be paid with grants funds (e.g. rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial, or security services, and investigative or confidential funds).</i>	<i>Show the basis for computation</i>						
	Quantity	Basis	Cost	Length of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
DAT Strong Authentication (PingID Service) subscription-based	1	yearly	\$10,912.00	1	\$10,912	\$0	\$10,912
DAT Single Sign-On (PingFederate Software) subscription-based	1	yearly	\$10,912.00	1	\$10,912	\$0	\$10,912
SHF Service - Complete Units	24	Annual	\$1,077.36	1	\$25,857	\$0	\$25,857
SHF Service - Mobile Units	16	Annual	\$1,077.36	1	\$17,238	\$0	\$17,238
Total(s)					\$64,919	\$0	\$64,919

Narrative

DAT - District Attorney (DAT). Strong Authentication (PingID Service) subscription-based is charged at \$10,912 per year for 400 users. Single Sign-On (PingFederate Software) subscription-based is charged at \$10,912 per year for 400 users. Currently, many staff are working remotely using personal computers necessitated during this COVID-19 pandemic. With these other costs, the Department will be able to expand and upgrade its remote work capacity in a secured manner. The Ping Identity Management software will allow secure in office applications to be accessed remotely with multi-factor authentication.

SHF - Sheriff Department (SHF). Service supports both "home grown" and Global Tel-Link augmentation video visitation system

J. Indirect Costs

Description <i>Describe what the approved rate is and how it is applied.</i>	Computation <i>Compute the indirect costs for those portions of the program which allow such costs.</i>				
	Base	Indirect Cost Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

Purpose Area #4



Budget Detail - Year 3

Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N
[\(DOJ Financial Guide, Section 3.10\)](#)

A. Personnel

Name <i>List each name, if known.</i>	Position <i>List each position, if known.</i>	Computation <i>Show annual salary rate & amount of time devoted to the project for each name/position.</i>						
		Salary	Rate	Time Worked <i>(# of hours, days, months, years)</i>	Percentage of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
						\$0		\$0
Total(s)						\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

B. Fringe Benefits

Name <i>List each grant-supported position receiving fringe benefits.</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation.</i>				
	Base	Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

Purpose Area #4

C. Travel										
Purpose of Travel	Location	Type of Expense	Basis	Computation						
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	<i>Lodging, Meals, Etc.</i>	<i>Per day, mile, trip, Etc.</i>	<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
				Cost	Quantity	# of Staff	# of Trips	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			N/A					\$0		\$0
Total(s)								\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative										

Purpose Area #4

D. Equipment					
Item		Computation			
<i>List and describe each item of equipment that will be purchased</i>		<i>Compute the cost (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>			
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative					
E. Supplies					
Supply Items		Computation			
<i>Provide a list of the types of items to be purchased with grant funds.</i>		<i>Describe the item and the compute the costs. Computation: The number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item.</i>			
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative					

Purpose Area #4

F. Construction

Purpose <i>Provide the purpose of the construction</i>	Description of Work <i>Describe the construction project(s)</i>	Computation <i>Compute the costs (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
		# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

G. Subawards (Subgrants)

Description	Purpose	Consultant?	
-------------	---------	-------------	--

Purpose Area #4

Provide a description of the activities to be carried out by subrecipients.		Describe the purpose of the subaward (subgrant)		Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.					
						Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request	
								\$0	
Total(s)						\$0	\$0	\$0	
Consultant Travel (if necessary)									
Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>	Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
			Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request	
						\$0		\$0	
Total						\$0	\$0	\$0	
Narrative									
H. Procurement Contracts									
Description	Purpose			Consultant?					

Purpose Area #4

<p><i>Provide a description of the products or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the costs. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000).</i></p>		<p><i>Describe the purpose of the contract</i></p>		<p><i>Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.</i></p>							
							Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request		
									\$0		
Total(s)							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Consultant Travel (if necessary)											
Purpose of Travel		Location		Type of Expense		Computation					
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>		<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>		<i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>		<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>					
						Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
									\$0		\$0
Total							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Narrative											
I. Other Costs											
Description					Computation						

Purpose Area #4

<i>List and describe items that will be paid with grants funds (e.g. rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial, or security services, and investigative or confidential funds).</i>	<i>Show the basis for computation</i>						
	Quantity	Basis	Cost	Length of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
					\$0		\$0
Total(s)					\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative							
J. Indirect Costs							
Description <i>Describe what the approved rate is and how it is applied.</i>		Computation <i>Compute the indirect costs for those portions of the program which allow such costs.</i>					
		Base	Indirect Cost Rate		Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
					\$0		\$0
Total(s)					\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative							

Purpose Area #4



Budget Detail - Year 4

Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N
[\(DOJ Financial Guide, Section 3.10\)](#)

A. Personnel

Name <i>List each name, if known.</i>	Position <i>List each position, if known.</i>	Computation <i>Show annual salary rate & amount of time devoted to the project for each name/position.</i>						
		Salary	Rate	Time Worked <i>(# of hours, days, months, years)</i>	Percentage of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
						\$0		\$0
Total(s)						\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

B. Fringe Benefits

Name <i>List each grant-supported position receiving fringe benefits.</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation.</i>				
	Base	Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

Purpose Area #4

C. Travel										
Purpose of Travel	Location	Type of Expense	Basis	Computation						
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	<i>Lodging, Meals, Etc.</i>	<i>Per day, mile, trip, Etc.</i>	<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
				Cost	Quantity	# of Staff	# of Trips	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			N/A					\$0		\$0
Total(s)								\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative										

Purpose Area #4

D. Equipment					
Item		Computation			
<i>List and describe each item of equipment that will be purchased</i>		<i>Compute the cost (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>			
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative					
E. Supplies					
Supply Items		Computation			
<i>Provide a list of the types of items to be purchased with grant funds.</i>		<i>Describe the item and the compute the costs. Computation: The number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item.</i>			
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative					

Purpose Area #4

F. Construction

Purpose <i>Provide the purpose of the construction</i>	Description of Work <i>Describe the construction project(s)</i>	Computation <i>Compute the costs (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
		# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

G. Subawards (Subgrants)

Description	Purpose	Consultant?	
-------------	---------	-------------	--

Purpose Area #4

<i>Provide a description of the activities to be carried out by subrecipients.</i>		<i>Describe the purpose of the subaward (subgrant)</i>		<i>Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.</i>		
				Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
						\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0
Consultant Travel (if necessary)						
Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>	Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>			
			Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost
						\$0
Total				\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative						
H. Procurement Contracts						
Description	Purpose		Consultant?			

Purpose Area #4

<p><i>Provide a description of the products or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the costs. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000).</i></p>		<p><i>Describe the purpose of the contract</i></p>		<p><i>Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.</i></p>							
							Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request		
									\$0		
Total(s)							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Consultant Travel (if necessary)											
Purpose of Travel		Location		Type of Expense		Computation					
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>		<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>		<i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>		<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>					
						Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
									\$0		\$0
Total							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Narrative											
I. Other Costs											
Description					Computation						

Purpose Area #4

<i>List and describe items that will be paid with grants funds (e.g. rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial, or security services, and investigative or confidential funds).</i>	<i>Show the basis for computation</i>						
	Quantity	Basis	Cost	Length of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
					\$0		\$0
Total(s)					\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative							
J. Indirect Costs							
Description <i>Describe what the approved rate is and how it is applied.</i>	Computation <i>Compute the indirect costs for those portions of the program which allow such costs.</i>						
	Base	Indirect Cost Rate		Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request	
				\$0		\$0	
Total(s)					\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative							

Purpose Area #4



Budget Detail - Year 5

Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N
[\(DOJ Financial Guide, Section 3.10\)](#)

A. Personnel

Name <i>List each name, if known.</i>	Position <i>List each position, if known.</i>	Computation <i>Show annual salary rate & amount of time devoted to the project for each name/position.</i>						
		Salary	Rate	Time Worked <i>(# of hours, days, months, years)</i>	Percentage of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
						\$0		\$0
Total(s)						\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

B. Fringe Benefits

Name <i>List each grant-supported position receiving fringe benefits.</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation.</i>				
	Base	Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

Purpose Area #4

C. Travel										
Purpose of Travel	Location	Type of Expense	Basis	Computation						
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	<i>Lodging, Meals, Etc.</i>	<i>Per day, mile, trip, Etc.</i>	<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
				Cost	Quantity	# of Staff	# of Trips	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			N/A					\$0		\$0
Total(s)								\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative										

Purpose Area #4

D. Equipment					
Item		Computation			
<i>List and describe each item of equipment that will be purchased</i>		<i>Compute the cost (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>			
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative					
E. Supplies					
Supply Items		Computation			
<i>Provide a list of the types of items to be purchased with grant funds.</i>		<i>Describe the item and the compute the costs. Computation: The number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item.</i>			
	# of Items	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
			\$0		\$0
Total(s)			\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative					

Purpose Area #4

--	--	--

F. Construction

Purpose <i>Provide the purpose of the construction</i>	Description of Work <i>Describe the construction project(s)</i>	Computation <i>Compute the costs (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
		# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

--	--

G. Subawards (Subgrants)

Description	Purpose	Consultant?	
-------------	---------	-------------	--

Purpose Area #4

Provide a description of the activities to be carried out by subrecipients.		Describe the purpose of the subaward (subgrant)		Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.					
						Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request	
								\$0	
Total(s)						\$0	\$0	\$0	
Consultant Travel (if necessary)									
Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>	Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
			Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request	
						\$0		\$0	
Total						\$0	\$0	\$0	
Narrative									
H. Procurement Contracts									
Description	Purpose			Consultant?					

Purpose Area #4

<p><i>Provide a description of the products or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the costs. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000).</i></p>		<p><i>Describe the purpose of the contract</i></p>		<p><i>Is the subaward for a consultant? If yes, use the section below to explain associated travel expenses included in the cost.</i></p>							
							Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request		
									\$0		
Total(s)							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Consultant Travel (if necessary)											
Purpose of Travel		Location		Type of Expense		Computation					
<i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>		<i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>		<i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>		<i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>					
						Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
									\$0		\$0
Total							\$0	\$0	\$0		
Narrative											
I. Other Costs											
Description					Computation						

Purpose Area #4

<i>List and describe items that will be paid with grants funds (e.g. rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial, or security services, and investigative or confidential funds).</i>	<i>Show the basis for computation</i>						
	Quantity	Basis	Cost	Length of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
					\$0		\$0
Total(s)					\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative							
J. Indirect Costs							
Description <i>Describe what the approved rate is and how it is applied.</i>		Computation <i>Compute the indirect costs for those portions of the program which allow such costs.</i>					
		Base	Indirect Cost Rate		Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
					\$0		\$0
Total(s)					\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative							

Purpose Area #4



Budget Summary

Budget Summary											
<i>Note: Any errors detected on this page should be fixed on the corresponding Budget Detail tab.</i>											
Budget Category	Year 1		Year 2 <i>(if needed)</i>		Year 3 <i>(if needed)</i>		Year 4 <i>(if needed)</i>		Year 5 <i>(if needed)</i>		Total(s)
	Federal Request	Non-Federal Request	Federal Request	Non-Federal Request	Federal Request	Non-Federal Request	Federal Request	Non-Federal Request	Federal Request	Non-Federal Request	
A. Personnel	\$125,982	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$125,982
B. Fringe Benefits	\$20,272	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,272
C. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
D. Equipment	\$368,491	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$368,491
E. Supplies	\$287,557	\$589	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$288,146
F. Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
G. Subawards (Subgrants)	\$306,687	\$375,638	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$682,325
H. Procurement Contracts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
I. Other	\$275,158	\$0	\$64,919	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$340,077
Total Direct Costs	\$1,384,147	\$376,227	\$64,919	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,825,293
J. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Project Costs	\$1,384,147	\$376,227	\$64,919	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,825,293
Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N											No

Budget Detail

EXAMPLE

Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N
[\(DOJ Financial Guide, Section 3.10\)](#)

A. Personnel

Name <i>List each name, if known.</i>	Position <i>List each position, if known.</i>	Computation <i>Show annual salary rate & amount of time devoted to the project for each name/position.</i>						
		Salary	Rate	Time Worked <i>(# of hours, days, months, years)</i>	Percentage of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
John Smith	Executive Director	\$140,000	yearly	1	5%	\$7,000	\$0	\$7,000
Jane Doe	Project Manager	\$90,000	yearly	1	75%	\$67,500	\$0	\$67,500
Alex Jones	Program Assistant	\$22	hourly	1,040	100%	\$22,880	\$0	\$22,880
Total(s)						\$97,380	\$0	\$97,380

Narrative

John Smith, Executive Director, will provide oversight on the entire award providing 5% of this time to the project.
 Jane Doe, Project Manager, will manage the project, complete reports, and submit deliverables spending 75% of her time on the project.
 Alex Jones, Program Assistant, will provide the project manager assistance where needed spending 1,040 hours on the project.

B. Fringe Benefits

Name <i>List each grant-supported position receiving fringe benefits.</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation.</i>				
	Base	Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
John Smith	\$7,000	25.00%	\$1,750	\$0	\$1,750

Purpose Area #4

Jane Doe	\$67,500	25.00%	\$16,875	\$0	\$16,875
Alex Jones	\$22,880	25.00%	\$5,720	\$0	\$5,720
Total(s)			\$24,345	\$0	\$24,345

Narrative

Our fringe benefits rate is 25% and covers the following items: FICA (7.65%), Worker's comp (1.35%), Health Insurance (11%), Retirement (5%)

C. Travel

Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Lodging, Meals, Etc.</i>	Basis <i>Per day, mile, trip, Etc.</i>	Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>						
				Cost	Quantity	# of Staff	# of Trips	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
Project Manager Training	Reno, NV	Other	N/A	\$50.00	1	1	1	\$50	\$0	\$50
Project Manager Training	Reno, NV	Local Travel	N/A	\$50.00	1	1	1	\$50	\$0	\$50
Project Manager Training	Reno, NV	Transportation	Round-trip	\$600.00	1	1	1	\$600	\$0	\$600
Project Manager Training	Reno, NV	Mileage	Mile	\$0.51	100	1	1	\$51	\$0	\$51

Purpose Area #4

Project Manager Training	Reno, NV	Meals	Day	\$51.00	5.5	1	1	\$281	\$0	\$281
Project Manager Training	Reno, NV	Lodging	Night	\$94.00	5	1	1	\$470	\$0	\$470
Project Manager Field Travel	Various	Mileage	Mile	\$0.51	250	1	20	\$2,550	\$0	\$2,550
Mandatory Orientation Training	Washington, DC	Local Travel	N/A	\$25.00	1	3	1	\$75	\$0	\$75
Mandatory Orientation Training	Washington, DC	Other	N/A	\$50.00	1	3	1	\$150	\$0	\$150
Mandatory Orientation Training	Washington, DC	Transportation	Round-trip	\$500.00	1	3	1	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
Mandatory Orientation Training	Washington, DC	Mileage	Mile	\$0.51	100	1	1	\$51	\$0	\$51
Mandatory Orientation Training	Washington, DC	Meals	Day	\$71.00	3.5	3	1	\$746	\$0	\$746
Mandatory Orientation Training	Washington, DC	Lodging	Night	\$224.00	3	3	1	\$2,016	\$0	\$2,016
Total(s)								\$8,590	\$0	\$8,590
Narrative										
<p>Per award guidelines, key members must attend orientation training in Washington, DC. We are following our own written travel policy. Lodging is for 3 nights and meals are budgeted at 3.5 days as the two travel days are computed at .75 days. Mileage to get to the airport and local travel is for taxi to and from the airport. Also baggage fees of \$50 is \$25 each way.</p> <p>The project manager will attend training in Reno, NV. We are following our own written travel policy. Lodging is for 5 nights and meals are budgeted at 5.5 days as the two travel days are computed at .75 days. Mileage to get to the airport and local travel is for taxi to and from the airport. Also, baggage fees of \$50 is for \$25 each way.</p> <p>The project manager will use her own vehicle to travel to complete field work with the average trip around 250 miles and an anticipated 20 trips.</p>										
D. Equipment										

Purpose Area #4

Item	Computation				
<i>List and describe each item of equipment that will be purchased</i>	<i>Compute the cost (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
	# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
Dell Laptop Computer	1	\$2,547	\$2,547	\$0	\$2,547
Total(s)			\$2,547	\$0	\$2,547
Narrative					
The project manager will need a laptop computer while out in the field and while away at training. We are following our agency's capitalization policy.					
E. Supplies					
Supply Items	Computation				
<i>Provide a list of the types of items to be purchased with grant funds.</i>	<i>Describe the item and the compute the costs. Computation: The number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item.</i>				
	# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
Printer	1	\$500.00	\$500	\$0	\$500
Locking file cabinet	2	\$1,000.00	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Flatbed scanner	1	\$400.00	\$400	\$0	\$400
General office supplies	12	\$150.00	\$1,800	\$0	\$1,800
Total(s)			\$4,700	\$0	\$4,700
Narrative					

Purpose Area #4

The project manager will need a printer to print reports. A locking file cabinet is needed to keep client information secure. A flatbed scanner is needed to scan various documents collected in the field. General office supplies will be used by all personnel on this project and include: pens, pencils, paper, binder clips, and other basic supplies. The office supplies are based on 12 months at \$150 per month. This amount was determined based upon other projects of this size that we have completed in the past.

F. Construction *As a rule, construction costs are not allowable. Consult with the program office before budgeting funds in this category.*

Purpose <i>Provide the purpose of the construction</i>	Description of Work <i>Describe the construction project(s)</i>	Computation <i>Compute the costs (e.g., the number of each item to be purchased X the cost per item)</i>				
		# of Items	Cost	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
				\$0		\$0
Total(s)				\$0	\$0	\$0

Narrative

G. Subawards (Subgrants)

Description <i>Provide a description of the activities to be carried out by subrecipients.</i>	Purpose <i>Describe the purpose of the subaward (subgrant)</i>	Consultant <i>Is the subaward for a consultant?</i>			
			Total Cost	Non-Federal	Federal

Purpose Area #4

			Total Cost	Contribution	Request			
Conduct field activities in a remote area	Provide services and conduct field work in a remote area included in the project	No	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000			
Total(s)			\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000			
Consultant Travel (if necessary)								
Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>	Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>					
			Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
						\$0		\$0
Total			\$0	\$0	\$0			
Narrative								
The agency will make a subaward to provide services and conduct field work in a remote area. The \$25,000 was calculated based upon a similar size project completed in the same area.								
H. Procurement Contracts								
Description <i>Provide a description of the products or services to be procured by contract and an estimate of the costs. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source procurements in excess of the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000).</i>	Purpose <i>Describe the purpose of the contract</i>	Consultant <i>Is the contract for a consultant?</i>						
			Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request			
William Penn, CPA	Accounting Assistance	Yes	\$9,400	\$0	\$9,400			

Purpose Area #4

ABC Company		Survey creation and data entry services from submitted surveys.		No	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000
Total(s)					\$49,400	\$0	\$49,400
Consultant Travel (if necessary)							
Purpose of Travel <i>Indicate the purpose of each trip or type of trip (training, advisory group meeting)</i>	Location <i>Indicate the travel destination.</i>	Type of Expense <i>Hotel, airfare, per diem</i>		Computation <i>Compute the cost of each type of expense X the number of people traveling.</i>			
				Cost	Duration or Distance	# of Staff	Total Cost
							\$0
Total					\$0	\$0	\$0
Narrative							
<p>ABC Company will put together online an online survey at the direction of the project manager to reach out to the various sites to determine the needs. In addition a hard copy survey will also be available for thos unable to use the online survey. ABC Company will key in the hard copy surveys. Once the surveys are completed, ABC Company will compile the data for the project manager.</p> <p>William Penn will assist in completing financial reports as well as tracking award expenditures. Mr. Penn's rate is \$47 per hour, and we estimate that Mr. Penn will provide 200 hours of services.</p>							
I. Other Costs							
Description <i>List and describe items that will be paid with grants funds (e.g. rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial, or security services, and investigative or confidential funds).</i>	Computation <i>Show the basis for computation</i>						
	Quantity	Basis	Cost	Length of Time	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
Rent	500	sq feet	2.51	12	\$15,060	\$0	\$15,060
Telephone	1	monthly rate	50	12	\$600	\$0	\$600
Reproduction	500	per copy	0.05	12	\$300	\$0	\$300
Postage	1000	quarterly newsletter	0.5	4	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Total(s)					\$17,960	\$0	\$17,960
Narrative							

Rent is charged at \$2.51 per square foot per month.
 Telephone is based upon \$50 per month for 12 months.
 Reproduction is based on 500 copies per month for 12 months.
 Postage for mailing a quarterly newsletter for 1,000 recipients.

J. Indirect Costs

Description <i>Describe what the approved rate is and how it is applied.</i>	Computation <i>Compute the indirect costs for those portions of the program which allow such costs.</i>				
	Base	Indirect Cost Rate	Total Cost	Non-Federal Contribution	Federal Request
Indirect Costs	\$121,725	12.54%	\$15,265	\$0	\$15,265
Total(s)			\$15,265	\$0	\$15,265

Narrative

Indirect costs are based on Federally approved rate of 12.54% on Total Direct Labor (Personnel + Fringe).

Definitions

Additional information can be found in the DOJ Financial Guide

[DOJ Financial Guide](#)

Term	Definition
Match	<p>Match is the recipient share of the project costs. Match may either be “in-kind” or “cash.” In-kind match includes the value of donated services. Cash match includes actual cash spent by the recipient and must have a cost relationship to the Federal award that is being matched. (Example: Match on administrative costs should be other administrative costs, not other matching on program costs).</p> <p>Sample Non-Federal Match Calculation: Match Calculation: If the match is 25%, the calculation is as follows: Federal Request: \$350,000 Divided by .75 or 75%: \$466,667 Multiplied by match amount .25 or 25% equal required match amount: \$116,667</p>
Approved Negotiated Rate	Approved Negotiated Rate is any current fringe benefits rate approved for the grant recipient by their cognizant Federal agency.
Expendable	An expendable item is any materials that are consumed during the course of the project such as office supplies, program supplies etc. Expendable items are usually considered to be consumed when issued and are not recorded as returnable inventory.
Non-Expendable	A non-expendable item is tangible property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. (Note: Organization’s own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000).
Renovations	Costs incurred for ordinary rearrangements, alterations and restoration of facilities are considered allowable. Special arrangement and alteration costs incurred specifically for the project are allowable with the prior approval of the awarding agency.
Federal Acquisition Regulations	The Federal Acquisition Regulations are established for the codification and publication of uniform policies and procedures for acquisition by all executive agencies. The Federal Acquisition Regulations System consists of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), which is the primary document, and agency acquisition regulations that implement or supplement the FAR.
Sole Source	<p>Procurement by noncompetitive proposals is procurement through the solicitation from only one source, or after solicitation of a number of sources, competition is determined inadequate.</p> <p>Grant recipients may make the initial determination that competition is not feasible if one of the following circumstances exists:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The item of service is available only from a single source.</i> 2. <i>The public exigency or emergency for the requirement will not permit a delay resulting from a competitive solicitation.</i> 3. <i>After solicitation of a number of sources, competitions is considered inadequate.</i>

<p>Arm-Length Transaction</p>	<p>A transaction in which the buyers and sellers of a product act independently and have no relationship to each other. The concept of an arm's length transaction is to ensure that both parties in the deal are acting in their own self interest and are not subject to any pressure or duress from the other party.</p> <p>Generally, costs of renting facilities are not allowable where one party to the rental agreement is able to control or substantially influence the actions of the other (e.g. organizations under common control through common officers. Directors or members).</p>
<p>Confidential Funds</p>	<p>Confidential funds are those monies allocated to:</p> <p>Purchase of Services (P/S). This category includes travel or transportation of a non- Federal officer or an informant; the lease of an apartment, business front, luxury-type automobiles, aircraft or boat, or similar effects to create or establish the appearance of affluence; and/or meals, beverages, entertainment, and similar expenses (including buy money and flash rolls, etc.) for undercover purposes, within reasonable limits.</p> <p>Purchase of Evidence (P/E). This category is for P/E and/or contraband, such as narcotics and dangerous drugs, firearms, stolen property, counterfeit tax stamps, and so forth, required to determine the existence of a crime or to establish the identity of a participant in a crime.</p> <p>Purchase of Specific Information (P/I). This category includes the payment of monies to an informant for specific information. All other informant expenses would be classified under P/S and charged accordingly.</p>
<p>Fully Executed Negotiated Agreement</p>	<p>Fully Executed Negotiated Agreement is a signed, approved indirect cost rate agreement which reflects an understanding reached between the grant recipient and the cognizant Federal agency.</p>
<p>Cognizant Federal Agency</p>	<p>The cognizant Federal agency is the Federal agency that generally provides the most Federal financial assistance to the recipient of funds. Cognizance is assigned by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Cognizant agency assignments for the largest cities and counties are published in the Federal Register.</p>

Applicant: City and County of San Francisco
Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
Title: The San Francisco Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program
Attachment: INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW

GOVERNING BODY REVIEW

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) is a dual jurisdiction governed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The CCSF will make the grant application available for review by the next upcoming governing body meeting. This item will appear on the Board of Supervisor's agenda. An opportunity to comment will be made available to citizens at that time.

Documentation of this review and comments, if made, will be kept on site for audit purposes throughout the duration of the grant award.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Notice for Public comment was made available throughout the San Francisco Public Library System and Department of Children Youth and Their Families website. The following language was posted:

PUBLIC NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

On May 22, 2020, the Department of Children Youth and Their Families of the City and County of San Francisco issued a notice of intent to apply for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program Solicitation FY 2020. The JAG Program (34 U.S.C. 10151-10158) is the primary provider of federal criminal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions. The CESF Program is authorized by Division B of H.R. 748, Pub. L. No. 116136 (Emergency Appropriations for Coronavirus Health Response and Agency Operations); 28 U.S.C. 530C. The due date for applying for funds under this announcement is May 29, 2020. However, those interested in commenting on this funding opportunity are required to respond by close of business on May 27, 2020.

The Solicitation and Fund Guidelines will be available for down load at:
<https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/bja-2020-18553.pdf>

Applicant: City and County of San Francisco
Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
Title: The San Francisco Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program
PROGRAM NARRATIVE

❖ **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

On February 25, 2020, San Francisco's Mayor London N. Breed issued an emergency declaration to strengthen the City's response to COVID-19 even though there were no confirmed cases reported. This declaration helped mobilize City resources, accelerated emergency planning, streamline staffing, coordinated agencies across the city, allowed for future reimbursement by the state and federal governments and raised awareness throughout San Francisco about how everyone could prepare in the event that COVID-19 appeared in the City.

San Francisco began preparing early and schools were given direction to plan how they would manage potential closures, and businesses were told to examine their work-from-home policies and sick leave in order to support people who may need to self-quarantine.

On March 5, 2020 there were a reported two cases in San Francisco and then on March 16, 2020 San Francisco issued a new public health order requiring residents stay home except for essential needs. The announcement included instruction that all businesses, other than Essential Businesses and Essential Government Functions, are required to cease all operations. All public and private gatherings of any number of people occurring outside a single family or living unit are prohibited, except for the exemptions listed below.

At present we are currently operating as a city under a Stay Home Health Order that was issued on March 31, 2020 in coordination with surrounding Bay Area counties. This was done in an effort to slow the spread of the virus and save lives. While this effort has been extremely productive in helping San Francisco work towards flattening the curve there is still more work

ahead as the City prepares for an impending surge. San Francisco is working daily to prevent hospitals from being inundated and are currently working under the following mandates:

- Social distancing requirements are mandatory.
- Use of playgrounds, outdoor gym equipment, picnic areas, and barbecue areas is prohibited.
- Use of enclosed dog parks is prohibited. Open spaces that allow dogs, like San Francisco's Crissy Field are open.
- Use of shared recreational facilities like golf courses, tennis courts, basketball courts, and climbing walls is prohibited.
- Sports or activities that include the use of shared equipment, like frisbee, basketball, or soccer, may only be engaged in by members of the same household.
- Businesses that supply products needed for people to work from home are no longer essential businesses under the Order and must cease storefront sales to the public. Minimum basic operations and delivery directly to residences or businesses may continue.
- Essential businesses like grocery stores, banks, and pharmacies can remain open but must stop running the parts of their operations that are not essential. Employees who can work from home must do so.
- Essential businesses must put in place formal rules, a social distancing protocol, to ensure proper sanitation and to ensure that people stay a safe distance away from each other.
- Most construction must stop. There are exceptions for projects to help keep people safe and housed. Those include health care projects directly related to addressing the pandemic, construction to house the homeless, affordable housing, and multi-unit or

mixed-use developments containing at least 10% income-restricted units. Social distancing requirements apply.

Following the guidance to this Stay Home Health Order can be challenging for a large metropolitan city. The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) is an urban environment spanning approximately 49 square miles with approximately 883,305 (U.S. Census Bureau 2018)¹ culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse residents (17,179 residents per square mile). San Francisco's ethnic diversity includes approximately 47.2% White, 34.2% Asian, 0.4% Pacific Islander, 15.3% Hispanic/Latino, and 5.3% African American residents. The coordination of safety and supports is critical during this pandemic.

While the City is under a shelter in place order, the City's staff continue to be fully operational. Workers across the City are taking extra precautions to stay well and healthy and many are essential workers and working to ensure they are not risking infecting others. All of the departments in this partnership are essential workers and most are able to work from home and work remotely.

While this pandemic is taking a devastating toll on our vulnerable populations, community and city workers it has taken an even greater toll on our City's budget. Funds from this local federal grant will go towards the immediate relief to several City departments currently experiencing depleted reserves as we work to support our staff and continue the operations of the City.

Unfortunately many partners and staff were not prepared to address the immediate needs of

¹ <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sanfranciscocitycalifornia,sanfranciscocountycalifornia/PST04521>

working remotely or working from home, supporting the child and youth care needs of healthcare workers, city staff and disaster workers and were not prepared to support with emergency housing units for those released from jail prior to adjudication. Our proposal below reflects each department's immediate needs and associated activities and plans for use of CESF JAG funds.

❖ **CCSF OVERVIEW OF 2020-21 ACTIVITIES**

The City and County of San Francisco will use 2020 CESF JAG funds to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus spread in San Francisco. JAG funding will be used specifically to support the following **four** strategies:

- **Staffing and Overtime**, for Department of Children Youth and Their Families for grant administration, Program and Planning Manager and Accountant II.
- **Supplies and Equipment**, support front line workers for essential services by providing:
 - o **Cleaning services** administered by the Department of Children Youth and Their Families to nonprofit service providers who are working the front lines as essential services in San Francisco Communities whose sites experience closure to COVID19.
 - o **Purchase of laptops, computers and related equipment** for San Francisco Police Department, Public Defender's Office, Adult Probation Department, Sheriff's Department and District Attorney's Office.
- **Emergency Child and Youth Care Program Childcare Slots**
 - o Department of Children Youth and Their Families to support childcare slots for front line workers.

- **Emergency Housing Fund**

- o Adult Probation Department will partner with two nonprofit organizations in San Francisco to pilot a 6-month project that will place a hotel block rental to both unhoused individuals released from jail prior to case adjudication and other unhoused, justice-involved San Francisco adult residents.

The strategies or projects listed above represent a collective approach to support the essential City workers, staff and nonprofit organizations working the front lines during this COVID-19 pandemic as well as San Francisco justice involved residents.

Current Data on San Francisco COVID19

As of May 28, 2020, San Francisco’s COVID-19 Data Tracker indicates that **61,016** test results have been reported and of those reported cases **2,437** have reported positive.

Unfortunately there have been **40** deaths. Of those who have tested positive, **39%** are female, **60%** are male and **1%** is unknown.²

Funding will provide continued support for CCSF public safety investments and will continue to build and strengthen our criminal justice system efforts to fight this pandemic. This team of partners represent a multidisciplinary team that have a long history of leveraging resources. San Francisco has a strong history of practicing both traditional criminal justice approaches as well as using an alternative set of evidence-based responses. CCSF looks forward to directing federal, state and local dollars towards supporting the continuum of alternative responses to substance abuse and focused drug deterrence. Funds will be used to support the

² <https://data.sfgov.org/stories/s/fjki-2fab>

infrastructure of gains made by collaborative courts, upgraded justice technology and community-based interventions and programs that address individual-level resiliency and skills building tactics that help at-risk and reentering individuals permanently exit the criminal justice system, and become productive members of our San Francisco community.

Competitive stimulus JAG, federal and state formula stimulus JAG funds has provided CCSF criminal justice partners an opportunity to strengthen collaboration and to think critically about how we conduct public safety business. These collective funds will continue to help CCSF improve communication, coordination and information sharing amongst criminal justice partners, expand strategies that strengthen public safety system efficacy, and support San Francisco in constantly reflecting upon our successes and challenges in reducing recidivism and increasing public safety. JAG funds will allow CCSF to continue to support San Franciscans during this pandemic with uninterrupted critical operations and support.

❖ **CCSF 2020-21 JAG STRATEGIES (PROJECTS, ROLES, AND ACTIVITIES)**

Strategy 1: Staffing and Overtime

Goals of Strategy 1: Support administration and staffing for department partners

1) Overtime and staffing (Department of Children Youth and Their Families)

- Staffing and Overtime for two DCYF employees, Program and Planning Manager and Accountant II.

Strategy 2: Supplies and Equipment

Goals of Strategy 2: Support in the purchase of supplies and equipment for department partners, including but not limited to:

- 1) Cleaning Supplies and services at nonprofit essential service sites if a staff member tests positive for COVID-19 (Department of Children Youth and Their Families)
 - Cost of cleaning services for nonprofit community-based organizations
- 2) Purchase of laptops, cell phones and related equipment for support staff to work remotely from home to help mitigate the risk and transmission of COVID-19. (San Francisco Police Department, Public Defender's Office, Adult Probation Department and District Attorney's Office), breakdown includes:
 - Laptops for Investigative Bureau and support staff (SFPD)
 - Laptops, county jail module program software, phones, video conference cameras, radios, hard drive servers, scanners, and software (PD)
 - Laptops and briefcases, cell phones and covers, WiFi activation devices, drive storage units, earbuds, various wiring, lightening supplies, chargers, digital auto storage solution, zoom licenses, cell phone services and hot spot activations (APD)
 - Laptops and associate accessories such as hard drives, mouse, keyboards and subscriptions for staff who are working remotely. (DA)

Strategy 3: Emergency Child and Youth Care Program Slots

Goals of Strategy 3: Support the newly formed Emergency Child and Youth Care Program by offering childcare slots to frontline workers (ECYC)

- 1) Implementation and administration from the Department of Children Youth and Their Families to prepare and respond to the emergency child and youth care needs and to provide a safe place for children of first responders, health care workers, and essential City employees. This program began on March 16th and has the capacity to provide services at 28 sites for children in kindergarten to 8th grade and are equipped to support

working 12-hour shifts.³ The ECYC is a partnership led by the Department of Children Youth and Their Families and the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. The ECYC program will remain open while the School District is closed and uses recreation centers and clubhouses to support kindergarten through 8th grade youth Monday – Friday and offers extended hours and early drop-offs. The sites offer dedicated professionals that provide homework help and a variety of indoor and outdoor activities, including sports, arts and STEM projects as well as offers three healthy meals per day.

- Cost of supporting childcare slots.

Strategy 4: Emergency Housing Program

Goals of Strategy 4: Support a new emergency ordinance requiring that the City secure 8,250 hotel rooms for individuals most impacted by the shelter in place ordinance. Adult Probation will support individuals experiencing homelessness and who are involved in the criminal justice system by providing safe, alternative housing with critical support services designed to ensure public safety and address client needs and support clients success.

Additionally, this plan is responsive to the emergency bail schedule implemented by the Judicial Council of California, which is designed to safely reduce jail populations during the COVID-19 pandemic. This proposal will provide safe emergency housing through a hotel block rental to both unhoused individuals released from jail prior to case adjudication and other unhoused, justice-involved adult residents of San Francisco. Project will include a collaborative partnership with two nonprofit organizations including San Francisco:

Recovery Survival Network and San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project.

- Cost of 51 private rooms at the St. Moritz Hotel.

³ <https://sfmayor.org/article/san-francisco-extends-emergency-child-and-youth-care-until-end-school-year>

CCSF 2020-21 JAG GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES

Strategy 1: Staffing and Overtime

Goal 1: To cover expenses for lead department staffing and overtime (DCYF)

Objective 1: DCYF Manager will direct reporting and coordination with partner departments and support coordination of services; Accountant II will support in fiscal management and reporting of the grant.

Outcomes: Increased coordination of support services and dedicated support for grant fund administration.

Strategy 2: Supplies and Equipment

Goal 1: To provide supplies and equipment in response to and prepare for continued service delivery.

Objective 1: To provide cost reimbursement for cleaning services at essential nonprofit organizations if staff member tests positive for COVID-19.

Outcomes: Nonprofit organization can clean and reopen service site and have all staff return to work. Also includes but not limited to routine cleanings, and support in communication plans.⁴

Objective 2: To purchase laptops, cell phones and related equipment for APD, SFPD, SHF, PD and DA essential department employees.

Outcomes: Essential staff workers can continue safely working remotely and clients are given access to needed supportive service equipment and supplies.

⁴ <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/files/COVID19-Cleaning-Environmental-Businesses-Agencies-24Feb2020.pdf>; https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-business-response.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fspecific-groups%2Fguidance-business-response.html; <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/list-n-disinfectants-use-against-sars-cov-2>

Strategy 3: Emergency Child and Youth Care Program (ECYC)

Goal 1: Offer free high-quality childcare services to frontline workers.

Objective 1: To provide childcare slots at various sites for children and youth grade kindergarten to 8th.

Outcomes: Essential workers are guaranteed childcare during rotating shifts during COVID-19.

Strategy 4: Emergency Housing

Goal 1: Support housing needs for justice involved individuals experiencing homelessness

Objective 1: To provide 51 private room rentals.

Outcomes: Individuals are provided with safe, alternative housing with critical support services.

❖ CCSF JAG DATA TRACKING AND DOCUMENTATION

All JAG partners regularly maintain internal electronic and hardcopy tracking procedures to measure progress towards JAG goals and maintain department specific records needed to regularly report on required JAG performance measures. DCYF will remain the lead applicant and will collect data for reporting purposes and submit in a timely manner for all partners noted on this grant.

❖ CCSF JAG COORDINATION

The 2020 JAG funds will be administered by DCYF. CCSF has successfully overseen federal and state JAG funds for over a decade and will continue to deliver on JAG activities under the administration of DCYF. The JAG Program Manager will lead CCSF's coordination of JAG partners and project activities. Once funds are available to CCSF, DCYF will lead in coordination with the partners to discuss implementation of JAG-funded strategies, meeting

schedules and review reporting protocols. The coordination will include developing additional preparation and needs as the City works to flatten curve and prepare for another surge in the Fall.

❖ **CLOSING**

These JAG funds will provide CCSF an opportunity to prevent, prepare for and respond to impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. To that end, CCSF looks forward to using 2020 JAG funds to support the continued operation of City services and be prepared to respond to safety measures to keep all San Franciscans safe during this pandemic.

Acronym Table

Acronym	Term
APD	Adult Probation Department
CCSF	City and County of San Francisco
DCYF	The Department of Children Youth and Their Families
ECYC	Emergency Child and Youth Care Program
PD	San Francisco Public Defender
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
SFDA	San Francisco District Attorney
SFSD	San Francisco Sheriff’s Department

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Approved by OMB

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352

0348-0046

(See reverse for public burden disclosure.)

1. Type of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. contract <input type="checkbox"/> b. grant <input type="checkbox"/> c. cooperative agreement <input type="checkbox"/> d. loan <input type="checkbox"/> e. loan guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> f. loan insurance	2. Status of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application <input type="checkbox"/> b. initial award <input type="checkbox"/> c. post-award	3. Report Type: <input type="checkbox"/> a. initial filing <input type="checkbox"/> b. material change For Material Change Only: year _____ quarter _____ date of last report _____
4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity: <input type="checkbox"/> Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Subawardee Tier _____, if known: Congressional District, if known:	5. If Reporting Entity in No. 4 is a Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime: Congressional District, if known:	
6. Federal Department/Agency:	7. Federal Program Name/Description: CFDA Number, if applicable: _____	
8. Federal Action Number, if known:	9. Award Amount, if known: \$ _____	
10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant <i>(if individual, last name, first name, MI):</i>	b. Individuals Performing Services <i>(including address if different from No. 10a)</i> <i>(last name, first name, MI):</i>	
11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when this transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.	Signature: _____ Print Name: _____ Title: _____ Telephone No.: _____ Date: _____	
Federal Use Only:		Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form LLL (Rev. 7-97)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF SF-LLL, DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime Federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered Federal action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with a covered Federal action. Complete all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.
2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.
3. Identify the appropriate classification of this report. If this is a followup report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the last previously submitted report by this reporting entity for this covered Federal action.
4. Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is, or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient. Identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime is the 1st tier. Subawards include but are not limited to subcontracts, subgrants and contract awards under grants.
5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks "Subawardee," then enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the prime Federal recipient. Include Congressional District, if known.
6. Enter the name of the Federal agency making the award or loan commitment. Include at least one organizational level below agency name, if known. For example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.
7. Enter the Federal program name or description for the covered Federal action (item 1). If known, enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.
8. Enter the most appropriate Federal identifying number available for the Federal action identified in item 1 (e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number; Invitation for Bid (IFB) number; grant announcement number; the contract, grant, or loan award number; the application/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency). Include prefixes, e.g., "RFP-DE-90-001."
9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award/loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.
10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the lobbying registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.

(b) Enter the full names of the individual(s) performing services, and include full address if different from 10 (a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).
11. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB Control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB No. 0348-0046. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0046), Washington, DC 20503.

Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program Solicitation

FY 2020 Formula Grant Solicitation

May 8, 2020

This solicitation has been changed on page 5 with revised information on how to draw down funds. Thank you for your attention to this update.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance



Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program Solicitation FY 2020 Formula Grant Solicitation

CFDA #16.034

Solicitation Release Date: March 30, 2020

Application Deadline: 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 29, 2020

The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications for the Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program.

This solicitation incorporates the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) by reference. The OJP Grant Application Resource Guide provides guidance to applicants on how to prepare and submit applications for funding to OJP. **If this solicitation expressly modifies any provision in the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide, the applicant is to follow the guidelines in this solicitation as to that provision.**

Eligibility

The following entities are eligible to apply:

- States, U.S. Territories, the District of Columbia, units of local government, and federally recognized tribal governments that were identified as eligible for funding under the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 State and Local Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program are eligible to apply under the Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding (CESF) Program solicitation. NOTE: Only the State Administering Agency that applied for FY 2019 JAG funding for a state/territory may apply for the state allocation of CESF funding.

The eligible allocations for the FY 2020 CESF Program can be found at:
<https://bja.ojp.gov/program/fy20-cesf-allocations>.

For the purposes of the CESF Program, please note the following:

- The term “states” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. (Throughout this solicitation, each reference to a “state” or “states” includes all 56 jurisdictions.)

- The term “units of local government” includes a town, township, village, parish, city, county, borough, or other general purpose political subdivision of a state, or a federally recognized Indian tribal government that performs law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior). A unit of local government also may be any law enforcement district or judicial enforcement district established under applicable state law with authority to independently establish a budget and impose taxes; for example, in Louisiana, a unit of local government means a district attorney or parish sheriff.
- All recipients and subrecipients (including any for-profit organization) must forgo any profit or management fee.

Contact information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants Management System (GMS) Support Hotline at 888–549–9901, option 3, or via email at GMS.HelpDesk@usdoj.gov. The GMS Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, including federal holidays

An applicant that experiences unforeseen GMS technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the NCJRS Response Center contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen GMS Technical Issues” in the **How to Apply (GMS)** section in the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#).

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, applicants may contact the NCJRS Response Center by telephone at 1–800–851–3420; via TTY at 301–240–6310 (hearing impaired only); by email at grants@ncjrs.gov; by fax to 301–240–5830; or by web chat at <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Post-Award Legal Requirements Notice

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, and all applicable requirements of federal statutes and regulations (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance). OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

For additional information on these legal requirements, see the “Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements” section in the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#).

Deadline details

Applicants must register in GMS at <https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov/> prior to submitting an application under this solicitation. All applicants must register, even those that previously registered in GMS. Select the “Apply Online” button associated with the solicitation title. All registrations and applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time May 29, 2020.

For additional information, see the “How to Apply (GMS)” section in the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#).

Contents

A. Program Description.....	4
Overview	4
Permissible uses of Funds	4
B. Federal Award Information	5
Type of Award	5
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	5
Budget Information.....	5
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement.....	5
Pre-agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	6
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs.....	6
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable).....	6
C. Eligibility Information.....	6
D. Application and Submission Information.....	6
What an Application Should Include.....	6
How to Apply	7
E. Application Review Information	7
Review Process	7
F. Federal Award Administration Information.....	8
Federal Award Notices.....	8
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	8
Information Technology (IT) Security Clauses	8
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	8
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s).....	9
H. Other Information	9
Freedom of Information and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a).....	9
Provide Feedback to OJP	9
Appendix A: Application Checklist.....	10

Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program Solicitation CFDA # 16.034

A. Program Description

Overview

The Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding (CESF) Program will provide funding to assist eligible states, local units of government, and tribes in preventing, preparing for, and responding to the coronavirus.

Statutory Authority: The CESF Program is authorized by Division B of H.R. 748, Pub. L. No. 116-136 (Emergency Appropriations for Coronavirus Health Response and Agency Operations); 28 U.S.C. 530C.

Permissible uses of Funds

Funds awarded under the CESF Program must be utilized to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus. Allowable projects and purchases include, but are not limited to, overtime, equipment (including law enforcement and medical personal protective equipment), hiring, supplies (such as gloves, masks, sanitizer), training, travel expenses (particularly related to the distribution of resources to the most impacted areas), and addressing the medical needs of inmates in state, local, and tribal prisons, jails, and detention centers.

Expenditures which require prior approval – There are no specific prohibitions under the CESF Program other than the unallowable costs that are identified in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide; however, the following items should be identified during application and appropriately justified as noted:

- **Individual items costing \$500,000 or more** – if the recipient intends to purchase an individual item that costs \$500,000 or more, those item(s) should be identified and thoroughly justified by the grantee and receive written prior approval from BJA post-award through the submission and approval of a Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN). Costs must be reasonable to receive approval.
- **Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), Unmanned Aircraft (UA), and/or Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV)** – if the recipient requests to purchase an UAS, UA, and/or UAV, Federal Aviation Administration approval must be obtained as outlined here: https://www.faa.gov/news/fact_sheets/news_story.cfm?newsId=22615. Documentation related to these purchases should be included with the application or the applicant must receive written prior approval from BJA post-award through the submission and approval of a GAN.

Draw-down – Consistent with the CESF Program's purposes, which involve assistance in responding to the present national emergency in connection the coronavirus, OJP has determined that eligible states (or State Administering Agencies) or units of local government may draw down funds either in advance or on a reimbursable basis. To draw down in advance, funds must be placed in an interest-bearing account, unless one of the exceptions

in 2 C.F.R. § 200.305(b)(8) apply. This interest-bearing account must allow for sufficient tracking and traceability of CESF Program award funds. (See, e.g., 2 CFR 200.302.) It is not necessary that the interest-bearing account be a “trust fund.” For additional information, see [2 C.F.R. § 200.305](#).

Prohibition of supplanting – Funds may not be used to supplant state or local funds but must be used to increase the amounts of such funds that would, in the absence of federal funds, be made available.

Limitation on direct administrative costs – Funds may not be used for direct administrative costs that exceed 10 percent of the total award amount.

B. Federal Award Information

Maximum number of awards BJA expects to make	1,874
Period of performance start date	January 20, 2020
Period of performance duration	2 years

Recipients have the option to request a one-time, up to 12-month extension. The extension must be requested via GMS no fewer than 30 days prior to the end of the performance period.

The expected eligible allocations for the FY 2020 CESF Program can be found at: <https://bj.a.ojp.gov/program/fy20-cesf-allocations>.

All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by statute.

Type of Award¹

BJA expects to make awards under this solicitation as grants. See the “Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements” section of the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for additional information.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements² as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303, comply with standards for financial and program management. See [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for additional information.

Budget Information

This solicitation expressly modifies the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide by not incorporating the “Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver” provision in the “Financial Information” section of the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

¹ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

² The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R. Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

The CESF Program does not require a match.

Please see the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for information on the following:

[Pre-agreement Costs \(also known as Pre-award Costs\)](#)

[Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs](#)

[Costs Associated with Language Assistance \(if applicable\)](#)

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

See the “Application Elements and Formatting Instructions” section of the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for information on what happens to an application that does not contain all the specified elements. (This solicitation expressly modifies the “Application Elements and Formatting Instructions” section of the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide by **not** incorporating paragraph two of that section (referring to nonresponsive applications or applications missing critical elements not “[proceeding] to peer review”). The solicitation further expressly modifies the “Application Attachments” section of the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide by **not** incorporating the “Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications,” “Applicant Disclosure and Justification – DOJ High Risk Grantees,” and “Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity” provisions.)

1. Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form (SF)-424)

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. See the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for additional information on completing the SF-424.

Intergovernmental Review: This solicitation (“funding opportunity”) is subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). An applicant may find the names and addresses of State Single Points of Contact (SPOCs) at the following website: https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/spoc_1_16_2020.pdf. If the applicant’s state appears on the SPOC list, the applicant must contact the State SPOC to find out about, and comply with, the state’s process under E.O. 12372. In completing the SF-424, an applicant whose state appears on the SPOC list is to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19, once the applicant has complied with its State E.O. 12372 process. (An applicant whose state does not appear on the SPOC list should answer question 19 by selecting the response that the: “Program is subject to E.O. 12372, but has not been selected by the State for review.”)

2. Program Narrative

Describe the specific coronavirus prevention, preparation, and/or response efforts that will be addressed with this funding and include a summary of the types of projects or items that will be funded over the 2-year grant period.

3. [Budget Information and Associated Documentation](#)

Please note that the budget narrative should include a full description of all costs, including administrative costs or indirect costs (if applicable).

See the Budget Preparation and Submission Information section of the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for details on the Budget Detail Worksheet, and on budget information and associated documentation, such as information on proposed subawards, proposed procurement contracts under awards, and pre-agreement costs.

This solicitation expressly modifies the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide by not incorporating the “Information on proposed subawards” provision in the “Budget Preparation and Submission Information” section of the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide. Specifically, OJP is suspending the requirements for CESF grant recipients to receive prior approval (either at the time of award or through a Grant Adjustment Notice) before making subawards.

For additional information regarding subawards and authorizations, please refer to the subaward section in the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#).

Please see the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide for information on the following:

4. [Indirect Cost Rate Agreement](#) (if applicable)

See the Budget Preparation and Submission Information section of the OJP Grant Application Resource Guide for information.

5. [Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire \(including applicant disclosure of high risk status\)](#)

6. [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities](#)

How to Apply

An applicant must submit its application through [GMS](#), which provides support for the application, award, and management of awards at OJP. Find information, registration, and submission steps on how to apply in GMS in response to this solicitation under **How to Apply (GMS)** in the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#).

E. Application Review Information

Review Process

BJA reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, achievable, and consistent with the solicitation. See the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for information on the application review process.

In addition, if OJP anticipates that an award will exceed \$250,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and consider any information about the applicant that appears in the nonpublic segment of the

integrity and performance system accessible through the System for Award Management (SAM) (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, FAPIIS).

Important note on FAPIIS: An applicant, at its option, may review and comment on any information about itself that currently appears in FAPIIS and was entered by a federal awarding agency. OJP will consider any such comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in FAPIIS, in its assessment of the risk posed by the applicant.

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, the Assistant Attorney General will make all final award decisions.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Please see the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for information on the following:

[Federal Award Notices](#)

[Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#)

OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

In addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, and all applicable requirements of federal statutes and regulations (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance).

For additional information on these legal requirements, see the “Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements” section in the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#).

[Information Technology \(IT\) Security Clauses](#)

General Information about [Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements](#)

Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to submit the following reports and data:

Required reports. Recipients typically must submit quarterly financial status reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent. (In appropriate cases, OJP may require additional reports.)

See the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for additional information on specific post-award reporting requirements.

OJP may restrict access to award funds if a recipient of an OJP award fails to report in a timely manner.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP contact(s), see page 2 of this solicitation.

For contact information for GMS, see page 2.

H. Other Information

Please see the [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#) for information on the following:

[Freedom of Information and Privacy Act \(5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a\)](#)

[Provide Feedback to OJP](#)

Appendix A: Application Checklist

Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program: FY 2020 Solicitation

This application checklist has been created as an aid in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in GMS:

- Acquire a DUNS Number (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))

To Register with GMS:

- For new users, acquire a GMS username and password* (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- For existing users, check GMS username and password* to ensure account access (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- Verify SAM registration in GMS (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- Search for and select correct funding opportunity in GMS (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- Register by selecting the “Apply Online” button associated with the funding opportunity title (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))

If experiencing technical difficulties in GMS, contact the NCJRS Response Center (see page 2)

*Password Reset Notice – GMS users are reminded that while password reset capabilities exist, this function is only associated with points of contact designated within GMS at the time the account was established. Neither OJP nor the GMS Help Desk will initiate a password reset unless requested by the authorized official or a designated point of contact associated with an award or application.

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

- Review the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2020 Awards](#)” in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

Scope Requirement:

- The eligible allocations for the FY 2020 CESF Program can be found at:
<https://bja.ojp.gov/program/fy20-cesf-allocations>.

Eligibility Requirement:

States, U.S. Territories, the District of Columbia, units of local government, and federally recognized tribal governments that were identified as eligible for funding under the FY 2019 State and Local JAG Program will be eligible to apply under the CESF Program solicitation. NOTE: Only the State Administering Agency that applied for FY 2019 JAG funding for a state/territory may apply for the state allocation of CESF funding.

What an Application Should Include:

- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- Intergovernmental Review (see page 6)
- Program Narrative (see page 7)
- Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 7)
- Budget Narrative (see page 7)
- Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 7)
- Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities ([SF-LLL](#)) (see [OJP Grant Application Resource Guide](#))

From: [Reports, Controller \(CON\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Fay, Abigail \(MYR\)](#); [Bruss, Andrea \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Kirkpatrick, Kelly \(MYR\)](#); [Ma, Sally \(MYR\)](#); [Cretan, Jeff \(MYR\)](#); [Lynch, Andy \(MYR\)](#); [Owens, Sarah \(MYR\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [Finkel, Jessica \(MYR\)](#); [Campbell, Severin \(BUD\)](#); [Brousseau, Fred \(BUD\)](#); [Goncher, Dan \(BUD\)](#); [Docs, SF \(LIB\)](#); [Smith, Susie \(HSA\)](#); [Johns, Rose \(HSA\)](#); [Barnes, Maximilian \(MYR\)](#); [Gleason, Alexander \(HSA\)](#); [Dobson, Graham \(HSA\)](#); [Cheu, Brian \(MYR\)](#); [Ramirez, Hugo \(MYR\)](#); [Pascual, Merrick \(ECN\)](#); [Johnson, Chandra \(HSA\)](#); [Chan, Gloria \(ECN\)](#); [Goudeau, Matthew \(ADM\)](#); [Strong, Brian \(ADM\)](#); [Faust, Kate \(ADM\)](#); [Salem, David \(ADM\)](#); [Vasilyeva, Kay \(DEM\)](#); [CON-EVERYONE](#); [MYR-ALL Department Heads](#); [CON-Finance Officers](#)
Subject: Issued – Give2SF COVID-19 Response & Recovery Fund Biweekly Update – June 26, 2020
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 4:24:51 PM

The Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund (Give2SF) is a special fund established by the City and County of San Francisco (City) as part of the Second Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency, dated February 25, 2020, and issued on March 13, 2020.

This memorandum summarizes both monetary and in-kind donations (goods) for Give2SF.

To view the memorandum, please visit our website at:

<http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2840>

To view the monetary donations attachment, please visit our website at:

<http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2841>

To view the in-kind donations attachment, please visit our website at:

<http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2842>

This is a send-only e-mail address.

For questions about the memorandum, please contact the Controller's Office at ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org or (415) 554-7500.

For all press inquiries, please contact Alyssa Sewlal at alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org.



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund

Biweekly Status Update

TO: Mayor's Office
Board of Supervisors

FROM: Ben Rosenfield, Controller

CC: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator, General Services Agency
Mary Ellen Carroll, Executive Director, Department of Emergency Management

DATE: June 26, 2020

SUBJECT: City and County of San Francisco's Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund

The Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund (Give2SF) is a special fund established by the City and County of San Francisco (City) as part of the *Second Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency*, dated February 25, 2020, and issued on March 13, 2020. This memorandum summarizes both monetary and in-kind donations (goods) for Give2SF.

Monetary Donations

The Second Supplement authorizes the Controller to accept and expend funds to provide shelter, food, financial assistance, and other assistance to individuals and families in San Francisco impacted by the emergency; to replace, repair, and rebuild public buildings, infrastructure, and other assets for use in the City's efforts to respond to the emergency; to issue and administer grants and/or interest-free loans to small businesses in San Francisco to compensate for economic harms resulting from COVID-19; and for other city efforts to address the impacts of COVID-19.

Within the authorized uses outlined above, the City has identified three priority areas for the immediate use of the Give2SF funds: (1) food security; (2) access to housing; and (3) security for workers and small businesses. Disbursements of funds are approved by a committee consisting of City Administrator Naomi Kelly, Director of Emergency Management Mary Ellen Carroll, and myself.

Through June 26, 2020:

- \$28,334,648 has been donated to and received by Give2SF both directly and through the San Francisco Foundation.
- All outstanding pledges have been fulfilled.

- Of \$28,194,000 that has been allocated:
 - \$18,310,000 is for programs operated by the Human Services Agency, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, Office of Early Care and Education, or Office of Economic and Workforce Development.
 - \$9,884,000 will be transferred to nonprofit organization partners from the San Francisco Foundation with city oversight.

The exhibits below summarize this information, including how departments have disbursed the funds through their programs. An attachment to this memorandum shows the individual donations received, including donor name, date, amount, and fund (and excludes individual donations received by departments directly for their own use).

Exhibit 1: Total Donations Received by Give2SF

Donations Received Directly by Give2SF	Donations to Give2SF Through San Francisco Foundation	Total Donations Received
\$7,539,230	\$20,795,418	\$28,334,648

Exhibit 2: Total Approved Disbursements and Disbursements to Departments, by Use of Fund

Department	Use of Fund	Disbursements Approved	Disbursements Made*
Human Services Agency	Food security	\$6,660,000	\$4,160,000*
Office of Early Care and Education	Security for workers and small businesses	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Security for workers and small businesses	\$4,360,000	\$4,360,000
Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development	Access to housing	\$6,290,000	\$6,285,000*
Total		\$18,310,000	\$15,805,000

* Disbursements to the Human Services Agency and Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development are in progress.

A total of \$9,884,000 has been allocated to programs that will be administered by nonprofit organizations, including a newly approved allocation of \$3,000,000 for income security for workers and small businesses. Funds will be transferred directly from the San Francisco Foundation with city oversight. Grant agreements are in progress. The approved allocations are as follows:

- \$4,884,000 to the Emergency Family Relief Fund, which will provide \$500 to about 5,000 families, or residents with children 18 and younger, affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, who do not qualify for federal benefits.
- \$2,000,000 to the Right to Recover program, which will provide eligible workers who have COVID-19 with two weeks of wage replacement, or \$1,285, based on San Francisco's hourly minimum wage.
- \$3,000,000 will support the Office of Economic and Workforce Development's existing grant and loan programs for small businesses affected by COVID-19, including \$1,500,000 that will be allocated to the City's recently created African American Small Business Revolving Loan Fund.

Exhibit 3: Human Services Agency’s Program Uses and Impacts

Purpose	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Allocated Amount	Impact
Senior/ Disability Food and Nutrition Network	Support equipment, staffing, and other infrastructure needed to modify services under COVID-19 (for example, freezers to provide multiday meal packs, additional delivery drivers and vehicles).	Department of Disability and Aging Services Network Providers ^a	\$1,600,000	100,000 new meals per month and supporting program modifications to maintain pre-COVID-19 service levels of 250,000 meals per month
Disconnected Populations	Support undocumented populations ineligible for mainstream benefits (for example, CalFresh), disbursed as \$200 gift cards for undocumented and mixed-status households.	HealthySF	\$500,000	2,631 households ^b
Family Support	Support low-income families with gift cards distributed through Family Resource Centers (value based on household size), which operate in high-priority zip codes (based on COVID-19 infection rate, CalFresh application volume, and other factors).	Family Resource Centers	\$750,000	Up to 1,400 families
Asian/Pacific Islander Immigrant Needs	Distribute gift cards to support undocumented and low-income Asian/ Pacific Islander immigrant households. Card values are based on household size.	Chinese for Affirmative Action	\$300,000	500-700 households
Isolation/ Quarantine Support	Meet emergency food needs of households in isolation/quarantine due to confirmed or suspected infection until regular food support is established.	Shanti Project	\$75,000	300-450 households
LGBTQ Food Relief	Distribute gift cards to help LGBTQ people meet urgent food needs, with a particular focus on trans people of color, trans immigrants, low-income LGBTQ people, and those who have lost their income due to COVID-19.	LGBTQ Center	\$75,000	300-400 individuals
Vulnerable Residents Receiving Safety Net Support	Distribute gift cards to vulnerable residents receiving Human Services Agency-administered public benefits who report pressing food needs via an agency-administered survey and are unlikely to receive other disaster assistance food support. Specifically, gift cards will be sent to transitional aged youth on Medi-Cal.	N/A – To be distributed by Human Services Agency	\$860,000	3,700-4,000 individuals
<i>Allocated funds are for food security programs focused on communities of color not currently reached by existing programs.</i>			\$2,500,000	<i>To be quantified</i>
		Total	\$6,660,000	

Notes:

^a Bayview Senior Services, Centro Latino, Episcopal Community Services, Glide, Jewish Family & Children’s Services, Kimochi, Meals on Wheels, On Lok/30th Street, Project Open Hand, Russian American Community Services, San Francisco-Marin Food Bank, Self-Help for the Elderly

^b Total card value exceeds allocation because bulk purchase of cards provides 5 percent discount.

Source: Human Services Agency

Exhibit 4: Office of Economic and Workforce Development Program Uses and Impacts

Purpose	Description	Grantee	Allocated Amount	Impact
Small Business Resiliency Grants	Make emergency grants to eligible small businesses with evidence of at least 25% revenue loss in a 30-day period.	Northeast Community Federal Credit Union	\$1,000,000	At least 100 small businesses to access grants of up to \$10,000
Small Business No-Interest Loans	San Francisco Hardship Emergency Loan Program (SF HELP) funds can be used to pay payroll, rent, utilities, inventory, and more. Flexible loan terms determined on a case-by-case basis, based on borrower's ability to repay.	Mission Economic Development Agency	\$1,000,000	At least 20 businesses to access no-interest loan of up to \$50,000
		Main Street Launch	\$1,200,000	At least 24 businesses to access no-interest loan of up to \$50,000
Supportive Services for Immigrant Workers	Provide direct support to immigrants and undocumented children, families, and communities affected by COVID-19.	Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (Subrecipient: SF Labor Council)	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
		Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (Subrecipient: UndocuFund SF)	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
		Bay Area Community Resources	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
		Bay Area Community Resources (Subrecipient: Community Youth Center)	\$115,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
Supportive Services for Food Security	Provide direct relief to support immigrants and undocumented children, families, and communities affected by COVID-19.	Bay Area Community Resources	\$100,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
		Bay Area Community Resources (Subrecipient: Community Youth Center)	\$100,000	Provide \$200 to at least 500 individuals
	Provide support to the Mission District Food Hub, which Carnaval kicked off on Cinco de Mayo.	San Francisco Arts Commission (Subrecipient: Cultura y Arte Nativa de las Americas (CANNA))	\$100,000	Provide groceries to 4,000 disadvantaged, mostly immigrant households
	Provide direct relief to support vulnerable residents in low-income communities of color hard-hit by the pandemic, with a focus on public housing residents and at-risk households.	Human Rights Commission (Subrecipients El/La Para TransLatinas, Larkin Street Youth Services, Code Tenderloin, Rafiki Coalition, Collective Impact, Calle 24)	\$350,000	<i>To be quantified*</i>
	Support food relief efforts for low-income, limited English-speaking workers who test positive for COVID-19 and find they cannot support themselves during quarantine.	Bay Area Community Resources (Subrecipient: Community Youth Center)	\$50,000	Provide support to 250 low-income, vulnerable, disconnected households
		Total	\$4,360,000	

* Program/service delivery is in the planning phase. Grantees and impact will be reported in subsequent reports.

Source: Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Exhibit 5: Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development’s Program Uses and Impact

Program	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Allocated Amount	Impact
Housing Stabilization	Provide financial assistance of up to \$3,000 for rent, mortgage, utility, and other housing costs to eligible households per application period (with an assistance cap of \$10,000 per household). Households are eligible, regardless of immigration status, if they have experienced a substantial loss of income due to COVID-19 and cannot afford their housing costs. Applications are run through a prioritization tool that identifies households that are most at risk.	Catholic Charities of San Francisco	\$1,258,000	4,888 applications received requesting financial assistance amounting to \$15,832,613. To date, 444 prioritized applications are in the process of receiving up to a combined \$1,332,000 in assistance.
		Eviction Defense Collaborative	\$1,258,000	
		La Raza Community Resource Center	\$1,258,000	
		Q Foundation	\$1,258,000	
		Young Community Developers	\$1,258,000	
		Total	\$6,290,000	

Source: Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development

Exhibit 6: Office of Early Care and Education’s Program Uses and Impact

Program	Description	Nonprofit Organization Partner	Allocated Amount	Impact*
Family Child Care (FCC) Emergency Operating Grants	Provide economic relief to FCC educators, who represent a sector of self-employed, low-income workers, who are not eligible or do not have access to many of the funding resources available to other business sectors, in order to help FCCs to survive loss of revenue until full enrollment can begin again.	Low Income Investment Fund	\$1,000,000	Since applications were released on June 19, 2020, OECE has received the following languages response: 119 Chinese 98 English 51 Spanish
		Total	\$1,000,000	

* Grant awards have not been made as of the date of this memorandum.

Source: Office of Early Care and Education

Exhibit 7: Total Approved Disbursements from San Francisco Foundation Directly to Nonprofit Organizations

Purpose	Oversight Department(s)	Nonprofit Organization	Amount
Emergency Family Relief Fund	Office of Economic and Workforce Development/ Human Rights Commission	Bay Area Community Resources	\$1,555,000
		Central American Resource Center—San Francisco	\$100,000
		Chinese for Progressive Action	\$750,000
		Coleman Advocates (Excelsior Works!)	\$200,000
		Collective Impact	\$50,000
		Community Youth Center of San Francisco	\$750,000
		Dolores Street Community Services	\$150,000
		Tenderloin Housing Clinic (La Voz Latina SF)	\$100,000
		Mission Economic Development Agency	\$850,000
		Young Community Developers	\$379,000
		Total	\$4,884,000
Right to Recover Program	Office of Economic and Workforce Development/ Human Rights Commission	Mission Economic Development Agency	\$500,000
		Young Community Developers	\$500,000
		<i>To be determined</i>	\$1,000,000
		Total	\$2,000,000
COVID-19 Related Grants and Loans for Small Businesses	Office of Economic and Workforce Development	MainStreet Launch	\$1,500,000
		Mission Economic Development Agency	\$500,000
		<i>To be determined</i>	\$1,000,000
		Total	\$3,000,000
			\$9,884,000

In-Kind Donations

The Ninth Supplement, dated April 10, 2020, revised and replaced Item 4 in the Second Supplement to authorize the acceptance and use of goods donated to support the City’s COVID-19 response efforts. Some donated goods are received by the Emergency Operations Center’s feeding and affordable housing units and are distributed according to highest need by the Logistics Section of the Emergency Operations Center. Other in-kind goods have been donated directly to city departments for their use.

Through June 26, 2020:

- 1,199,770 units of in-kind goods have been donated to and received by Give2SF.
- 1,014,892 units have been distributed to city departments by the Emergency Operations Center’s Logistics Section.

Exhibit 8 summarizes this information. An attachment to this memorandum shows the individual donations received, including donor name, date, and value of donated item only for goods received through the Emergency Operations Center (and excludes individual donations received by departments directly for their own use).

Exhibit 8: In-Kind Donations Received by Give2SF and Distributed by the Logistics Section of the Emergency Operations Center

Category	Count Received	Count Distributed*
Face Shields	2,735	27
Gloves	518,300	489,700
Goggles	3,350	3,040
Gowns	4,572	393
Masks	447,466	342,628
Other Bulk Items*	155,934	113,617
Shoe Covers	1,800	-
Wipes or Sanitizers	65,613	65,487
Total	1,199,770	1,014,892

* Count distributed does not include goods purchased and distributed by the Emergency Operations Center's Logistics Section.

Source: EOC Logistics

Anonymous Donations

The Sunshine Ordinance (Administrative Code, Chapter 67) requires the disclosure of the true source of the donation to the City and any financial interest the donor has involving the City. However, some donations received by Give2SF both directly and through the San Francisco Foundation were from donors who wish to remain anonymous. The Controller's Office is following up with donors to obtain this information. The Annual Report will include options city policymakers may consider in the event any anonymous donors remain after our outreach and identification efforts. To date, only 8 of 2,210 donations (\$217,000 of \$7,539,230) to the City Fund are anonymous.

Should you need additional information, please contact me at ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org or (415) 554-7500.

Attachments

- Give2SF Monetary Donations Received
- Give2SF In-Kind Donations Received

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
Total Through June 26, 2020		\$ 7,539,230.04	\$ 20,795,418.00
6/26/2020	Nisit Jirangpitakkul	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/26/2020	Moore Moore	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/25/2020	DAVID W DUMAIS	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/23/2020	Andrew Clark	\$ 3,372.00	\$ -
6/23/2020	Ryan Mo0re	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Dropbox	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00
6/22/2020	Ramaswamy Srikant	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Davies Dan	\$ 250.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Amy Felsenthal	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Harold Erdman	\$ 1,800.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Alexis and Rachel Rouda	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Linda Joan Saraf	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Luke Lovett	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/22/2020	Janet C Wade	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Joyce B Renaker	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Arlene Waksberg, Charles M Clark	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Mark Brody	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Patricia Mahoney	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/19/2020	Kacey J Clark	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/18/2020	Vesuvio, Inc	\$ 500.00	\$ -
6/17/2020	Brian Borromeo	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/16/2020	Gilead Sciences, Inc.	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00
6/16/2020	Silicon Valley Community Foundation	\$ -	\$ 200,000.00
6/16/2020	Comcast	\$ -	\$ 25,000.00
6/16/2020	Netflix**	\$ -	\$ 3,000.00
6/16/2020	Apple Computer, Inc.**	\$ -	\$ 850.00
6/16/2020	Google Inc.**	\$ -	\$ 6,425.00
6/16/2020	Simon Rogers**	\$ -	\$ 7,675.00
6/16/2020	Shreyas R Gandhi	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/15/2020	Matt M Munz	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/15/2020	Boris Cherny	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/15/2020	Jack Douglas	\$ 500.00	\$ -
6/15/2020	Leslie Wellbaum	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/15/2020	Mason Scott	\$ 150.00	\$ -
6/15/2020	GIC Real Estate Inc.	\$ 3,796.17	\$ -
6/12/2020	Patrick Family Fund	\$ -	\$ 5,000.00
6/12/2020	Mike Grisso	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/11/2020	REYNALDO L. PANTALEON	\$ 25.00	\$ -
6/10/2020	Samuel Valdez	\$ 500.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
6/10/2020	Jewish Community Federation	\$ 500.00	\$ -
6/8/2020	PETER KINMOND	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/8/2020	KEEGAN HAFNER	\$ 176.85	\$ -
6/8/2020	Matt Beaumont-Gay	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
6/8/2020	Meredith Bauer	\$ 318.50	\$ -
6/8/2020	Philip A Reitz	\$ 20.00	\$ -
6/8/2020	Anne Fuchs-Chesney	\$ 54.00	\$ -
6/8/2020	Michael J McGinley	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
6/8/2020	Jennifer Lin	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	Patricia Wise	\$ 25.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	Nancy Leahy	\$ 300.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	Russell Thau	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	James Cole	\$ 110.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	John J Beam	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	John Cuffney	\$ 1,500.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	Blue Beyond Consulting, Inc	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	Kristin Anundsen	\$ 500.00	\$ -
6/5/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 500.00	\$ -
6/4/2020	AT&T	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
6/4/2020	Lili C Byers	\$ 300.00	\$ -
6/4/2020	Bruce Parker	\$ 30.00	\$ -
6/4/2020	Jacob Ostrofsky	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/4/2020	Matthew Jee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/4/2020	tom budgick	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/3/2020	L. R. Ingersoll	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/3/2020	Sarah Owens	\$ 250.00	\$ -
6/3/2020	I M Thomson	\$ 30.00	\$ -
6/3/2020	Jenny Nguyen	\$ 600.00	\$ -
6/3/2020	Becky Lehman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	Lisel Joseph	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	Tess C Winlock	\$ 40,000.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	Ashley B Macy	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	JoAnn Ogden	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	Kimberly Low	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	Francesca C Vera	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	CHUNG-CHENG KEVIN HUNG	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/2/2020	Brandon Schwartz	\$ 500.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Alina C Lodahl	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	sasha Cuttler	\$ 180.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Tap Tap Organics	\$ 112.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Tommy Lin	\$ 300.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Kevin Gao	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Carolyn Yao	\$ 15.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Anna Mae Abia	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	William W Atkins	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Sy Aal	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Mason Scott	\$ 200.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Robert K. Deel	\$ 500.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
6/1/2020	Arjun Krishna Kumar	\$ 75.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	cindy changar	\$ 50.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Colin Mckeehan	\$ 150.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Jeffrey R Rigo	\$ 100.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Jesse A Guzman	\$ 500.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Edward Lesmes Maldonado	\$ 237.81	\$ -
6/1/2020	India C Prentice	\$ 250.00	\$ -
6/1/2020	Sophie Diao	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Vanguard Charitable	\$ -	\$ 250,000.00
5/29/2020	The Morgan Stanley GIFT Fund	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
5/29/2020	David L. Klein, Jr. Fund	\$ -	\$ 7,000.00
5/29/2020	Fidelity Charitable Gift Fund	\$ -	\$ 2,500.00
5/29/2020	Judith Tomese	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Arthur Rock	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	OB Services	\$ 2,100.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Ardian US LLC	\$ 15,000.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Frances Ohashi	\$ 40.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Leonard Torres	\$ 40.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Connie J Mar	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Trisha Thadani	\$ 40.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Karen R Traister	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Heath Massey	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Cary J Fleisher	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	Camille LeJeune	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/29/2020	sheldon kirchman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/28/2020	Rachelle Axel	\$ 75.00	\$ -
5/28/2020	Louis DeRosa	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/28/2020	Brenda A Tucker	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/28/2020	Andrew Work	\$ 426.50	\$ -
5/28/2020	james christie	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/27/2020	Stephan J Leonoudakis	\$ 800.00	\$ -
5/27/2020	Gretchen M Ehrenkauffer	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/27/2020	Jason Pellegrini	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/27/2020	Emily M Morris	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/27/2020	Rebecca Herman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/27/2020	Crunchbase Inc.	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/27/2020	Iran Narges	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Bruce B Johnson	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Robin Morales	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Nicolette Beck	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Erin Bailey	\$ 297.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Miss Rosa Birch	\$ 1,500.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Lara Hammamy	\$ 200.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
5/26/2020	Keegan Hafner	\$ 182.40	\$ -
5/26/2020	Antonia I Ruiz	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Julia Lopez	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Lauren MacGuidwin	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Blair G Helsing	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Colin Mckeehan	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Cassandra McGoldrick	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Thomas X Bockmon	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Randy Weled	\$ 400.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Alison Dame-Boyle	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Evelyn Kelsey	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Stephanie Schneider	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Vivian Fong	\$ 120.00	\$ -
5/26/2020	Carmen Chu	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	American Endowment Foundation	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	Susan Rosen	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	Richard L Suen	\$ 125.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	al crowell	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	Ashesha Mehrotra	\$ 101.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	Kathleen White	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	Matthew B Bohm	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	Susan G. Van	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/22/2020	Julia A Pak	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Brenda Tucker	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Valeria Wilson	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Lan V Liem	\$ 281.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Marian Halley	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Teresa Feng	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Cynthia Gregory	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Richard Lesnick	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Leuwam Tesfai	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/21/2020	Charles Perl	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/20/2020	Nancy M Duffy	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/20/2020	Stephen L Garber	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/20/2020	Allison c vicencio	\$ 10.00	\$ -
5/20/2020	Antonio Gurgel	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/20/2020	Kristin Tieche	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/20/2020	Denise Selleck	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/20/2020	Rachel Lim	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	Diana R Meistrell	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	Taylor M McNair	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	Paul Crowell	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	Chris Wojcicki	\$ 12.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	John Melichar	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	MICHAEL K TRUONG	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	Tiffany T Huang	\$ 600.00	\$ -
5/19/2020	Kawanna Jenkins	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Mark R. and Mauree Jane Perry	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
5/18/2020	Hills Bank	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 180.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	The Tides Foundation	\$ 62,500.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Levin Family Foundation	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Cynthia J Goguen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Stephen Heide	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Audrey E. Groomes	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Bonnie M. Moffett / Eugene V. Moffett	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Mark Leno	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Michael Silverman	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Janelle Caywood	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Adam Shaywitz	\$ 318.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Laurel Gaddie	\$ 5.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Betsy Eckstein	\$ 180.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Tamisie vrolyk	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Keith Hardaway	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Jeffrey Briz-Felisilda	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Robert Livingstone	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Cynthia Lin	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Yohana mehari	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Bianca DOERSCHLAG	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	LEAH JACKSON	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Bryan Wolf	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Peter L Vliet	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	CLAIRE R FRAM	\$ 600.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Arnel Bautista	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	1905 laguna St	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Billy R McFadden	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Scott A McFadden	\$ 40.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	David Kidd	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Christian Topham	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Andrew R Hutchinson	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Anton Herasymenko	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Deepak Kumar	\$ 15.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	James L Kilgore	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Mason Scott	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Clara J Jeffery	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Cara Cara	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Derron Thweatt	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Blaine Bookey	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Hannah Krier	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	XuanThu Pham	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Edward Lesmes Maldonado	\$ 237.81	\$ -
5/18/2020	Barbara Komansky	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Diane Sidd-Champion	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Xin Liu	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
5/18/2020	Bradley Collins	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Amy Wollman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Chris Farrell	\$ 400.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Yesenia lopez	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Brian Reynoso	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Stephanie Sun	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Thomas Van Dyck	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	Christopher Maniace	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	James Hardin	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/18/2020	San Francisco Foundation	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	The Scorpio Rising Fund	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
5/15/2020	Holly French	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Jim Bolinger	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Harold Liss	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Monica Seghers Hayes	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Raymond G Quesada	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Gurlyn S. Grewal	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Michael Vuong	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Athisri Prayoonthong	\$ 30.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Anne K Gallagher	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Lee A Ryan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Lester Logue	\$ 15.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Alex Clemens	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Narayana pappu	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Sophie Goodwin	\$ 40.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Stuart L Silberman	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Carolyn Goossen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Amy Beinart	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Sloan Looney	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Anthony B. Jones	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Benjamin J Roodman	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Elizabeth Warner	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Jeffrey Tumlin	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Stevana Case	\$ 1,250.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Alexandra Sweet	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Gareth J Hoo	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Cyrus Hall	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	joan wendt	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Christiaan Vorkink	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Jacob Y Wang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Marsha OBannon	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Matthew Koontz	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Margaret J Handler	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Kristin Henry	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/15/2020	Peter Barschall	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Sherrie Groshong	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Margaret Rubio	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Sheila Stuart	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
5/14/2020	Susan L Karp	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	RODMAN S rogers	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Paul A Allen	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Mary L Miller	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Jonathan A Funk	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Ariel GARCIA De la Vega	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Jan R Potts	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Gail M MacGowan	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Samuel M Sobol	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	David J Bloom	\$ 69.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Genevieve Mansfield	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	David E Babbitz	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Jacob G Wellins	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Bradley Tanzman	\$ 12.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Charles T Whipple	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Thomas Hanley	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Kathryn Claiborn	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Mark Barnes	\$ 10.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Kirk Beckstead	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Charlotte L Johnson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Gina fromer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Henry Minn	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	LAURA L MUNTER	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Timothy A. Simon	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Kevin Darling	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Deborah Fellingner	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Erin Loback	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Terri Ludden	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Cathy E. Rabin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Diane C Carr	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Nedra Dias	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Alana Ronen	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Emily Johnston	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Sarah Marie Smith	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Tracy Freedman	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Kathryn Marple	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Andrew Y Ong	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Andrew Y Ong	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Anne Caird	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Michel Schoemaker	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	S Dimitropoulos	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Bruce Colman	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Stephen Mangum	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	henry milich	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Judith A Holm	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Steven Kasapi	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Tristan Cameron	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Chana Greene	\$ 450.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
5/14/2020	Carol Porter	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Arta Zygielbaum	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Robert M Fruchtman	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Jonathan Cohen	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Catherine Cusic	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Jennie Parrilla	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Andrew Dai	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Laura Brunow Miner	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Eric Shaw	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Steven Bookbinder	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/14/2020	Gustave Feldman	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Christine Beard	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Wanqing Ouyang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Sonja R Johnson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Michael J. Solomon	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Sandy Leung	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Rachel Hill	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Victor Lin	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Jamie Nargassans	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	caroline cross	\$ 5.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Vincent Eckert	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Jamal R Collins	\$ 10.00	\$ -
5/13/2020	Ryan L Nichols	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/12/2020	Chaivat Suwannaporn	\$ 600.00	\$ -
5/12/2020	Meghan Kamat	\$ 70.00	\$ -
5/12/2020	Selina Selina	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/12/2020	Margaret Wilson	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Iris Fung	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	KEEGAN HAFNER	\$ 189.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Denise Powell	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	James Cole	\$ 110.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Ripa Saha	\$ 501.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Mark Watson and Clare Winterton	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Peter Vulgaris	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Heather B Gonzalez	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Thomas R. and Georgia L. Schuttish	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Lorraine Thompson	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	McMorgan & Company	\$ 7,500.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Jewish Community Federation and Endowment Fund	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Wells Fargo Foundation	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Cashier's Check	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Vanguard Charitable	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	wai m yee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Stewart Murrie	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Steven Chang	\$ 2,400.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Daniel Hertz	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Jason Greco	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/11/2020	Ginger lau	\$ 500.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
5/11/2020	Ginger Lau	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/8/2020	Chime, Inc.	\$ -	\$ 75,000.00
5/8/2020	margaret hom	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/8/2020	Kerry Viengvilai	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/8/2020	Eden Kfir	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/8/2020	Vivan Som	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/8/2020	Zarana K Udani	\$ 10.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	Patrick Family Fund	\$ -	\$ 5,000.00
5/7/2020	william s tannenbaum	\$ 180.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	Andrew Crebar	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	Lauren M Harriman	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	Mariya Mykhaylova	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	James G. Respass	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	Cary Bronstein	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	KARTHIK BALAJI	\$ 1,220.00	\$ -
5/7/2020	Andrew Tremblay	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	#Start Small	\$ -	\$ 15,000,000.00
5/6/2020	Adriana Grino	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Amanda Schapel	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Stephanie Rose	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	ROBERT TAINE	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Felicia Pitre	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Drew Liming	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Jeannie Sun	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Erika K Opper	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Timothy Hsu	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/6/2020	Ivory Madison	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Jesse M King	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Ken Irelan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Laurel A. Kilgour	\$ 30.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Addison Luria-Roberson	\$ 120.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Shuchita Mishra	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Sherry Coveney	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$ 10.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Alice Xu	\$ 1,500.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Divya M Patel	\$ 10.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	ROSALIND K JOHNSON	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/5/2020	Heather A Cutler	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	First Republic Bank	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
5/4/2020	Jewish Family and Children's Services/ Andy Coblentz and Shari Libicki Donor Advised Continuity Fund	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00
5/4/2020	Google	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	George H. Rey	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Michael Macia	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Daphne Wray	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Wilson J Lam/Mary Leong Lam	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	H. Kamimoto	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Timothy Yip	\$ 20.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
5/4/2020	Kathy McCormick	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Darrin Ward	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Michael Moghaddam	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Chris Lesch	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Stephanie Boudreau	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Tiffany Edwards .	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Sarah Kaplan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Alexa Hansen	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Linda Wilford	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	David N Goldman	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Charles Magahern	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Jonathan B Hernandez	\$ 400.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Ramila Desai	\$ 25.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Jonathon M Grist	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Sarah Chuck	\$ 30.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Owen G Auch	\$ 250.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	REYNALDO L. PANTALEON	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Alex J Thompson	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Rhisa C Muse	\$ 3,041.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Oren Yunger	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	David Stiepleman	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	David Brian Ward	\$ 500.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Steffen Frech	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Aleksandra Ponomareva	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Andrew Vernon	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Colin Mckeehan	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Robert Pooley	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Kevin Metcalf	\$ 20.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	David A De Valeria	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Edward Lesmes Maldonado	\$ 237.80	\$ -
5/4/2020	Chaivat Suwannaporn	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	NIKLAS NORDLUND	\$ 101.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Carolyn White	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Caroline Young	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	anna ogarkova	\$ 150.00	\$ -
5/4/2020	Lizzette Otlang	\$ 50.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00
5/1/2020	Randy Weled	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Ankit Vaish	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Barbara Bernstein	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Mathew Honan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Andrew O'Connor	\$ 300.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Frederico Rocha	\$ 70.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Frank Buonagurio	\$ 200.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Elysia B Su	\$ 100.00	\$ -
5/1/2020	Alex S Moskowitz	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 2,000.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 800.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 600.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 600.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 500.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 500.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 500.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 500.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 400.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 300.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 300.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 150.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 150.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 80.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 30.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 30.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 25.00
4/30/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 5.00
4/30/2020	Ann Agbayani	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	Kristen Kalez	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	Sarah T Kiani	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	Dennis Wei	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	Jody Reiss	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	Emily A Headden	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	Janet Clyde	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/30/2020	Lana Glatt	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Slack Corp.	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
4/29/2020	Joyce A Calagos	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	James Thomas Conte	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Debra E. Marchi	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Gianluca Franzese	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 4,000.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Fidelity Chartable	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Fidelity Chartable	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	The San Francisco Foundation	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Iris s Johnson-Edlund/Robin E McNally	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Tracy Chapman	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Natalee McIntyre	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	David Heflin	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Joaquin N Torres	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Eliot Kent-Uritam	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Steve Pepple	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Wendy Rothenberg	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Jonathan Ferrugia	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Helen Zhang	\$ 750.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Alyssa Saquilayan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Stanley J Mandell	\$ 600.00	\$ -
4/29/2020	Gaye E Beceren	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/29/2020	W Y Ong	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/28/2020	Helen Bai	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/28/2020	Lauren Poole	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/28/2020	Eran Aloni	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/28/2020	Annette M Lai	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/28/2020	Timothy Dunn	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/28/2020	Andrea Aranda	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	\$ -	\$ 15,000.00
4/27/2020	Bethany Hollrah	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	MAry A Garcia Tejada	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Phillip Fernberg	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Bernadette C. Tyler	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Kylee Lessard	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Janis Greenspan	\$ 19.94	\$ -
4/27/2020	Francoise Herrmann	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Andrea Nickerson	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Julie Kalter	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Lars Owenmark	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Mia Risher	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Adra Upadhyaya	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Nila Bogue Staudt	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	David H Kaskowitz	\$ 400.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Jolie Gines	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Liana Y Szeto	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	KEEGAN HAFNER	\$ 187.95	\$ -
4/27/2020	PETER LEAF	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	carole e deitrich	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Bruce Bowden Johnson	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	316 Prentiss St San Francisco Ca	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	ROBERT MING LIM	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Geoffrey Bauman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Siu Ling Chen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Evelyn Kelsey	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Chris Y Emanuel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Matthew C Miller	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Ann H Chen	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Kara M Sloat	\$ 125.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Brian Streiffer	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Joanne Wong	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Sara Zak	\$ 27.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Peter C Warden	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Tristan Tristan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Kimberly M Sarquis	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Jane Lang	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Laney Whitcanack	\$ 30.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Haruko Hata	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Magdalena R Blackmer	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Julie E Taylor	\$ 500.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/27/2020	Mario Lanao	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Emily Fong	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Meredith N Derecho	\$ 30.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Caroline Pincus	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Sarah Ta	\$ 30.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Chaivat Suwannaporn	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Jean I. Korn	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Rachel I Mozesson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/27/2020	Jeffrey Nigh	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Impact Assets	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00
4/24/2020	Ivy Ngo	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Nancy Y Lui	\$ 99.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Ryan Devens	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Ko Ko Zin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Robert J Reinhard	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Pamela Rockwell	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Bettie Holaday	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Laura E Jacobson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	David S Schmidt	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Jeanine R Nicholson	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Rebecca Gaynor	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	William R. Conrad	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Ed Pascucci	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/24/2020	Bruce H Agid	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Bank of America, Charitable Foundation	\$ -	\$ 200,000.00
4/23/2020	Comcast	\$ -	\$ 25,000.00
4/23/2020	Jewish Communal Fund	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Stanford University	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Christine C Garward	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Bo Meng	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Akiyo Kinst-Hori	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	suk p kwan	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Annie Palmer	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Peter Woods	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Kathleen J Sasso	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Lionel E Trufant	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Heorhi Fedchanka	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Karlyn Tjaden	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	CAROLYN H SCOTT	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Ganesh Seshan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Dagmar P Crichton	\$ 30.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Maeve Metzger	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Neil David Byres	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Jonathan Lai	\$ 600.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Susan Livingood	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Excel Plumbing Supply	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Dilara T. Mehmed	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Hoang Cuong	\$ 10.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/23/2020	Valerie Aubel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Sara E Spengler	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Thomas W. Pulliam, Jr.	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Lisa Ligon	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	samuel k wilson	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Sandra LaFerrera	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Lauren M Harriman	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Elizabeth Totten	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Aditya Chakraborty	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Cynthia Guynn	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Christine Chudd	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Judith M. Coulter	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	JEFFREY A TOPOR	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Meiko S Simada	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Serra c akgun	\$ 60.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Robert Morrison	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	James Jude Jr	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Wil Curiel	\$ 1,681.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Randy M Girer	\$ 40.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Kelly Sprague	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Shabnam Dadkhah	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Gina M Castro	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Hillary A Ronen	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Howard Isaacson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Dhruv Maheshwari	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Jared Brown	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/23/2020	Paul H Lovgreen	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Sheryl Davis	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Bruce Seidel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Dipak R Patel	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	John Robin Orme	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Chloe Hill	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Daniel Adams	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Lanedin Robbins	\$ 440.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Chloe Hill	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Infinity Services LLC	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Naomi Kelly	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Josh Taylor	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	julie I campioni	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Aaron G Calhoun	\$ 120.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Josh Mukhopadhyay	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Kevin D Frank	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/22/2020	Manaswini Garimella	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/21/2020	Sean Elsbernd	\$ -	\$ 500.00
4/21/2020	David W Dumais	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/21/2020	Taylor Tromburg	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/21/2020	Madeline Bredouw	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/21/2020	Cathy Hong	\$ 300.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/21/2020	kristin leung	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/21/2020	GUOZI DAI	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/21/2020	Rupesh D Chavan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,700.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,700.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,700.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 250.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 200.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 100.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/20/2020	The Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$ -	\$ 50.00
4/20/2020	Xiomara Holsworth	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Joseph M. McCune III/Karen Kaye Smith-McCune	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Raymond Chan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Horizons Foundation	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Charles Schwab	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Alex Kuo	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Andrew Nartker	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Rishabh M Jain	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Danne S Duncan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	John Robert Bernhelm	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Kelle Pedro	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Christine Tran	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	John E. Robinson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Kiranmayee Suryadevara	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Chaivat Suwannaporn	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Matthew Waters	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	William A V McRae	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	RICHARD A JOHNSON	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Laura D Straus	\$ 900.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Madhavi Maheshwari	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Jeremy Gonzales	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Scott J Levokove Trust	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Laura E Sanman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Roxanne Brittain	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	TRUE Sake LLC	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Katherine Lam	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Geoffrey McNally	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Michael Gleeson	\$ 5.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/20/2020	Arjan Schutte	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Candice Wold	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Caroline A Cooper	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Mason Scott	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Katherine Wang	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Charles Osborne	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Jaime S Osorno	\$ 34.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Pratyush Buddiga	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Pratyush Buddiga	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Lei Xiang	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Nathaniel Fruchter	\$ 125.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Michael A Barnett	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Andrea Cathcart	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Paul Work	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Vikram Mohan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/20/2020	Priscilla Tov	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Roman Martinez	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	K Nietes-Wong	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Craig McFadden	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Hanqing Huang	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Catherine Geewax	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Adanya Lustig	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Piper Lewis	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Malena Spar	\$ 600.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Cinta Lewis	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	John J Beam	\$ 2,400.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Soneri Chaturvedi	\$ 70.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Jaren J Bonillo	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Erin Bailey	\$ 52.00	\$ -
4/17/2020	Mikel Maron	\$ 4,400.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Silicon Valley Community Foundation	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
4/16/2020	Friedman/Meyer Fund	\$ -	\$ 5,000.00
4/16/2020	David L. Klein, Jr. Fund	\$ -	\$ 3,000.00
4/16/2020	Emma Fisher c/o Hirsch & Associates	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
4/16/2020	John & Marcia Goldman Foundation	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Hercules Capital	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Onur Burak YILDIRIM	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Sarah Swanson	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	James Wilsterman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Asma Stephan	\$ 125.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Neeta Sahadev	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Darren Olson	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	James Lovette-Black	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Raghavendra Sundresh	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Hanqing Huang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Sean Sorrell	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Megan Willson	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Bethany L Taylor	\$ 50.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/16/2020	Jeremy Gordon Frisch	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Peter Williams Cota Capital	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	GABRIEL A MANTEGNA	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	David A Petzold	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Ja-Chin Audrey Lee	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Emily Bussiere	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	COURTNY L DOLAN	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Isabelle Boin	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Steele Davidoff	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Ricky A Yee	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/16/2020	Mikhal Bouganim	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Mukesh Agrawal	\$ 1,300.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 7,500.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Gemma G Gaisano	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Puja Ramani	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	teresa jones	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	David Salem	\$ 108.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Brian H Lee	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Rigney Turnham	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Chaivat Suwannaporn	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Theodore J Kwong	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Aaron Rabideau	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	JASON C WONG	\$ 40.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Willy A Saldana	\$ 60.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Andrew M Chen	\$ 40.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Derek Dong	\$ 60.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Matthew Finkle	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/15/2020	Lara D'Emilio	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Kyle and Tracy Voght Charitable Fund	\$ -	\$ 50,000.00
4/14/2020	Mark A White	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Colin Mckeehan	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	REIRI SONO	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Robert K. Deel	\$ 1,130.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	John foley	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Matthew Cooper	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Thomas Scharffenberger	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	John W Crittenden	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Seamus Doyle	\$ 30.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Catherine E Reilly	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Jiajun Zhu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/14/2020	Valerie Law	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Vanguard Charitable	\$ -	\$ 750.00
4/13/2020	Salesforce.com	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Gerson Bakar Foundation	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	J.P. Morgan Charitable Giving Fund	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	J.P. Morgan Charitable Giving Fund	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Morgan Stanley Gift Fund	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Lisa Stone Pritzker Family Fund	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/13/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 25,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Ayco Charitable Foundation	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Kristin L Anundsen (IRA) WFCS as Custodian	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	L Sabau	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Tami Bryant for Democratic County Central Committee 2020	\$ 123.72	\$ -
4/13/2020	John C Carrillo	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Leigh Kloss	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Meridee Moore	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Natalie Olin	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Brandon R Wirakesuma	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Sara A Spencer	\$ 35.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	EMIKO OYE	\$ 43.49	\$ -
4/13/2020	Jeanne Zara Lim	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	PILATES IN COMMON COOPERATIVE INC	\$ 178.80	\$ -
4/13/2020	Robert Bransten	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Barbara L Jue	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Taylor Carroll	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Sukanda ODonnell	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Marielle Price	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Siddharth Mandava	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Mable Woo	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Josina Reddy	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Christopher Wittman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Xiaxing Li	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Tyler Sonnemaker	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	YINGZHUO ZHAO	\$ 900.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Lila W Tyler	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Michelle Tallin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Jacqueline LeSage	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Anna McBee	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Paige S Rossi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	mio nitta	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	YUN ZHAO	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Larry V. Pulliam	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Regina Regina	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Aditi Maheshwari	\$ 101.00	\$ -
4/13/2020	Linda L Aldrich	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Waymo, LLC	\$ -	\$ 50,000.00
4/10/2020	Marin Community Foundation	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Marin Community Foundation	\$ 15,000.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Lin Lisa	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Reality SF Church	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Debra Guskin	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	maryann hulsman	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Kristie Kookan	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/10/2020	GIC Real Estate, Inc.	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Mike D Ikeda	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Jeffrey Tumlin	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Yvonne Young	\$ 800.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Erin W Tou	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Mark A Rathbun	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Claudia Lin Margolis	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/10/2020	Meghan Guerin	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	DrumStick Fund	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
4/9/2020	Eileen and Peter Michael Fund	\$ -	\$ 15,000.00
4/9/2020	Anonymous Donor	\$ -	\$ 5,000.00
4/9/2020	Kevin Reed	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	Archangel Pangan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	Alice H Yen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	Sara R Corrigan	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	lori mason	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	Elizabeth Harrington	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	Patrick Tam	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/9/2020	Stephen M Reichling	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Diane B. Wilsey	\$ 111,000.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Addison Johnson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Elizabeth F Smith	\$ 1,500.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Cynthia Rancatore	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Jane Gong	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	CHIA TSUNG CHOU	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Boramy Khloth	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Cesar D Iraheta	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Connor Cimowsky	\$ 162.65	\$ -
4/8/2020	Melissa Liptak	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Adam L Spector	\$ 75.00	\$ -
4/8/2020	Steven Shows	\$ 800.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Brittany Marquez	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Marc Haeberlin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Juliana Appenrodt	\$ 15.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Charles Ho	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Rebecca Brown	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Lori Yamauchi	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Pierre-Eric Jacoupy	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Jarie Bolander	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Rajvi Joshi	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Harsh Patel	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	LaShanda Greene	\$ 60.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Sarah P Delaney	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Amelia May Teng Wong	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Melissa Nelli	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Christine Gardner	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
4/7/2020	Dagang Wei	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	The Stupski Foundation	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/6/2020	Kyle and Tracy Voght Charitable Fund	\$ -	\$ 111,682.00
4/6/2020	Silicon Valley Community Foundation	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	John Pritzker Family Fund	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 700.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Suzanne S Choi/Mimi M.K. Choi	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 600.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Sam Stokes	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Dennis Sell	\$ 315.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	James G Smith	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	James Cole	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	SANGHA C HAN	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Theodore Lamm	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Melissa Woo	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Aditya Kota	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Tak M Poon	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Carolyn Wong	\$ 118.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Karen Reyna	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Michael Frankenfield	\$ 3.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Ronan Murphy	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Li Sun	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	John G Zlatunich	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Wayne Lee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Carole e Deitrich	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Roselee Greenholtz	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	David goldbrenner	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Anand Ramesh	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Frederick Chatfield	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Teresa Goebel	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Ruth C Dimagmaliw	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Lisa He	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Phoebe Signer	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Stefanie Arthur	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Michelle Tallin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Julia Lee	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Michael Xing	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Angeline M Miranda	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	guojian he	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	guojian he	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Carson Rickey	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Jeffery M Karas	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Aimee Pierce	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Carly Webster	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Jonathan S Chan	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Brian Ayuban	\$ 20.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Charles Z Mooney	\$ 300.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/6/2020	Steven H Fowler	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Michele c jackson	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Rene Venegas	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Hannah L Byers-Straus	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/6/2020	Tal Shprecher	\$ 300.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Aneel Bhusri	\$ -	\$ 995,010.00
4/3/2020	Nebiyu D Tegegn	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Juan Bosco Albanell Flores	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Edith N Williams	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Hilnbrand Hilnbrand	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Chung Yan Lo	\$ 6,500.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Larry Rosenstein	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Inder narula	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Mara Ezekiel	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Jaclyn Karpiak	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Manolito L. Claudel	\$ 130.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Cinta Lewis	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Suzanne Mero	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Tonya M Grootendorst	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Tomoya Ogura	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Brennan J Hom	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Lisa J Lightman	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	Matthew Wright	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/3/2020	JANE PETERSEN	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Silicon Valley Community Foundation	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
4/2/2020	norman schlossberg	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Scott Mauvais	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Tiffany Lee	\$ 30.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Alice T Rogers	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	XIAODONG CHEN	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	marco bianchi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Colleen Boddy	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Chloe Agape	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Stephan J Leonoudakis	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Anthony Federico	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Tiffany Wong	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Kara Gillis	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Karlo Berket	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Jordan Jewell	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Jessie Cheng Charitable Foundation	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Jacob H Saper	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	DU YUN	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Lillian Bui	\$ 50.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Thomas Carabajal	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Evonne Chen	\$ 150.00	\$ -
4/2/2020	Stanley D Currier	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Berkshire Partners	\$ 58,000.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Amy Hall	\$ 200.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
4/1/2020	Elliot Kendall	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Bruce H Agid	\$ 500.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Camelin Blackstone	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Tianxuan Chen	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Jeannie Anderson	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Lillian Tsay	\$ 250.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	AD AD	\$ 10.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Josh Taylor	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Chih Yi Hsieh	\$ 200.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Irene Zhou	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Angela Huang	\$ 25.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	finance department	\$ 75,000.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Evan Fried	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Laurel Bailey	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Alison S Lycette	\$ 100.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Cecilie Wrye	\$ 120.00	\$ -
4/1/2020	Gregory Klasuner	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Pablo Vargas	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/31/2020	Ann and Gordon Getty	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Laurie Bouck	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	sarah cirone	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	rahul patel	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Elizabeth I Powers	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Zoe Camille McBride	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	BETH A BURKHART	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Shane DeWael	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Robert Li	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Cinta Lewis	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Michelle Ann Taylor	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Elizabeth N Rosseter	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	anna mei-hsiu, chien	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Jason W Roberts	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Qin M Liang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Lay Tshu Tan	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Neal P Mhaskar	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Sophie Hwang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Kristiina Kansen	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Diane Turner	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Alexander White	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	ROGER O HERNANDEZ	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/31/2020	Ava C Yap	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	The Conway Family Charitable Fund	\$ -	\$ 50,000.00
3/30/2020	Daniel Ammann	\$ -	\$ 8,000.00
3/30/2020	Brian Calvert	\$ -	\$ 1,350.00
3/30/2020	Luke Pulaski	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
3/30/2020	Jennifer Blight	\$ -	\$ 350.00
3/30/2020	Carden Bagwell	\$ -	\$ 300.00
3/30/2020	Emmanuel Turlay	\$ -	\$ 300.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Jennifer Huang	\$ -	\$ 300.00
3/30/2020	Manjukumar Harthikote Matha	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/30/2020	Marko Kudjerski	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/30/2020	Raya Islan	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/30/2020	Rebekah Brandt	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/30/2020	Erica Banh	\$ -	\$ 150.00
3/30/2020	Kaitlyn Williams	\$ -	\$ 150.00
3/30/2020	Santiago Vargas Soto	\$ -	\$ 150.00
3/30/2020	Chris Van Dusen	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Daniel Edwards	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Daniel Kuljis	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Eben Freeman	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Edmond Jordan	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Franck Lefebvre	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Jessica Yao	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Jonathon Ryan Gillespie	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Kristy Anne Boyd	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	KristyAnne Thompson	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Matthew Anderson	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Nandini Arora	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Nicholas Decker	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Nicholas Robinson	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Thomas Melanson	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Yunfei Wang	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/30/2020	Emily Lakritz	\$ -	\$ 75.00
3/30/2020	Daniel Tien	\$ -	\$ 51.00
3/30/2020	Ansley Peduru	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/30/2020	Ishan Singh	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/30/2020	Max Meyers	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/30/2020	Nolan Finn	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/30/2020	Sierra Gegenheimer	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/30/2020	Abigail Owens	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/30/2020	Belinda Yamate	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/30/2020	Bridget Collins	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/30/2020	Charles Harrington	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/30/2020	Elton Loberternos	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/30/2020	Olivia Tsai	\$ -	\$ 20.00
3/30/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Morgan Stanley Gift Fund	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Morgan Stanley Gift Fund	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Janet T. Oyama	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	The House of Gatto Revocable Trust - JJ Bergovoy Trustee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Shirley Mei	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Robert C Long III	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	David J Piazza	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Vania Fong	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Richard Avendano	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Siyao Zhu	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Samuel T Caven	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Ellen Wang	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Richard J Lawne	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Sarah S Kaplan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Rachel Pia D'Agostino	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Michael Chen	\$ 347.28	\$ -
3/30/2020	Rosny Daniel	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Kathleen DAmore	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Cinta Lewis	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Drake Piper	\$ 6.65	\$ -
3/30/2020	Drake Piper	\$ 5.86	\$ -
3/30/2020	Mohammad Gorjestani	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	kalyani girvanesh	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Matthias Plappert	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Jennifer D Ng	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Michael Mills	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Vardhman Jain	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Michael A Berkowitz	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	laura humbrecht	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Aishwarya M Borkar	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Kunal Sharma	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Zhize Wang	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	William Koury	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Jessica Finkel	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	KEEGAN HAFNER	\$ 135.15	\$ -
3/30/2020	Noelle letoile	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Susan Baker Lehne	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Katie Thomas	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Gaurav B Murade	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Victor Ronin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Anthony D Truong	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Christopher S Rossi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Rik Williams	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Stacey Harte	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Cui Yu Huang	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Daniel L Jiang	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Jenna Theisen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Michelle L Fishberg	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Hannah Katherine Long	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Joseph M. Imbriani	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Ian Luo	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Monica Q Culanay	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Leon Parker	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	loretta jones	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/30/2020	Rani Manoharan	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Jay Anderson	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Ian J Whelan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Shubham Naik	\$ 284.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Jimmy Hsu	\$ 142.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Amy T Herbertson	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Michael Murray	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Amy D LU	\$ 350.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Ayushi Samaddar	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Consuelo Spalding	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Jonathan S Abramson	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Shanna Wagner	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Damon Uyeda	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Cindy Muzio	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Nancy McCormick	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Timothee Geoghegan	\$ 3,580.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Sheli Chabon	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Susan Karp	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Bo Meng	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Blake Davidoff	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Hung Dinh	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Rohan Natraj	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Emile Baizel	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Janet Y Spears	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Matthew S Dietz	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/30/2020	Phillip Kobernick	\$ 36.00	\$ -
3/29/2020	Brooks Reed	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
3/29/2020	Neal Uppal	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/29/2020	Michael Rusignola	\$ -	\$ 250.00
3/29/2020	Anjuli Felix	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/29/2020	Christopher Phan	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/29/2020	Sneha Sinha	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/29/2020	Namrata Rao	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/29/2020	Unnikrishnan Nair	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/29/2020	Victor Oliveira	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/29/2020	Nariman Moezzi Madani	\$ -	\$ 30.00
3/29/2020	Nicholas Christian	\$ -	\$ 15.00
3/28/2020	Benjamin Goldstein	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/28/2020	Charles Matlack	\$ -	\$ 300.00
3/28/2020	Matthew Fornero	\$ -	\$ 250.00
3/28/2020	Sean Harris	\$ -	\$ 250.00
3/28/2020	Sean Harris	\$ -	\$ 250.00
3/28/2020	Sheila Egan	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/27/2020	Violet World Foundation	\$ -	\$ 5,000.00
3/27/2020	Eugene Wong	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/27/2020	Elizabeth Sellier	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/27/2020	Jessica Yao	\$ -	\$ 100.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/27/2020	Andrea Santwier	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/27/2020	Devin Cass	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/27/2020	Shitao Zheng	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/27/2020	Matthew L Schumpert	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Dimple Kapadia	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Alisa Diane Calvillo	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Sui lin lee	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	GRC Roofing, Inc.	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Kristina K Lee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	James Laureys	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Rick HN Curvers	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Alexis Leifheit	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Holly Haraguchi	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Mallory P Brown	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Suzanna Khatchatrian	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Leon Y Zhang	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	William Summer	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Oliver Burgelman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Melanie Pratt	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Kirill Zhukov	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	James King	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Peter Kinmond	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Lawrence S Lansing	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Jeremy Apthorp	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Dan Evans	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Anna Merritt	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Zachary Olson	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Scott M Sandler	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	scott huhn	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Jeses Bounds	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Cyndi Wheeler	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Tyler Herb	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Jennifer Murse	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Veronica Abreu	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Ashley Harvey	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Daniel Malmkvist	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	GUOHUA ZHENG	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	YANNA TONG	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	GUOHUA ZHENG	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	David Hecht	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Mitchell A. Harris	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/27/2020	Fatema Waliji	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Hellman Foundation	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000.00
3/26/2020	Crankstart Foundation	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00
3/26/2020	Shashwat Kandadai	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00
3/26/2020	Walter Gray	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
3/26/2020	Brendan O'Hare	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/26/2020	Griffin Childers	\$ -	\$ 100.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/26/2020	Hon Kwok	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/26/2020	Olivia Isaac	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/26/2020	Vinitha Suresh	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/26/2020	Justin DeCell	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/26/2020	Karen Sun	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/26/2020	Tom Raith	\$ -	\$ 20.00
3/26/2020	KaiCheng Chang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Charla Kaul	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Diana Hsu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Diane L Huang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Sarah Israel	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Yvonne Yau	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Linda Pham	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Lauren Slack	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Hannah B Gordon	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Alison Stosich	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Jamila Keba	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Charles Olson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Shannon Wells	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Hilary Hsu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Rengasudharsan Srinivasan	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Jorge A Lopez	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Franklin Yam Ching	\$ 15.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Bryan Lee	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Natalia Mendez Cortes	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Yanru Cheng	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Davies Dan	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Franklyn O Bakala	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Karen R Goldenberg	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Visa Visa	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Jason Maynard	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Mary Ellen McGillan	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Kari Nordvik	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Louis R Acresti	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/26/2020	Dana Riess	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Robert Grant	\$ -	\$ 1,200.00
3/25/2020	Cody Neil	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
3/25/2020	Thomas Boyd	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
3/25/2020	Alexandri Zavodny	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/25/2020	Erin Antcliffe	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/25/2020	Sahil Narang	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/25/2020	Stephanie Box	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/25/2020	Michael Plotz	\$ -	\$ 360.00
3/25/2020	Karine Mule	\$ -	\$ 250.00
3/25/2020	Anup Parameswaren	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/25/2020	Fen Chen	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/25/2020	Kelsey Abdollahian	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/25/2020	Luke Pulaski	\$ -	\$ 200.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Wyatt Alt	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/25/2020	Adriana Rosas	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Craig Callihan	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Eileen Bai	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Erik Danko	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Mahesh Seetharaman	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Matthieu Fond	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Michael Pierce	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Moshe Ororn	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Rafael Quiroz	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Raluca Musaloiu-Elefteri	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Zhichang Yan	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/25/2020	Andrew Acosta	\$ -	\$ 75.00
3/25/2020	Amber Illig	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/25/2020	Feng Zhong	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/25/2020	Marie Ledger	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/25/2020	Meet Bhagde	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/25/2020	Shakti Shah	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/25/2020	Taylor Thomas	\$ -	\$ 10.00
3/25/2020	Fan Tielking	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Anna Schomer	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Hailey C Teton	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Elizabeth A. Carey	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Lili C Byers	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Kaitlyn Fowler	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Zack Morris	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Brad Girardeau	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	William L Rohrer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Patrick J Maley	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Mei Luh C Lee	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	V Srivathsan	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	james w pace	\$ 120.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Andrew Chan	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Shalini Shashi Kumar Shankar	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	David Kennedy	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Albert Lee	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Carolyn Tom	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Richard L Ledon	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Brian O'Hearn	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Paula Gerhardt	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Sara Dermody	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Wai Chung Wong	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Henry Brodtkin	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Saining Li	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	vamshi krishna repala	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Olivia Malterre	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Rachit P Nandwani	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Rita Hao	\$ 20.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/25/2020	Ezra M Rufino	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Sriram Krishnan	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Sarah J Aerni	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Andrew Branscomb	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Ashlee Kirsten Tsukushi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Bradley Zundel	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Junan Pang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Pin-ya Tseng	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Kirsti Aho	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Colin Denman	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Josephine Simon	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Holly J Allen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Richard W Bailey III	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Nola Ong	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Person Person	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Steven Kasapi	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	SIMON TAN	\$ 120.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Andrew Menendez	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Michael McKeon	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Sanjay Mani	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/25/2020	Saurabh Sahni	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Divya Thakur	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
3/24/2020	Amy Kepler	\$ -	\$ 250.00
3/24/2020	Tristan Zier	\$ -	\$ 250.00
3/24/2020	Anant Rathi	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/24/2020	Wenbing Bai	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/24/2020	Bruce Botsford	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/24/2020	Matthew Goudeau	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/24/2020	Rachelle Celebrezze	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/24/2020	Savannah Leggett	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/24/2020	Tyler Tate	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/24/2020	Amanda Jacob	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/24/2020	Shahram Rezaei	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/24/2020	Sue-Ling Huynh	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/24/2020	Tyalar Cunnington	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/24/2020	Peter Martin	\$ -	\$ 25.00
3/24/2020	Carol S Michely	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Richard G Gonzalez	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Kristine Boyden	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Brian P Marentay	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Deirdre Hussey	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Hala K Hijazi	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Sherry J Wickwire	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Mary Rose Costello	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Brian J Tarricone	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	ALEXANDER VENEGAS	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Susanna Goldenstein	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Andreas Pedersen	\$ 200.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/24/2020	Colleen Regan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Lauren Tulp	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Yu Chen Hou	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Martin MacKerel	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Matt Grigoryan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Marion Holaday	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Corey Block	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Laura Spaventa Lewis	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Anna Brown	\$ 125.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Andrea Armanino	\$ 800.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Asdrubal A Ibarra	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Pranay Suresh	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Elizabeth Ramirez	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	veena bontu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Crystal Dolis	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Shirley Li	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Khariza Estacio	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Jeffrey C Kuo	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Ben Villagra	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Anand Ramesh	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Steven H Kaplan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Karlyn Tjaden	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Benoit berthoux	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Irene Lee	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/24/2020	Alice Liu	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Preston-Werner Foundation	\$ -	\$ 250,000.00
3/23/2020	Roman Sergeev	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
3/23/2020	Robert Ussey	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/23/2020	Wilbur Arajuo	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/23/2020	Yi-Yu Chen	\$ -	\$ 500.00
3/23/2020	Ian Swarbrick	\$ -	\$ 300.00
3/23/2020	Stephen Staffieri	\$ -	\$ 200.00
3/23/2020	Spencer Hoffman	\$ -	\$ 150.00
3/23/2020	Albert Q. Pham	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Albert Yang	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Arkadeb Ghosal	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	David Rubin	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Eric Lujan	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Jonathan Tang	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Kevin Keogh	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Kevin Metti	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Louis Roseguo	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Ramachandran Jagadeeswaran	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Syed Hussain	\$ -	\$ 100.00
3/23/2020	Stefanie Von Guten	\$ -	\$ 75.00
3/23/2020	Anvesh Kunati	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/23/2020	Ashley Sams	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/23/2020	Cassandra Clark	\$ -	\$ 50.00

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Daniel Tien	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/23/2020	Kenneth Fendick	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/23/2020	Rishab Sareen	\$ -	\$ 50.00
3/23/2020	State Street Bank and Trust Co	\$ 25,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Schwab Charitable Fund	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jennifer L Scheidt/James D Gold	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Randi Slaughter-Broussal	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Raymond P Hoehn, JR	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Shannon N Bennett/Durrell D Kapan	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Benjamin G. Shaw/ Suzanne L. Thomas	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Schwab Charitable	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Michael Gold/Susan West	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Barbara Benjamin	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Nicholas C Fox	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	David A Herman	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Desiye Neil Collier	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Philip J Rose	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Julie Trescott	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	BNY Mellon Trust of Delaware	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Fidelity Charitable	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	David Wohlreich	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Tiffany Hsu	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Erica J Steimetz	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	James C Moschou	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Philipp Kuecuekyan	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Eugenia Lee	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sheila D. Gunter	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Steven Sheh	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Ying Hw	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Long Hen Tang	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sara Winslow	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sarah E Scussel	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Robert combier	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Alvin Baum	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Patrick Lee	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Erin Laye	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sabrine Rekik	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Leslie goldstein	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Anthony Daniell	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sarah Locke-Henderson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Brandon Schwartz	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	KAMAL BENKIRAN	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Mario Pacini	\$ 500.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Christopher Aycock	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Audrey K Tang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Liam Doyle	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Melinda Ginsburg	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Gregory S. Borman	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Erin G. Lane	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Shalin Modi	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Kristin D Rhodes	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Kelsey Villalobos	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Emma L Dill	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Stephan Zuercher	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	ADAM J DESOUZA	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Vishal Singal	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Maria B Pasos	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Haoyang Zhu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sanjana Ramana	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	ANDREW G SCOTT	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Noah Levin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Linda Lin	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sergei Troxel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Trevor Hartsell	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Shannon E Oshea	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Erika B Ekiel	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	WALTER A HAAS	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Rachel Baker	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Elzbieta Gibbons	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sean Sorrell	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Ryan Lanteigne	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	douglas coker	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Eric C Schwartz	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Ilona smuk	\$ 1.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Andrew J Seigner	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Julia Lee	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Andrew larsen	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Aish Raj Dahal	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Bo Meng	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Fenny Hanfen Lin	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Adam Greenberg	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	London Lee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Vishal Seshagiri	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Lauren Sassoubre	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Steven J Cary	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jinal Surti	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	JI YOUNG LEE	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jana messerschmidt	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jordon Wing	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Ellen Kort Price	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	David Suendermann-Oeft	\$ 30.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/23/2020	Degree, Inc. dba Lattice	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Heidi R Hamilton	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Courtney Camps	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Amy McAuliffe	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Kelly K Pagano	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Swathi Bonda	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Denise E Allen	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Erik E Rotman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jacqueline O'dwyer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jacquelyn M Horton	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sania Baqai	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Kevin Burke	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Michael Panoff	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Courtney Anne Bell	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Matthew G Crocker	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Angela avera	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Kameela Din	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Selina B Wang	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Evelyn Killaby	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Sarah S Meyer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Glenn Thomas	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Drew T Schuster	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jane A Sherman	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Andrew Timmons	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jessica Fain	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Joshua A Stubbs	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Naman Agrawal	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Matt lewis	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Lori Dietrich	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Caia Brookes	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Crystal Le	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Christopher M Wade	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Mitchell Harper	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Danny S Gonzalez	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Joan Gamell Farre	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	sascha b cohen	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Peter L Scott	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Jennifer Liu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/23/2020	Elizabeth A Drew	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Benjamin Shulman	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Andrew M Scarani	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Ralph Richart	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Sean M Kane	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Shawn Grunberger	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Sylvia Irene sroba	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Thomas M Gloger	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Karen Schneemann	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Chloe Aftel	\$ 50.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/20/2020	Neha Batra	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Michael Young	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Christopher Shewchuck	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Sharon Coone	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Emily R McNab	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	SAMUEL H GARFIELD	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Kyle Petrovich	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Elizabeth Reid	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Alan Cordova	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Jean Dere	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Claire E Markham	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Liezel C Cruz	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Riddhi Shah	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Neil House III	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Diana tsao	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Amanda Eller	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Randall Maycock	\$ 180.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Ruud Visser	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Kamryn Claridge	\$ 110.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	sean baity	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Alyssa M Lim	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Valerie Stevens	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Gaurav Gollerkeri	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Epic Church San Francisco	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Jeannine Fleck	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Matt Zwicky	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Amy Jiang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Eric Chun	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Patricia Perozo	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Nancy Pan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Vaishali K Mullapudi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Catherine Jue	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Jue Zou	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Colin Beighley	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Rafaela de Oliveira	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/20/2020	Bingxin Zhang	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Sangmin Lee	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Vanessa Ginman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Monique Gannon	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Jordan Rose	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Alexandra Wong	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Michael Holmes	\$ 125.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Stewart Mandel	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Peter L Vliet	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Maria S Chang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Cameron J Lencki	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	JOHN STEDMAN	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Alexander Kumamoto	\$ 50.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/19/2020	Guannan Shi	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Colleen Chung	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Grace Sakoda	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Cory Bennett	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Kristan Frankel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Mark F Taylor	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Kirsten Byron	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Sonia Lawrence	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Cheryl Contee	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Michael Rolig	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Louis M Goudeau	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Joanna Ga Wah Gee	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Samantha Harrington	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Ruth Sappelt	\$ 99.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Cornelia Vernon	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	April Gaudette	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Snuller K Price	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Carl Stein	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Menaka Fernando	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Amy Chen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Emily mclinden	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Christiana Lackner	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Zach Thigpen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Annemaria Breaux	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Alice Lu Zheng	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Eric Chong	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Liam Pedersen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Douglas Kahn	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Natasha Dimond	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	SHEILA VERGARA	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Benjamin Neumann	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Justin Durack	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Mike Wey	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Susan J Adams	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Da Y Kim	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Nana Kofi K Ohene-Adu	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Melanie Day	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	rodrigo manubens	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	CHristina PLuta	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	LEILA M DWIGHT	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Hayley N Gross	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/19/2020	Katherine Lohec	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	NEEL IYER	\$ 350.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	elizabeth hamel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Alexander S Majercik	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Jaclyn H Prange	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Nicole Appleton	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Wonjun Bae	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/18/2020	Hannah Schlacter	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Sharon F Piansay	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Marissa Phillips	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Lindsey Hogg	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Nicole Glabinski	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Michael Zhang	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Sarah Chan	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Yash Kshirsagar	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Kathryn Garner	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Liz Catalano	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Elliot Kendall	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Juanjuan Han	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	David Nolan	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Ryan Ryan	\$ 110.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Ingfei Chen	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Jennifer a Plath	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	KIRK E PAULSEN	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Lin Lisa	\$ 400.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Karen Schulkin	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Adi Berglez	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Rica Santos	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Gary A Zellerbach	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Paul Chu	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Atrejo Patridge	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Lara K Owen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Aileen Appe	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	John E Robinson	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Yejin Kwon	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Jazmine Applin	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Sarah Maisel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	jonathan meade	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Rachel hill	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Glennis Coursey	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Philippe Fossier	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Philip Chu	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Joseph L Ciarallo	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Craig Mautner	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	CHARLOTTE FS WILL	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Brian and Laura Elbogen	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Jennifer Herriot-Hatfield	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Catherine E House	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Nathaniel Stanley	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Leonore Ralston	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Luanne Sequeira	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Bill Smullin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Jonathan Eldridge	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Molly Alarcon	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Emily Martinez	\$ 125.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/18/2020	Helen Ung	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Scott Numamoto	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	ana gardea	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Vivien Nguyen	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Paul Mandel	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Jared Erundu	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Swaroop jagadish	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Eric Constantin	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Patrick Brown	\$ 600.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Jason Goodman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Zachary M Subin	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Ozge Islegen	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Patrick L Canfield	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Helen resor	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Shantha Condamoor	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Rachel Hsu	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/18/2020	Nikrad Mahdi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Judith F Leff	\$ 36.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Steven Chang	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Bezhou Feng	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Theodore Kwong	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Mary Wyatt	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Denise E Lee	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Aaron Lapierre	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Brynne Henn	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Faya Peng	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Sarah Chung	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	KIMBERLY JOHNSON	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Jennifer Suen	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Amy Ravenscroft	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	ROSALIND K JOHNSON	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	John W. Glynn	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Jeannine Fleck	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Yoo Hsiu Yeh	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Paul Bien	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Gulabi Rajasekar	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kathryn M Jereza	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Namrita Singh Mathew	\$ 15.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Sarah Murphy	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	katherine obrien	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Samara Flug	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Clement Canonne	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Mehmet C Anbarlilar	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Suhas Deshpande	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Justyna Janczyszyn	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Jordan Rozsa	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Colleen McGinnis	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Danan barnett	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/17/2020	Minyoung Chun	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Eric Koslow	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Alisha Mowder	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Nadine Carole	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Katherine Meng	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Elizabeth Mumm Meier	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Andrew Gibiansky	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Amar Chokshi	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Lauran B Johnson	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Michel Louis Alexander	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Casey Jung	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Bethany S Campos	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Victor Smith	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Carol R Langbort	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Long Ouyang	\$ 101.69	\$ -
3/17/2020	Pedro Ortez	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Bianca Buckridee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Christoph Christoph	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Joanna Goldin	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Zofia M Burr	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Isaac Jacobs-Gomes	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Elizabeth A Joyce	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Andrew L Perito	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	MICHAEL R PETRICK	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Terrence B Jenkins	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Aashna Mago	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Britt H Evangelist	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Bronwen Marshall-Bass	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	May Stearman	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Sean D Childers	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Abhay Kumar	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Samantha Jane Bennett	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Paul J Lieponis	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Marivel NICOLAS	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kendra Wong	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Leah Jackson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	NATALIE M ENRIGHT	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Lucy Dotson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Jennifer Anderson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Puthita Wacharasin	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Faith H Yi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Craig Weibel	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	DENNIS A ANTENORE	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Elizabeth Burl	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Stephanie H Rewis	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Andrew Stanek	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	David Tsai	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Chester Hitz	\$ 50.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/17/2020	Phuong L Vu	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kelly Murphy	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Danielle Bogaards	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Scott Hansma	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Aamna Dhillon	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kendra Byrne	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Dale A Martin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Leslie Simon	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Lyndsay murrow	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Guillaume Forget	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Brooke L Peterson	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Roberto Lopez	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kathryn MacDonald	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Preethi Krishnan	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Rebecca Archer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	KYLE ROSENTHAL	\$ 101.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Elizabeth Wang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Ryan Biggs	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kristie Kooken	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Lisa ratner	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Stacey Baradit	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Evan McCulloch	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	William Lee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kathryn Pulaski	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Jessica Nolan	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kristin leung	\$ 270.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Anna Andresian	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Elain Sprague Stuebe	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	William E Reeves	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Amanda Morgan	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Clio A Korn	\$ 35.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Wendy Bear	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Brenna Marketello	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Ryan Davids	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Aaron Pigeon	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Sabeena Pradhan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Chelsea M Childs	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Paul Supawanich	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Mara Raider	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Asif M Adnan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Kaleb Tseo	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Cristiano ceccarelli	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Sean M Engel	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Holly Friel	\$ 175.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	George Koster	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	akash mohanty	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Meredith Johnson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/17/2020	Nirav Patel	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/17/2020	Kevin Prodehl	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alberto Gobbi & Man-Ling Lee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael Mellody	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeffrey M Moore	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rachael Morton	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alyssa Roy	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Emily Broas	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael E Fanning	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Frederick B Zamore	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Maureen Haverty	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sayuri dimitroff	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	rayana stanek	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	George C Rodgers	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Paul Campbell	\$ 109.02	\$ -
3/16/2020	Audrey K ONeill	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Naomi Stoll	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	YINGZHUO ZHAO	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Naomi Stoll	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gregory J Kieber	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alexandra Brown	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tjarko Leifer	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Aaron Beitch	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jacqueline Paige Stoermer	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Colin Dickau	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Benjamin W Redman	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Daniel DePaolo	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gary M Decad	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sneha Sankavaram	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alexander Barth	\$ 600.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Katlin Smith	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mary Thengvall	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Melody Cheung	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christopher D. Pappas	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Angelina Huang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Oliver M Raskin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer Enrique	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Benjamin Benjamin	\$ 60.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Natnael Getahun	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael P Rabbitt	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rachel Proctor	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kurtis Aguilar	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Joan Lubamersky	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kerrilyn Renshaw	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Julia Baily	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	MICHAEL L GUMMELT	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Charles E Lowey-Ball	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kate L Hughes	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jessica I Dell	\$ 38.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Keenan rice	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ivalina Demarco	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jesse Charles Battalino	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Robert M Fruchtmann	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sanae Rosen	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sandeep Bhanot	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Emanuel Evans	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Danielle Simpson	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Andrew Zloto	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Patrick RoDee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Brian A Carr	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Adam Cue	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Deirdre Anderson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ryan Davids	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ryan Davids	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	kbhergaq kbhergaq	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Maral Mara	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	YUKIKO NISHIGUCHI	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Pin-ya Tseng	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Philip Hutchison	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nathan Reynolds	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Suejin Kim	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Evan Gelfand	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shannon Beck	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Vikram Raman	\$ 101.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Matthew Wagner	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sophia Dermoutz	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	victor j torres	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Aleksandr Mistratov	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Chase Starr	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Oi Man Ng	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	James L Barnes III	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	JESSICA DA SILVA	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ahmet Emre Unal	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tyler Wozny	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alison Murphy	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Grace Lattyak	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Grace Gellman	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rebecca Brown	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kristin Fleming	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Robert Hayes	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lauren Patti	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alon gilat	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kevin Lutz	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Patrice G. Kleinberg	\$ 74.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hester Loo	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Charles Lim	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Wally Cheng	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Paul Fagin	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Carmen Souza Cole	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sheela Chandrasekhara	\$ 51.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Brian Zaik	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sabeek Pradhan	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rosie D Belpasso	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alla Barkan	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kristina Gonzalez	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jenny Wang	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Celine Cuevas	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ryan T Wong	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ti-Fen Pan	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Caroline Fichtenberg	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	MAXIME PRADES	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Peter Shiau	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeremy Tsuchitani-Watson	\$ 15.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kristy E Leung	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Emily Kuhbach	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ethan H Stone	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alex Cohen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Aimee Lucido	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rachel P Katz	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	DENNIS P BIROSCAK	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Muneeb A Ahmad	\$ 110.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Matthew J LoSardo	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Patrick Holmes	\$ 111.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	lynn chao	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Andrew D Gaffney	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	lynn-kai chao	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alexandra emrich	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Linda G Jordan	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Julia Doan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	David Ross	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alexis Luscutoff	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Douglas Hanlin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tara Lockhart	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Megan Chin	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lewis T Stringer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Anne Dolores Diaz	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	katrina lake	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hayley Wyeth	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Molly Fosco	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Leticia O Chavez	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Cecily A Dumas	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	M. Lee Dixon	\$ 125.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Juliana DeVries	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Eric M Walder	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Evan Tana	\$ 200.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Balakrishna Chennupati	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	LAURA YU	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Melanie Subbiah	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael DeNinno	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Brian Singerman	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ann Cheung	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Joshua W Dunsby	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Daria Maggio	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alexis Humiston	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nancy A Tabor	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kyle Piddington	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Geoffrey Weber	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Visa Credit Cd	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rebecca Wood	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	John R Murgia Jr	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shree Sharma	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nell Herbert	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kyna Kellogg	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sean P Cotter	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sadie C Harmon	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer Lynch	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Moira Burke	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer e raymond	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Travis LaCour	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jessica Fox	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kate S Carson	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Andrea Moore	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	patrick j obrien	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Spencer Simonsen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Allison N Jorge	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christopher Leader	\$ 105.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael Sidgmore	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Bryce Goodman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michelle Tigchelaar	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alexander Best	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Connie Kwong	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Thaddeus Ballantine	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lisa M Brown	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Melissa nicholson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Arvind Venkataramani	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Raina K Sheth	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Carol rossi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Leah Swiler	\$ 36.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lisa Crossett	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Johann v Lynch	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lucy Farey-Jones	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Stephanie Kim	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Louise fong	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Katherine Gallo-Podesta	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mozhdeh Rastegar-panah	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lijesh Manjacheri	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gilda Kemper	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Janis Greenspan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Roslyn Leiser	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Evan Evan	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Xin Xiao	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kirsten P Marcus	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Matthew Wagner	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Matthew Chanoff	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Adriana Villagran	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Janet Fung	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Antonio Martinez	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	savannah wagner belk	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	CARA LEONARDO	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Stanford K Goldman	\$ 1,500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hongxia Li Tsai	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Daniel E Medani	\$ 110.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Truc Nguyen	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christina Hellmich	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Catherine Hilary White	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Margaret R Wrensch	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sarah Sheckman	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mary Lee	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Marcella Campbell	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Devon Turner	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer A Stella	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Anand Chhatpar	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mohammad Gowayyed	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christopher Tuttle	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Omid Mortazavi	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mariana Magalhaes Chapei	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer Rosen	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Juli Ann Carter	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shir Yehoshua	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Felicia Evans	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lingamurthy ravi	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Janice A. McIntosh	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ingrid Ojeda	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Thomas Cruz	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Dorit Grunberger	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lindsay bruce	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	JENNIFER LIU	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gwynne Stoddart	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Julia T Peppiatt	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	William Larsen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Utsav Ahuja	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	LINDY MCKNIGHT-ERIN CUNNINGHAM	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Irena Martinez	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Eva Gutierrez	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Steve Susoyev	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Katelyn Kimmons	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sahil Shah	\$ 6,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Karsten Weide	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Genevieve M Conaty	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jinoos Jinoos	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Frances Yap	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Xiaotong Chi	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Danielle Bautista	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kimberly Quan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Eric H Panzer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Brian J Har	\$ 110.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Angela E Gonzalez	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer & Jesse Joint Account	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Dalel Nichole Jordan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hao Zou	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	David Hurst	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sergey Dubenko	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Suzanne Paige Sprincin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Samuel J Gould	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Danne Duncan	\$ 35.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lynne Mathison	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	DANIEL BYRD	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nicholas J Navarro	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tianyi Gou	\$ 120.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Pierre Urbain	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rebecca Yukelson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tracey Y Lin	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	SHARLENE BAKER	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Melissa Capria	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kathryn M Jereza	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kristina Le	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael Gangel	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Evan Friel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christina Armatas	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Brett Bukowski	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tracy P. Leone	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeffrey J McClure	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Beth S Bodner	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Zachary Subin	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Angelos M Kottas	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Conor Granahan	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Aura Terrell	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Arlene k singer	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Caryl Shaw	\$ 200.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Debra C Janowski	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jacqueline Chu	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Chenhung Wu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	SaRAH MOSS-HORWITZ	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	KRISTEN NOSKY	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	julie I campioni	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Vadim Geshel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Bailey e kass	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lourdes Apilado Devigal	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shannon P Terschluse	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sarah Schoellkopf	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mehul Kar	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Pingshun Huang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kyle pimley	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alan Magary	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kristin Lemaster	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Aylene Bao	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	John Snyder	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Stephen Forte	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael Rinaldi	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Bryan Quintero	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Joyce Sabel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Travis Dittenber	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Edward K Whitmore	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gail Venable	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Matthew Dello Russo	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Melissa Woo	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeffrey E Trull	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	John F. Moroney	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Paul Goodman	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alexandra Kutik	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Stephanie Dang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Melissa MacDonald	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Eric Proegler	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Quang Duong	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Brittanie Williams	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Margaret Montgomery	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	WF Credit Card	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeff Wallace	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Xian Ke	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Catherine Iazard	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Eileen Norman	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Luis M Aroche	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lawrence and Jennifer Kesteloot	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shauna ODonnell	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Robert J Merck	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tony Gonzales	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christian O Madden	\$ 30.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Mike Huynh	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nancy P Hornor	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	4342570037660380 4342570037660380	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Polly A. Stryker	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sarah Grossman Swenson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Caroline Orsi	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer Wu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rachel Bonfanti	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Vera Wasacz	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	JEFFREY A GRAY	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael E Moss	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Dan Talbott	\$ 120.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Grace Benson	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Samuel Feldman-Crough	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jon Doellstedt	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Carolyn Rundell	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christopher Ho	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ryan Hoyt	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael Coren	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sheila Marie Que	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	justin velo	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rebecca Newton	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Idil Bereket	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Annie C Pang	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mary Prah	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Casey S Barrett	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Andrew Sutherland	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Meena Lin	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Malia Young-Brohn	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nicholas J Roberts	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lauren Reda	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	KATHLEEN ODOWD	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	lindsay hershenhorn	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Russell West	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christina Hui Lin Feng	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jolanta Zandecki	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Charuwan Pholsith	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Eloise M Bates	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Radhika Ramanan	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Oliver Wilkie	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rashi King Abramson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ao Xu	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ramsay w gamble	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hannah S Lee	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Stephanie Rose	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	NICOLE LYCETT	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Bank of America	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Thomas I Meyer	\$ 250.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Stephanie Leduc	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	BENKAY IL KAJIHARA	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Chase Reserve	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Roberta Sarnoff	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jean Yang	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Noelle Mabanta	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kegan garrison	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Julie Van Vliet	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeffrey Erickson	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael Osofsky	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Adrienne Cianfrocca	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Constance Channon	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nicholas Kunst	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Fiona E Smythe	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kathryn arnold	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alana N Fink	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Marlene Grenon	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Yangchen Dolkar	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nadia R Baskett	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Daniel B Fuchs	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tiffani D Patrick	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lindsay N Bishop	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jessica gurskis	\$ 101.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Vivian T Sanchez	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Benjamin Peters	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ying Chen Chao	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nathan Sheard	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nicholas E Beyrer	\$ 101.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Frank Dario Jones	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Munezeh khan wald	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nicole C. Raeburn	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Mary L Licwinko	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Daniel Leffel	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Parissa Sayar	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jasmine lawrence	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael A Shiplett	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Andrew Schlaikjer	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	VANESSA J BELL	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Patricia E Franks	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Catherine Davis	\$ 108.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sarah Leyde	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Anne Vaittinen	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alyson Jacks	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jiasong Huang	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	David Abramsky	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Joanna Siegall	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Erica S Desouza	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ann Huber	\$ 10.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Gabriel P Dover	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shelley R Weisbrich	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	James Cross	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeffrey Sarnat	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Frank Buonagurio	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alice Dutrut	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	George Dobbins	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Francis Ellis	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Filip Spiridonov	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Julie S Jacobs	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Cole Bennett	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	R Mark Thornton	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Yanwen Jiang	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gillian Yu	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gavin Ahern	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	shotsy c faust	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Dave Glidden	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Doyle White	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Blair I sirolli	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sophia Zikanova	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Clara Brenot	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Pettee Edna	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Angela Glielmi	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sedat Kapanoglu	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Caroline Nassif	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tala Banatao	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Susan Schwegman	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sankaet Pathak	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Julia E Cheng	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Alice B Aronow	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sara Scanlan	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michelle Gellner	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Elena Fromer	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Regina Coleman	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Unlimited Biking Rentals LLC	\$ 125.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Suzanne D Poma	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Vivien D'Andrea	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sara N Cosenza	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Frank Bailinson	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Heidi Patel	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	ANDREW KAPLAN	\$ 105.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Blair J Davis	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Melina A Wyatt	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Erin M Leviant	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Elizabeth Hartmann	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ben Wu	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	PEDRO ERNESTO F LIMA	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nicole arata	\$ 100.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Laura Hayes	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Katherine Isbister	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Annabelle Ho	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeremy D Wood	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hannah Addario Berry	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tressa E Crozier	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sarah thompson	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jennifer Collins	\$ 26.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Deborah Cooper	\$ 450.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kelsey Stroshane	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	fe Valentin	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Danil Panache	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Michael Lee	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nathan Geer	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	KEVIN HE	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Theresa Brown	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gaurav G Mathur	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	James Reffell	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hunter Blankenbaker	\$ 40.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shahab Asghar	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rita Hao	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jessica Hilberman	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Justin Wyckoff	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Eric Socolofsky	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Laura Millham	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	lawrence hosken	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Amandeep Jawa	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shabnam Dadkhah	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nauzli Dadkhah	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	ADITYA T WRESNIYANDAKA	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Samuel James Maskell	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Teresa Ono	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Megan Crocker	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	David Liao	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Azis Abakirov	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	NICHOLAS PETERSON	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christopher Nguyen	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Noel Garcia	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	shawn e trombley	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jeffrey Tumlin	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gareth B Cross	\$ 300.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Earle McCartney	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Claudia Paz	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Benjamin Benjamin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Vipul Prakash	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sarah E Rogers	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	David L McIntosh	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Yi Yin	\$ 250.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF Monetary Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name*	Donation Amount	
		City Fund	SF Foundation
3/16/2020	Sattler Sattler	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Natalia A Fisher	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Rachel M Alonso	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Avril Swan	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kelli A Broin	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Stephanie Boudreau	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Robert hodsdon	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sokunthea Keo	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ioannis Gamvros	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Gabriel Paul Ortiz	\$ 25.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	IOANNIS YIAKOUMIS	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	James Nguyen	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Tyler Ochiai	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Helen W. Bentley	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Johannah Goldstein	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Allison Carroll	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Leslie A Forrester	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Renee di Cherri	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nancy Duan	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Timothy j Oleneack	\$ 20.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	JONATHAN HENDLER	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Laurence Berland	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Emily Hague	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	ANTON KAPRALOV	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Annette Dana	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Chris Etterman	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Sarah Jones	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Asumu Takikawa	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Ingrid Flores	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Thoma Grey	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Edward Esslemont	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Kristy R Lee	\$ 150.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Emily Angyal	\$ 500.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	safa aliabadi	\$ 30.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Christopher Ota	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hartley Miller	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hannah Moskowitz	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Lauren Jong	\$ 10.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Brian Lovin	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Anna M Zylicz	\$ 75.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Jacqueline M Ali Cordoba	\$ 250.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Hollis J Rich	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Amanda Pinsker	\$ 200.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	CAITLYN M BOLLER	\$ 100.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Heather Sullens	\$ 50.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Nicole Johnson	\$ 5.00	\$ -
3/16/2020	Shawn Allen	\$ 25.00	\$ -

* Shown as entered (unedited). Review of donation data is ongoing.

** Total donation amount based on multiple donations from corporate giving funds on specified date.

Give2SF In-Kind Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donated Item	Donation Value*
		Total Through June 26, 2020	\$ 1,925,643.85
6/16/2020	VM Ware	KN-95 Masks	\$ 15,000.00
6/16/2020	VM Ware	Hooded Isolation Suits	\$ 14,964.00
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper Small 4/40's	\$ 2,904.00
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper Medium 4/40's	\$ 5,984.00
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper Large 4/40's	\$ 6,512.00
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper X-Large 4/40's	\$ 7,216.00
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Bebin Super Diaper XX-Large 4/40's	\$ 6,160.00
6/16/2020	Supply Bank	Supply Bank Wet Wipes 12/100's	\$ 33,000.00
6/15/2020	Dick's Sporting Goods	Black Strap Cloth Face Masks	\$ 20,432.00
6/10/2020	Timbuk2	Face Coverings	\$ 8,492.05
6/9/2020	United Healthcare	Fabric Face Masks	\$ 1,500.00
6/8/2020	Red Cross	Bottles of Water	\$ 7,308.00
6/8/2020	Mallory Safety and Supply	Goggles	\$ 350.00
6/5/2020	PCS	Hand Sanitizer, Gallons	\$ 2,000.00
5/26/2020	SF Chinese Alliance Church	Level 1 Surgical Masks	\$ 957.75
5/22/2020	Marine Layer	Handsewn Fabric Masks	\$ 2,617.85
5/22/2020	Bay Area Face Shield Supply	3D Printed Face Shields	\$ 408.00
5/22/2020	Dry Ice Robotics	3D Printed Face Shields	\$ 850.00
5/22/2020	Private Individual (Kim Tirva)	40.5-ounce Refills of Foam Sanitizer for LTX-12 Touchless Dispensers	\$ 62.40
5/22/2020	Timbuk2	Bandannas and Neck Gaiters	\$ 10,804.70
5/15/2020	Onfleet	Monthly Software Access From Onfleet	\$ 500.00
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Cloth Masks	\$ 505.69
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Epidemic Protection Face Shields	\$ 1,313.25
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Impervious Isolation Gowns	\$ 2,414.00
5/14/2020	New Taipei City	Cloth Masks	\$ 229.86
5/14/2020	PCS	Vented N95 Masks	\$ 12,700.00
5/13/2020	ICBC US Region	Hazmat Suits (Dupont)	\$ 516.00
5/13/2020	ICBC US Region	Safety Goggles (Condor Model 1VT70)	\$ 2,016.00
5/13/2020	Shanghai Hongbo Investment & Management (Group) Co., Ltd	Disposable Face Masks	\$ 12,770.00
5/13/2020	ICBC US Region	KN95 Masks	\$ 4,000.00
5/13/2020	China Mobile International (USA)	Surgical Mask w/ Ear Loops	\$ 25,540.00
5/13/2020	Greenwich Terrace	1 Gal. RX 20/20 Hand Sanitizer, 80% Alcohol	\$ 21.13
5/13/2020	Vietnam Consulate General	Fabric Face Coverings	\$ 6,385.00
5/12/2020	Culk	Fabric Face Masks	\$ 3,064.80
5/12/2020	Private Individual (Lou and Suzanne Giraud)	Boxes of Miltons Gluten-Free Crackers	\$ 600.00
5/12/2020	Private Individual (Lou and Suzanne Giraud)	Chocolate Chip Cookies	\$ 600.00
5/11/2020	Dickinsoncorp	3D Printed Face Shields	\$ 4,000.00
5/11/2020	Timbuk2 X CNBC	Face Coverings	\$ 26,755.70
5/8/2020	Private Individual (Yan Xiao)	Medical Gown	\$ 500.00

*Excludes donations not received at the Emergency Operations Center. Review of values is ongoing.

Give2SF In-Kind Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donated Item	Donation Value*
5/8/2020	Private Individual (Yan Xiao)	Surgical Masks	
5/8/2020	SF Chinese Alliance Church	Level 1 Surgical Masks	\$ 957.75
5/6/2020	Global Office	Face Shields	\$ 4,250.00
5/6/2020	HUB Group	Large Refrigerated Truck	\$ 38,483.00
5/5/2020	Private Individual (Jonica Little)	3D Printed Faceshields	\$ 127.50
5/4/2020	BELLA+CANVAS	Fabric Face Masks	\$ 6,129.60
5/4/2020	Veritas Investments	Level 1 Surgical Masks	\$ 31,286.50
5/4/2020	Veritas Investments	3M N95 Masks	\$ 2,500.00
5/4/2020	Veritas Investments	San Huei N95 Masks	\$ 1,560.00
5/4/2020	EO Essentials	EO 40-ounce Unscented Hand Sanitizer	\$ 1,872.00
5/4/2020	SF Public Health Foundation	Boxed Lunch	\$ 825.00
5/1/2020	Marine Layer	Handsewn Fabric Masks	\$ 1,915.50
5/1/2020	Private Individual (Colette Vance-Wright)	Fabric Face Masks	\$ 127.70
5/1/2020	Westpoint homes	Fabric Face Masks	\$ 3,192.50
4/29/2020	Timbuk2 X CNBC	Timbuk2 Face Masks	\$ 3,295.94
4/28/2020	Shanghai City Government	1,200 N95 Masks	\$ 10,500.00
4/28/2020	Shanghai City Government	20,000 KN95 Masks	\$ 100,000.00
4/28/2020	RealReal	Level 1 Surgical Masks	\$ 103,053.90
4/27/2020	Consulate General of the People's Republic of China	Escalier 3-Ply Single-Use Masks	\$ 3,831.00
4/24/2020	Private Individual (Nikcole Cunningham)	Sunny Care Gloves, Size M	\$ 40.00
4/24/2020	Feysan Lodde	2 Pallets of 16.9-ounce Water Bottles	\$ 750.00
4/24/2020	Feysan Lodde	1 Pallet of Gallon Water Drums	\$ 750.00
4/24/2020	Hint, Inc	16-ounce Water Bottles	\$ 2,100.00
4/22/2020	Private Individual (Guo Zi Dai)	Surgical Masks	\$ 383.10
4/22/2020	Comcast	Large Tote Bags	\$ 5.00
4/21/2020	WestPoint Home	Masks from Westpoint Home	\$ 3,192.50
4/21/2020	Private Individual (Nga Pham)	OEKO-TEX, Standard 100	\$ 3,831.00
4/21/2020	Timbuk2 X NBC Sports	Timbuk2 Face Masks	\$ 2,298.60
4/20/2020	Timbuk2	Timbuk2 Bandannas	\$ 411.19
4/20/2020	Kerogen Capital	Surgical Masks	\$ 319.25
4/20/2020	Fanatics	Surgical Mask w/ Ear Loops	\$ 1,109.71
4/17/2020	DWU Consulting LLC	Standard Surgical Masks	\$ 1,277.00
4/17/2020	FitnessSF	FitnessSF Yowies	\$ 3,250.00
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments	Anphu Pharma and Medical Surgical Masks	\$ 6,065.75
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments	3M N95 8210 and 8710 Masks	\$ 2,800.00
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments	Anphu Pharma Medical Masks	\$ 6,065.75
4/17/2020	Veritas Investments	3M N95/8710 Masks	\$ 2,800.00
4/16/2020	Consulate General of the People's Republic of China	Escalier 3-Ply Single-Use Masks	\$ 3,831.00

*Excludes donations not received at the Emergency Operations Center. Review of values is ongoing.

Give2SF In-Kind Donations Received Through 6/26/2020

Gift Date	Donor Name	Donated Item	Donation Value*
4/16/2020	Apple	Face Shields	\$ 255,000.00
4/15/2020	Private Individual (Laurie Green)	3D Starbuss N95 Masks	\$ 13,440.00
4/14/2020	Comcast	Cloth Bags	\$ 57.53
4/13/2020	Elite Supply Source	Vinyl Aprons, Cordova #RA0bc48, Clear, Tied String, Sewn Edges	\$ 3,045.90
4/13/2020	Elite Supply Source	Disposable Sleeves, Cordova #PS18W2 White, 8-inch	\$ 127,800.00
4/10/2020	PCS	Peakfit N95 Particulate Respirators	\$ 1,000.00
4/10/2020	PCS	Shoe Covers	\$ 6,966.00
4/9/2020	RainBeau	Handsewn Fabric Masks	\$ 279.00
4/7/2020	AlterEco	Alter Eco Chocolates (Cases)	\$ 180.00
4/7/2020	Seamsters Union	Handsewn Fabric Masks	\$ 400.00
4/7/2020	Levi's	Handsewn Fabric Masks	\$ 30,402.00
4/6/2020	Apple	Disposable Particulate Filter Respirators (Safety Director: 305050A NIOSH-approved)	\$ 250,800.00
4/1/2020	One Medical	COVID-19 Test Kits (Swabs and Testing Media)	\$ 9,034.00
3/27/2020	Dolby Laboratories	Waxie Shield Nitrile Powder-Free General-Purpose Gloves (W8644S) - Multiple Sizes	\$ 5,888.00
3/27/2020	Dolby Laboratories	SAS N95 Particulate Respirators (8625)	\$ 10,500.00
3/27/2020	Endless West Spirits	Gallon Hand Sanitizer	\$ 980.00
3/27/2020	Endless West Spirits	Gallon Hand Sanitizer	\$ 2,000.00
3/27/2020	Apple	Epic 40578-RS5 Masks with Ear Loop	\$ 53,634.00
3/25/2020	Facebook	Clorox Bleach Cannisters	\$ 13,590.00
3/25/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip Gloves (Nitrile, XL)	\$ 12,288.00
3/25/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip Gloves (Nitrile, L)	\$ 1,280.00
3/25/2020	Facebook	Condor Safety Eyewear	\$ 21,000.00
3/25/2020	Facebook	Hand Sanitizer Dispensers	\$ 12,000.00
3/25/2020	Facebook	Germ Attack Hand Sanitizer, Gallon Refills	\$ 4,226.00
3/25/2020	Facebook	Self-Priming Filter, FDA Approved, NIOSH-	\$ 25,000.00
3/25/2020	DoorDash	Uline S-9632 Standard Respirators	\$ 13,000.00
3/25/2020	Asian Art Museum Foundation	Purple Nitrile Gloves, Kimberley Clark, Medium	\$ 1,024.00
3/25/2020	Asian Art Museum Foundation	Sperian One-Fit Masks	\$ 2,000.00
3/20/2020	Roddy Lindsay	2 ounce CleanSF Sanitizer	\$ 1,612.50
3/20/2020	Facebook	Sperian One-Fit W1400 Masks	\$ 54,000.00
3/20/2020	Facebook	UniAir SH3500 Masks	\$ 123,600.00
3/20/2020	Facebook	3-in-1 Valumax Disposable Ear Loop Masks	\$ 76,620.00
3/20/2020	Facebook	Shoma Gloves (M)	\$ 38,400.00
3/20/2020	Facebook	Shoma Gloves (L)	\$ 25,600.00
3/20/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip (Nitrile, L)	\$ 1,280.00
3/20/2020	Facebook	Tuff Grip (Nitrile, XL)	\$ 24,576.00
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	34000 Gloves	\$ 8,704.00
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	1900 Medical Gowns	\$ 7,600.00
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	60,000 Surgical Masks	\$ 76,620.00
3/20/2020	Flexport LLC	50 Thermometers	\$ 3,075.00

*Excludes donations not received at the Emergency Operations Center. Review of values is ongoing.

From: [Reports, Controller \(CON\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Bruss, Andrea \(MYR\)](#); [Kirkpatrick, Kelly \(MYR\)](#); [Cretan, Jeff \(MYR\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [Anatolia Lubos; pkilkenny@sftc.org](#); [Campbell, Severin \(BUD\)](#); [Rose, Harvey \(BUD\)](#); [Docs, SF \(LIB\)](#); [CON-EVERYONE](#); [Seifer, Jason \(FAM\)](#); [Moss, Christine \(FAM\)](#); [Rosenfield, Ben \(CON\)](#); [Rydstrom, Todd \(CON\)](#); [delarosa, Mark \(CON\)](#); [Chalk, Kate \(CON\)](#); [Ojo, Todd \(CON\)](#); [Wang, Hunter \(CON\)](#); [Tam, Kristen \(CON\)](#)
Subject: Issued: Field Follow-up of the 2016 Audit of the Payroll and Disbursements Process for the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 4:54:04 PM

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a memorandum on its assessment of corrective actions taken by the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco in response to CSA's 2016 report assessing the museums' payroll and disbursements process. The follow-up found that all recommendations have been fully implemented and are considered closed.

To view the full memorandum, please visit our website at:
<http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2845>

This is a send-only e-mail address. For questions about the memorandum, please contact Acting Director of Audits Mark de la Rosa at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or 415-554-7574 or CSA at 415-554-7469.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController.



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER


CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

FIELD FOLLOW-UP MEMORANDUM

TO: Thomas P. Campbell, Director and CEO
Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

FROM: Mark de la Rosa, Acting Director of Audits 
Audits Division, City Services Auditor

DATE: June 29, 2020

SUBJECT: Field Follow-up of the 2016 Audit of the Payroll and Disbursements Process for the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City and County of San Francisco (City) Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) issued a memorandum in October 2016, *The Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums Inappropriately Paid \$450,773 to a City Employee Without Support. The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and the Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums Should Improve Aspects of Their Payroll and Disbursements Processes*. CSA has completed a field follow-up to determine the corrective actions that the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (FAMSF) has taken in response to the memorandum. The memorandum contains 12 recommendations, all of which have been implemented and are now closed.

BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVE, AND METHODOLOGY

Background

In 2016 CSA audited the payroll and cash disbursements processes at FAMSF, a city department. Through FAMSF, the City owns and is responsible for the operation of the M.H. de Young Memorial Museum and the California Palace of Legion of Honor. The two museums are governed by the boards of trustees of:

- FAMSF – a charitable trust department of the City. FAMSF employees are city employees. The department has the authority to maintain, operate, and manage the buildings that house the museums.

- Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums (COFAM) – a private, nonprofit (501(c)(3)) organization, which supports and operates the activities of the museums in cooperation with FAMSF.
- Fine Arts Museums Foundation – founded to receive and disburse funds for the administration and advancement of the museums.

The audit found that FAMSF and COFAM needed to improve control weaknesses in their payroll and cash disbursements processes.

Objective

The objective of this field follow-up was to determine whether FAMSF has taken the corrective actions recommended in CSA's October 27, 2016, audit memorandum on the department's payroll and cash disbursement processes. Consistent with Government Auditing Standards, Section 9.08, promulgated by the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the purposes of audit reports include facilitating follow-up to determine whether appropriate corrective actions have been taken.

This field follow-up is a nonaudit service. Government Auditing Standards do not cover nonaudit services, which are defined as professional services other than audits or attestation engagements. Therefore, FAMSF is responsible for the substantive outcomes of the work performed during this follow-up and is responsible to be in a position, in fact and appearance, to make an informed judgment on the results of the nonaudit service.

Methodology

To achieve the objective, CSA:

- Obtained documentary evidence from FAMSF.
- Interviewed department staff to understand and verify the status and nature of the corrective actions taken.
- Verified the status of the recommendations that FAMSF had reported as implemented.

RESULTS

FAMSF has fulfilled the intent of all 12 of the recommendations made in CSA's October 2016 report, which, consequently, are now considered closed. The following exhibit summarizes the status of the recommendations.

Implemented and Closed Recommendations

Recommendation	Conclusion
<p>The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco should:</p>	
<p>1. Recommend that the boards of trustees of the Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums and of the Fine Arts Museums Foundation establish and follow written policies to approve in advance any compensation to employees of the City that exceeds that authorized by the San Francisco Charter or the City’s labor agreements.</p>	<p>CSA reviewed the COFAM board of trustees resolution dated June 4, 2019, stating that supplemental compensation to city employees requires advance approval by the compensation committee of the board of trustees, as well as through the approval of the museums’ annual budget by COFAM’s board of trustees.</p> <p>The memorandum of understanding among FAMSF, COFAM, and the Fine Arts Museums Foundation, discussed in Recommendation 2 below, explicitly assigned the museums’ annual budget approval and monitoring responsibilities to COFAM. Therefore, CSA concludes that the COFAM board of trustees’ oversight and approval of any supplemental compensation to city employees suffices for both COFAM and the Fine Arts Museums Foundation.</p>
<p>2. Establish and document a memorandum of understanding between the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, the Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums, and the Fine Arts Museums Foundation, listing the roles and responsibilities of each organization.</p>	<p>CSA reviewed the memorandum of understanding established on January 25, 2018, by the boards of trustees of FAMSF, COFAM, and the Fine Arts Museums Foundation, which lists the roles and responsibilities of each organization.</p>
<p>3. Work with the payroll system provider, ADP, to identify functional and reporting requirements to ensure that payroll staff can access payroll records, including approval records of former Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and Corporation of Fine Arts Museums employees for a designated period that complies with a record retention and destruction policy that is in accordance with city requirements.</p>	<p>CSA reviewed access to separated employees’ timecards and their approval history and found that the access is consistent with the City’s record retention policy.</p>
<p>4. Document and comply with a record retention and destruction policy that is in accordance with city requirements and request that the Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums does the same.</p>	<p>CSA reviewed FAMSF’s record retention policy and confirmed that it is consistent with the City’s. COFAM, a private nonprofit organization, has evaluated its record retention policy and does not believe it needs to adopt the City’s record retention policy.</p>

Recommendation	Conclusion
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco should:	
5. Enhance and enforce policies and procedures that document when employees are not required to provide support for purchases and that require employees to provide a written explanation for any missing receipts or discrepancies.	CSA verified that FAMSF adopted the City's <i>Accounting Policies and Procedures for Employee Reimbursements</i> , issued by the Controller's Office. A review of a sample of employee reimbursements indicates that FAMSF follows city policy.
6. Reimburse the \$15 owed to one employee and consider the cost-effectiveness of recouping from employees the \$121 overpaid.	CSA verified that COFAM reimbursed the \$15 owed to one employee but did not recoup the overpayments after determining that it would not be cost-effective to do so.
7. Correct the payroll errors that resulted in the \$36 overpayment and consider the cost-effectiveness of recouping the overpayment.	CSA was informed that FAMSF did not recoup the overpayment after determining that it would not be cost-effective to do so.
8. Create formal payroll policies and procedures to require the review of employee time entries.	CSA verified that FAMSF created a payroll procedure that requires supervisors each day to review employee timecards, which are electronic records in its timekeeping system.
9. Require and ensure that supervisors sign or otherwise approve in writing and date approval of all timesheets, whether those who appear on the timesheets are city employees or employees of the Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums.	CSA verified that FAMSF created a payroll procedure requiring supervisors to review and electronically approve employee timecards. CSA also verified the implementation status of this recommendation by reviewing active employee timecards in PeopleSoft and concludes that FAMSF follows its payroll procedure.
10. Require that any employee who holds a position at another entity complete an additional employment form.	CSA reviewed an e-mail message the FAMSF Human Resources unit sent to employees. The e-mail states that any employee who holds a position at another entity must complete an additional employment form in compliance with City policy.

Recommendation	Conclusion
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco should:	
<p>11. Document and implement policies and procedures defining payroll clerk responsibilities for entering timesheet and pay step data. At a minimum, the policies and procedures should provide for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A payroll procedures checklist. b. Requiring payroll management to review at least 10 percent of entries made in the PeopleSoft system and their associated documentation. c. Requiring payroll staff to document payroll-related changes made directly in the PeopleSoft system and obtain a supervisor's approval. d. Requiring payroll management to periodically review that payroll-related changes were properly authorized and documented. e. Requiring employees to enter time weekly into ADP, supervisory approvals to the payroll unit weekly, and payroll clerks to review payroll records for accuracy weekly. f. Reconciling the number of employees whose time is submitted to department payroll staff to the number of employees who receive pay. 	<p>CSA verified that FAMSF created payroll policies that define payroll clerk responsibilities and address all aspects of the recommendation except Part b. FAMSF did not implement this part of the recommendation because it determined that it would not be cost-effective to hire an additional payroll employee to review at least 10 percent of entries made in the PeopleSoft system and their associated documentation. However, five other requirements in the policies and procedures mitigate this lack of review, so CSA considers the recommendation to be fully implemented.</p>
<p>12. Request that the Corporation of the Fine Arts Museums develop and implement policies and procedures defining employee requirements and accounting staff responsibilities related to employee reimbursements and other cash disbursements. At a minimum, the policy should provide for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Expense reimbursements for payments other than for employee travel, entertainment, and courier travel. b. Exceptions stating when receipts and other supporting documentation are not required. c. Eligibility and guidelines for organizational credit cards, including allowable expenses, dollar thresholds, and approval process. 	<p>CSA verified that COFAM created Travel Expense Approval and Reimbursement Procedures that fulfill the recommendation.</p>

CSA extends its appreciation to you and your staff who assisted with this review. If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (415) 554-7574 or e-mail me at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org.

cc: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

Jason Seifer
Christine Moss

Controller

Ben Rosenfield
Todd Rydstrom
Kate Chalk
Todd Ojo
Hunter Wang
Kristen Tam

Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Citizens Audit Review Board
City Attorney
Civil Grand Jury
Mayor
Public Library

Attachment: Department Response

**de Young **
\ Legion of Honor
fine arts museums
of san francisco

\ June 23, 2020

Mark de la Rosa
Acting Director of Audits
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: FAMSF Acknowledgement to CSA Field Follow-up Audit of 2016 Audit of the Payroll and Disbursements Process for the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco


Dear Mr. de la Rosa,

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to respond to your field follow-up audit of your report, *2016 Audit of the Payroll and Disbursements Process for the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco*, as prepared by the Controller's Office, City Services Auditor.

We acknowledge that all twelve recommendations are now considered closed. We appreciate the time spent by your staff to review the Payroll and Disbursements Process.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 750-3661 or tcampbell@famsf.org.

Sincerely,



Thomas P. Campbell
Director and CEO

CC: Jason Seifer, Chief Financial Officer
Christine Moss, Director of Human Resources
Todd Ojo, Audit Manager

de Young
50 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive
San Francisco, CA 94118
415 750 3600 \ famsf.org

From: [Simley, Shakirah \(HRC\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Davis, Sheryl \(HRC\)](#); [Chicuata, Brittini \(HRC\)](#)
Subject: Office of Racial Equity: June 30, 2020 Updates + Deliverables
Date: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 8:56:19 PM

Honorable Supervisors, Madam Clerk and Legislative Aides,

It is my pleasure to share important updates and deliverables from the Office of Racial Equity! I am proud to lead this Office and honored to work with Director Sheryl Davis and my SF Human Rights Commission colleagues to empower the community and deepen our citywide commitment to racial equity. I want to especially thank Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer and Chelsea Boilard for their critical support and guidance, as well as Supervisor Walton and D10 Team for their ongoing collaboration.

The past six months have painfully (and, perhaps, necessarily) shown us the urgency of racial equity work. In the wake of an ongoing struggle against racist, state-sanctioned violence and the disparate impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, we are all called to deliver better public service. To achieve justice, we must not only flatten the curve, but also equalize opportunity and radically reimagine and build something more just and hopeful. To accomplish these visions for the future, the Office of Racial Equity will radically partner, listen and build; I encourage you all to do the same. As we look towards the next six months and beyond, I thank you in advance for your solidarity and partnership in this work.

Below, please find the following deliverables and due dates for City Departments:

- **ORE Racial Equity Citywide Framework: Phase 1**
- **Racial Equity Action Plan Template: Phase 1** - *due December 31, 2020*

Phase 1 of our citywide racial equity work focuses on internal programs and policies, workforce, as well as boards/commissions. For more questions about the plan and timelines, please refer to the Framework document. Phase 2 will focus on external equity indicators, City procurement, contracting/grants, and delivery of services and programs to San Franciscans. Phase 2 will be delivered by August 2020.

Office of Racial Equity June 30, 2020 Update:

[ORE Racial Equity Citywide Framework and Racial Equity Action Plan Template: Phase 1](#)

[\(including a Vulnerable Populations Engagement Assessment survey, due July 10.](#)

New Office of Racial Equity Website

www.racialequitysf.org

ORE Vision and Values

<https://www.racialequitysf.org/s/ORE-SF-Our-Vision-and-Values.pdf>

ORE Progress Report

A summary of activities and accomplishments to date; including deployment of the EOC Equity Team, support of the COVID-19 Economic Recovery Taskforce.

<https://www.racialequitysf.org/s/ORE-SF-Progress-Report.pdf>

ORE COVID-19 Response & Recovery Racial Equity Toolkit: *Fighting COVID-19 with Solidarity and Care for All*

A new resource to aid policymakers, organizations and community groups in prioritizing and maintaining a racial equity lens in messaging, discussions, practices, policies, and decision-making regarding COVID-19. The audience for this document is also local jurisdictions who are responding to the COVID-19 crisis and are looking for examples from the City and County of San Francisco's response.

<https://www.racialequitysf.org/s/ORE-SF-COVID-Racial-Equity-Toolkit.pdf>

In closing, Maya Angelou once said, "*History, despite its wrenching pain cannot be unlived. But if faced with courage, we need not live it again.*" We are never finished with the work of facing our history with courage. I invite you to continue to educate yourself, engage in conversations, and catalyze action toward a racially just world.

Warmly,

Shakirah

Shakirah Simley | Director

Pronouns: she/her/hers

Office of Racial Equity

San Francisco Human Rights Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue #800

San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: Shakirah.simley@sfgov.org

From: [Reports, Controller \(CON\)](#)
To: [Reports, Controller \(CON\)](#)
Subject: Issued: Fee Certifications FY20-21 and FY21-22
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 5:06:18 PM

The Controller has issued its annual report on mandated fee reviews and schedules. The report contains fee information for Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-22 as mandated by various San Francisco Municipal Code sections. The code sections listed in the Controller's certification letters and tables summarize legal requirements and authorization to increase fees. Only those fees which can be increased administratively by the Controller or the departments are reviewed by the Controller. Where authorized, fee adjustments reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) as determined by the Controller. Some fees are being adjusted to change the portion of service delivery costs recovered.

The CPI adjustment factor for most fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31% and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021. The July 1, 2020 rate is based upon Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area and the July 1, 2021 rate is based on CPI as projected by the Controller using California Department of Finance and Moody's forecasts. CPI adjustments will be updated during the FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23 budget deliberations.

When possible, based on information received from departments, the Controller has certified that fees do not produce revenue which is significantly more than the costs of providing the services for which each fee is assessed.

The report can be found here: <http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2846>

If you have any questions, please contact Michelle Allersma at (415) 554-4792.



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Controller's Annual Report of Municipal Code-Mandated Fee Reviews & Schedules—
FY2020-21 & FY2021-22

This report contains fee information for Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-22 as mandated by various San Francisco Municipal Code sections. The code sections listed in the attached Controller's certification letters and tables summarize legal requirements and authorization to increase fees. Only those fees which can be increased administratively by the Controller or the departments are reviewed by the Controller. Where authorized, fee adjustments reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) as determined by the Controller. Some fees are being adjusted to change the portion of service delivery costs recovered.

The CPI adjustment factor for most fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31% and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021. The July 1, 2020 rate is based upon Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area and the July 1, 2021 rate is based on CPI as projected by the Controller using California Department of Finance and Moody's forecasts. CPI adjustments will be updated during the FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23 budget deliberations.

When possible, based on information received from departments, the Controller has certified that fees do not produce revenue which is significantly more than the costs of providing the services for which each fee is assessed.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 554-4792.

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Administrator - Animal Care and Control

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Animal Care and Control - Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Health Code Article 1, Section 41.26 authorizes the Controller to adjust the Animal Care and Control fees set in Sections 41.9, 41.10, 41.15, 41.16, 41.17, and 41.22 to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate.

The San Francisco Health Code Article 39, Sections 3904 and 3910 authorize the Controller to adjust the cap on the dog walker license and permit fees beginning with Fiscal Year 2016-17, and every fifth year after that to reflect intervening changes in the relevant CPI without further action by the Board of Supervisors. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the cost of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst, Mayor's Budget Office, Chief Fiscal Officer-City Administrator

General Services Agency - City Administrator - Animal Care and Control

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
				3.31%				3.10%			
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.9 (a)	Adoption fee	\$19.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$20.03	\$20.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$20.65	\$21.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.9 (a)	Adoption fee - Senior (65+) adopter (50% reduction)	\$10.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$10.08	\$10.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$10.39	\$10.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (a)	Redemption fee	\$39.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$40.06	\$40.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$41.31	\$41.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (j)(1)	Penalty Redemption fee - Second impoundment	\$78.00	N/A	3.31%	N/A	\$80.00	N/A	3.10%	N/A	\$82.00	N/A
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (j)(2)	Penalty Redemption fee - Third impoundment	\$117.00	N/A	3.31%	N/A	\$120.00	N/A	3.10%	N/A	\$123.00	N/A
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (b)	Voluntary lifetime cat registration	\$16.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$16.03	\$16.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$16.52	\$17.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (c)	Spay/neuter deposit - Dog/Cat	\$65.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$66.77	\$67.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$68.84	\$69.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (d)	Feeding & Care (per day)	\$32.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$33.39	\$33.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$34.42	\$34.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (d)	Feeding & Care - Rabbit, bird, small animal (per day)	\$13.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$13.35	\$13.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$13.77	\$14.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (e)	Owner-requested euthanasia	\$32.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$33.39	\$33.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$34.42	\$34.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (f)	Owner surrender of animal	\$32.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$33.39	\$33.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$34.42	\$34.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (g)	Deceased pet disposal	\$26.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$26.71	\$27.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$27.54	\$28.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.10 (h)	Field services transport	\$52.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$53.42	\$53.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$55.08	\$55.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.15 (c)(1)	Dog license - One-year	\$65.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$66.77	\$67.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$68.84	\$69.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.15 (c)(2)	Dog license - Two-year	\$123.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$126.87	\$127.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$130.80	\$131.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.15 (c)(3)	Dog license - Three-year	\$181.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$186.97	\$187.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$192.76	\$193.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.16 (1)(A)	Dog license - Spayed/Neutered - One-year	\$26.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$26.71	\$27.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$27.54	\$28.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.16 (1)(B)	Dog license - Spayed/Neutered - Two-year	\$39.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$40.06	\$40.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$41.31	\$41.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.16 (1)(C)	Dog license - Spayed/Neutered - Three-year	\$52.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$53.42	\$53.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$55.08	\$55.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.17 (a)	Dog license - Late payment penalty	\$32.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$33.39	\$33.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$34.42	\$34.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 1 Sec 41.22 (a)	Duplicate dog/cat license/registration tag	\$8.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$7.89	\$8.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$8.14	\$8.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 39 Sec 3904	Dog walker permit ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾	\$285.00	< 100%	N/A	\$284.65	\$285.00	< 100%	N/A	\$337.66	\$338.00	< 100%
Health Code Article 39 Sec 3910	Dog walker permit - Renewal ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾	\$114.00	< 100%	N/A	\$113.86	\$114.00	< 100%	N/A	\$135.06	\$135.00	< 100%

(1) Beginning with FY 2016-17 and every 5th year after that, new cap fee amount shall be adjusted by the Controller to reflect intervening changes in the relevant CPI.

(2) FY21-22 adjusted for CPI based on CPI calculations as of June 2020, FY21-22 may be adjusted for updated factors in June 2021



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Administrator - County Clerk

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: County Clerk - Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 8, Section 8.33.1 and Chapter 95, Section 95.2 authorize the Controller to adjust the County Clerk's fees set in this section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the cost of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Chief Fiscal Officer-City Administrator

General Services Agency - City Administrator - County Clerk

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Public marriage license	\$75.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$77.20	\$77.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$79.59	\$80.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Confidential marriage license	\$75.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$77.20	\$77.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$79.59	\$80.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 62 Sec 62.8	Domestic Partnership Filing	\$60.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$61.76	\$62.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$63.67	\$64.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Duplicate copy of marriage license	\$24.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$24.70	\$25.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$25.47	\$25.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Amendment to marriage license	\$30.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$30.89	\$31.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$31.85	\$32.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Souvenir marriage certificate	\$7.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$7.72	\$8.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$7.96	\$8.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Performance of marriage/domestic partnership ceremony in City Hall - regular business hours ⁽¹⁾	\$90.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$92.63	\$93.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$95.50	\$96.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Performance of marriage/domestic partnership ceremony in City Hall - weekends or holidays off-site ⁽¹⁾	\$149.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$154.40	\$154.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$159.19	\$159.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Issuance of authority to perform ceremony and oath	\$149.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$154.40	\$154.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$159.19	\$159.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Filing fictitious business name statement	\$55.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$57.13	\$57.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$58.90	\$59.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Additional name or registrant on fictitious business name statement	\$13.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$13.89	\$14.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$14.32	\$14.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Filing affidavit of publication of fictitious business name statement	\$9.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$9.26	\$9.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$9.55	\$10.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Withdrawing partner or abandoning fictitious business name statement	\$45.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$46.32	\$46.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$47.75	\$48.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Administration of oath and filing notary public bond	\$45.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$46.32	\$46.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$47.75	\$48.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Surrender of notary journal	\$18.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$18.53	\$19.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$19.11	\$19.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Filing, revoking, cancelling or withdrawing power of attorney	\$40.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$41.68	\$42.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$42.97	\$43.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Filing additional name for power of attorney (surety insurer)	\$10.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$10.81	\$11.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$11.15	\$11.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Process server identification card	\$15.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$15.44	\$15.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$15.92	\$16.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Authentication of public official/notary public	\$15.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$15.44	\$15.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$15.92	\$16.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Search of indexed official records on file with the County Clerk, per record type	\$11.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$11.57	\$12.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$11.93	\$12.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Copies of records on file- per page, pages 1 through 3	\$7.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$6.94	\$7.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$7.16	\$7.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Copies of records on file - each additional page	\$0.10	< 100%	3.31%	\$0.15	\$0.20	< 100%	3.10%	\$0.16	\$0.20	< 100%

General Services Agency - City Administrator - County Clerk

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Certifying/endorsing documents or copies of documents per file number	\$2.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$2.31	\$2.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$2.39	\$2.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Fictitious business name index records - one day	\$14.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$14.66	\$15.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$15.12	\$15.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Fictitious business name index records - one week	\$14.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$14.66	\$15.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$15.12	\$15.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Fictitious business name index records - one month	\$30.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$30.89	\$31.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$31.85	\$32.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Diskette	\$1.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$1.54	\$2.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$1.59	\$2.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Subscription Fee	\$22.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$23.16	\$23.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$23.88	\$24.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Delivery handling fee	\$15.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$15.44	\$15.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$15.92	\$16.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.33.1 (a)	Environmental impact report, administrative fee	\$69.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$71.17	\$71.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$73.38	\$73.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 95 Sec 95.2 (e)	SF City ID Card (age 14+)	\$18.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$18.28	\$18.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$18.85	\$19.00	< 100%
Administrative Code Chapter 95 Sec 95.2 (e)	SF City ID Card (age 13 and Under, age 62+)	\$6.00	< 100%	3.31%	\$6.09	\$6.00	< 100%	3.10%	\$6.28	\$6.00	< 100%

(1) 100% of commitment ceremony fee is remitted to the Commission on the Status of Women. County Clerk retains 100% of marriage ceremony fee.



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Arts Commission

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Arts Commission - Street Artist Certificate Fee Increase

The San Francisco Police Code Article 24, Section 2404.2 requires the Arts Commission to publish an annual report, which details the revenues collected for Street Artist Certificates, the costs incurred in administering and enforcing the provisions of the Street Artist Ordinance, the anticipated costs for the ensuing year, and the fee which would be necessary to support such costs. The Board of Supervisors shall, by ordinance, establish or readjust the fee for a Street Artist Certificate. The fee set shall be equal to, but not greater than, the fees necessary to support the costs of administering and enforcing the provisions of the Street Artist Ordinance. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Beginning in FY 2013-14, legislation amending Police Code Section 2404.1 authorized the Controller to adjust the fees set in this section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area.

Based on the data submitted by the Arts Commission to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the cost of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule
cc: Budget Analyst, Mayor's Budget Office, Chief Fiscal Officer-Art Commission

Arts Commission - Street Artist Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Police Code Article 24 Sec 2404.1	Street Artist Certificate Fees - Quarterly	\$205.00	39%	3.31%	\$212.21	\$212.00	39%	3.10%	\$218.79	\$219.00	40%
Police Code Article 24 Sec 2404.1	Street Artist Certificate Fees- Annual	\$822.00	39%	3.31%	\$848.83	\$849.00	39%	3.10%	\$875.14	\$875.00	40%
Police Code Article 24 Sec 2404.1.1	Street Artist Application/Examination Fees	\$20.00	39%	N/A	\$20.00	\$20.00	39%	N/A	\$20.00	\$20.00	40%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Building Inspection
Department of City Planning
Department of Public Health
Department of Public Works
Entertainment Commission
Municipal Transportation Agency
Police Department

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Board of Appeals Surcharge for Permits & Fees—Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Administrative Code section 10G.2 authorizes the Controller to adjust the surcharges set in Section 10G.1 to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. If the Controller determines that the surcharge and applicable CPI adjustment will either: (1) not adequately cover, or (2) exceed the projected cost of Board of Appeals review subject to the surcharge, legislation shall be filed that would adjust the surcharge for the affected department(s) to the appropriate level. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Based on the data submitted by the departments, the Controller has estimated in FY 2020-21, City Planning and Department of Building Inspection surcharges are expected to increase to \$20.00, the

2 | Board of Appeals Surcharge

Department of Public Works surcharges are expected to increase to \$7.00, and the Department of Public Health surcharges are expected to increase to \$46.00. In FY 2021-22, City Planning and Department of Building Inspection surcharges are expected to increase to \$21.00, the Department of Public Works surcharge is expected to increase to \$7.50, and the Department of Public Health surcharge is expected to increase to \$47.50. This projection is subject to change pending next year's Controller calculations.

Attachment: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst, Mayor's Budget Office

Administrative Services, Building Inspection, City Planning, Municipal Transportation Authority,
Police, Public Health, and Public Works Chief Fiscal Officers

Board of Appeals - Surcharges

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Department of City Planning permits surcharge (Section. 4.105)	\$19.00	95%	\$20.00	89%	\$21.00	93%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Department of Building Inspection permits surcharge	\$19.00	95%	\$20.00	89%	\$21.00	93%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Department of Public Health permits surcharge (Health Code Section 1009.53)	\$44.50	72%	\$46.00	50%	\$47.50	51%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Department of Public Health renewals surcharge (San Francisco Health Code Section 1009.54)	\$44.50	72%	\$46.00	50%	\$47.50	51%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Department of Public Works permits surcharge (Section 4.132)	\$6.50	76%	\$7.00	86%	\$7.50	92%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Entertainment Commission permits surcharge (Police Code Section 2.26)	\$4.00	100%	\$4.00	100%	\$4.00	100%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (Taxi) permits surcharge (Transportation Code Division II Article 300 Sec. 320)	\$2.00	165%	\$2.00	100%	\$2.00	100%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Entertainment Commission renewals surcharge (Police Code Section 2.27)	\$4.00	100%	\$4.00	100%	\$4.00	100%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (Taxi) permits surcharge (Transportation Code Division II Article 300 Sec. 320)	\$2.00	165%	\$2.00	100%	\$2.00	100%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Police permits surcharge (Police Code Section 2.26)	\$6.00	120%	\$6.00	100%	\$6.00	100%
Administrative Code Chapter 10G Sec 10G.1&2	Police renewals surcharge (Police Code Section 2.27)	\$6.00	120%	\$6.00	100%	\$6.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Health

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Department of Public Health - Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Health Code Article 11, Section 609.2 authorizes the Controller to adjust the Vector Control and Healthy Housing Inspection Program fees, as provided for in Sections 609 and 609.1, for the upcoming fiscal year as appropriate to ensure that the program recovers the costs of operation without producing revenue that is significantly more than such costs. This fee adjustment may be made by the Controller without further action by the Board of Supervisors. Adjusted rates become operative on July 1, 2020 for FY 2020-21 and July 1, 2021 for FY 2021-22. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Health, Chief Fiscal Officer

Department of Public Health - Vector Control / Healthy Housing

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Apartment Building: 3 units	\$82.00	<100%	3.31%	\$85.06	\$85.00	<100%	3.10%	\$87.69	\$88.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Apartment Building: 4-6 units	\$104.00	<100%	3.31%	\$106.93	\$107.00	<100%	3.10%	\$110.24	\$110.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Apartment Building: 7-10 units	\$140.00	<100%	3.31%	\$144.60	\$145.00	<100%	3.10%	\$149.08	\$149.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Apartment Building: 11-15 units	\$281.00	<100%	3.31%	\$290.41	\$290.00	<100%	3.10%	\$299.41	\$299.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Apartment Building: 16-20 units	\$389.00	<100%	3.31%	\$402.20	\$402.00	<100%	3.10%	\$414.67	\$415.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Apartment Building: 21-30 units	\$552.00	<100%	3.31%	\$569.88	\$570.00	<100%	3.10%	\$587.55	\$588.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Apartment Building: over 30 units	\$648.00	<100%	3.31%	\$669.52	\$670.00	<100%	3.10%	\$690.28	\$690.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: less than 20 units	\$462.00	<100%	3.31%	\$476.85	\$477.00	<100%	3.10%	\$491.64	\$492.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: 20-29 units	\$538.00	<100%	3.31%	\$555.84	\$556.00	<100%	3.10%	\$573.07	\$573.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: 30-39 units	\$659.00	<100%	3.31%	\$680.99	\$681.00	<100%	3.10%	\$702.10	\$702.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: 40-49 units	\$810.00	<100%	3.31%	\$836.52	\$837.00	<100%	3.10%	\$862.46	\$862.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: 50-59 units	\$1,058.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,092.91	\$1,093.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,126.79	\$1,127.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: 60-99 units	\$1,218.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,258.16	\$1,258.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,297.17	\$1,297.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: 100-149 units	\$1,312.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,355.37	\$1,355.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,397.39	\$1,397.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: 150-175 units	\$1,475.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,524.27	\$1,524.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,571.52	\$1,572.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (f)	Hotel: more than 175 units	\$1,648.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,702.11	\$1,702.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,754.88	\$1,755.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609.1 (b)	Reinspection by environmental health inspector, per hour	\$206.00	<100%	3.31%	\$212.50	\$212.00	<100%	3.10%	\$219.08	\$219.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609.1 (b)	Reinspection by environmental health technician, per hour	\$185.00	<100%	3.31%	\$191.15	\$191.00	<100%	3.10%	\$197.07	\$197.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609.1 (b)	Reinspections by environmental health inspectors that require more than one hour to complete- each half hour	\$103.00	<100%	3.31%	\$106.13	\$106.00	<100%	3.10%	\$109.42	\$109.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609.1 (b)	Reinspections by environmental health technicians that require more than one hour to complete- each half hour	\$93.00	<100%	3.31%	\$95.57	\$96.00	<100%	3.10%	\$98.54	\$99.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11 Sec. 609 (d)	Late payment penalty	10.00 (after 30 days); 30.00 (after 60 days)	<100%	3.31%	\$10.00 (after 30 days); \$30.00 (after 60 days)	10.00 (after 30 days); 30.00 (after 60 days)	<100%	3.10%	\$10.00 (after 30 days); \$30.00 (after 60 days)	10.00 (after 30 days); 30.00 (after 60 days)	<100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fire Department

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Fire Department Service Fees – 2020 Annual Report

The San Francisco Fire Code Chapter 1, Section 113.21 requires the Fire Chief to file an annual report with the Controller. The annual report details the revenues received from each type of fee collected by the Fire Department, the direct and indirect costs incurred in providing the services for which the fee is assessed, the anticipated costs for the following fiscal year, and the rates which would be necessary to support such cost for each type of fee. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Rates must not exceed the rates necessary to support the costs of providing the services for which each fee is assessed. Based on the information submitted by the Fire Department to the Controller, the cost recovery for EMS Ambulance Services is 20 percent, and the cost recovery for Fire Prevention Services is 82 percent. A copy of the annual report submitted by the Fire Department is attached.

Attachment: Fire Department 2020 Annual Report

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Fire Department, Chief Fiscal officer

Costs Incurred, Direct and Indirect

The projected costs of the Fire Department in Fiscal Year 2020 for providing EMS and Fire Prevention services are in balance with the fees currently charged for these services. The Department is not collecting more revenues than it is incurring in costs.

Service Type	Projected Expenses	Projected Revenue	Difference	% of costs recovered
EMS Ambulance Services	153,183,648	30,703,753	122,479,895	20.0%
Fire Prevention Services	23,550,491	19,292,502	4,257,989	81.9%

Anticipated Costs for Fiscal Year 2021 and Recommended Rates

The Fire Department has analyzed its Emergency Medical and Fire Prevention Fees for Service in light of current service costs, negotiated wage increases for uniform staff members and other personnel costs, and indirect costs. The Fire Department's proposed fees are shown in Attachment 1.

Fees automatically adjusted by the CPI

The Fire Department has two sets of fees that are allowed to be automatically adjusted by the stipulated CPI index, provided that the Department does not calculate and submit a separate request to change the fees. The Fire Department is proposing increases to ambulance fees per the CPI increase.

Attachment 1, Proposed Fire Department Fee Schedule

Fee Title	Current Fee	Proposed Fee	Variance	Budget FY20	Proposed FY21	Variance
Pre-Application Plan Review	\$375	\$390	\$15	150,000	221,000	71,000
Water Flow Fees	\$125/\$250	\$130/\$250	\$5/\$0	212,500	214,500	2,000
Plan Check	See Schedule	See Schedule	\$0	8,710,000	9,377,000	667,000
Inspection Fees	\$125	\$130	\$5	2,031,250	2,147,500	116,250
High Rise Inspection Fees	\$13.00 sq ft	\$13.50 sq ft	\$0.50	1,950,000	1,957,500	7,500
Tax Collection Renewal Fees	\$359	\$359	\$0	1,990,000	2,118,800	128,800
Original Filing Fees	\$360	\$375	\$15	1,002,000	1,015,000	13,000
Re-Inspections	\$250	\$260	\$10	172,250	182,780	10,530
Referral Inspections	\$125	\$130	\$5	181,250	188,500	7,250
Overtime Service Fees	\$137	\$143	\$6	2,000,000	2,500,000	500,000
Residential Inspection Fee	\$157	\$157	\$0	627,041	627,041	0
False Alarm Fee	\$250/\$500	\$250/\$500	\$0	220,500	220,500	0
Vehicle Incident Fee	\$249/\$598	\$249/\$598	\$0	326,000	326,000	0
EMS Ambulance Fees	\$2,132/\$474/\$40	\$2,175/\$484/\$41	\$43/\$10/\$1	28,296,805	28,552,600	255,795
TOTAL				47,869,596	49,648,721	1,779,125

PROPOSED PLAN CHECK FEE SCHEDULE

From	To	FY 2020 Fees	FY 2021 Proposed Fees
\$1	\$2,000	\$74.00 for the first \$1,000 plus \$72.8791 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$76.45 for the first \$1,000 plus \$75.2914 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
\$2,001	\$50,000	\$146.88 for the first \$2,000 plus \$14.0747 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$151.74 for the first \$2,000 plus \$14.5406 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
\$50,001	\$200,000	\$822.46 for the first \$50,000 plus \$5.6482 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$849.68 for the first \$50,000 plus \$5.832 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
\$200,001	\$500,000	\$1,669.69 for the first \$200,000 plus \$2.6327 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$1,724.96 for the first \$200,000 plus \$2.7198 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
\$500,001	\$1,000,000	\$2,459.50 for the first \$500,000 plus \$1.7573 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$2,540.91 for the first \$500,000 plus \$1.8155 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
\$1,000,001	\$5,000,000	\$3,338.12 for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$1.3360 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$3,448.61 for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$1.3802 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof
\$5,000,001		\$8,681.96 for the first \$5,000,000 plus \$.6737 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	\$8,969.33 for the first \$5,000,000 plus \$.6960 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fire Department

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Emergency Medical Services – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Health Code Article 3, Section 128.1 authorizes the Controller to adjust the Emergency Medical Services fees set in this section to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for medical care. The medical care CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 2.28%, and 2.28% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable Code Sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule
cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Fire Department, Chief Fiscal Officer

Fire Department - Emergency Medical Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Medical CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Medical CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Health Code Article 3 Sec 128.1	Basic Life Service	\$2,336.00	100%	2.28%	\$2,389.71	\$2,390.00	100%	2.28%	\$2,444.20	\$2,444.00	100%
Health Code Article 3 Sec 128.1	Advanced Life Service	\$2,336.00	100%	2.28%	\$2,389.71	\$2,390.00	100%	2.28%	\$2,444.20	\$2,444.00	100%
Health Code Article 3 Sec 128.1	Mileage Fee (per mile)	\$44.00	100%	2.28%	\$45.25	\$45.00	100%	2.28%	\$46.28	\$46.00	100%
Health Code Article 3 Sec 128.1	Treatment without Transportation (per call)	\$520.00	100%	2.28%	\$531.68	\$532.00	100%	2.28%	\$543.80	\$544.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fire Department
Police Department
Municipal Transportation Agency

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board
Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of Streets for Street Fairs – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Transportation Code, Article 6, Section 6.6(n) authorizes the Fire Department, Police Department, and Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) to establish certain fees for Temporary Use of Streets for Street Fairs, and authorizes the Controller to adjust the fees set in this section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors or the MTA Board of Directors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedules and notify us of any changes or updates. Our analysis recognizes the fee levels of Temporary Use of Streets for Street Fairs as approved by the MTA Board of Directors for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedules. For departments that submitted cost data, no fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services. Since fees for the Fire Department and Police Department have been adjusted in accordance with San Francisco Transportation Code, Article 6, Section 6.6, no further action by the Board of Supervisors is required.

2 | Temporary Use of Streets for Street Fairs

Attachment: Fee Schedules

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Fire, Police, and MTA Chief Fiscal Officers

Police Department - Street Fair Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 20-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 20-21 Fee (rounded)	FY 20-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 21-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 21-22 Fee (rounded)	FY 21-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(4)(A)	Street Fair selling alcoholic beverages - up to 100,000 patrons, Maximum	\$7,289.00	100%	3.31%	\$7,530.28	\$7,530.00	100%	3.10%	\$7,763.72	\$7,764.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(4)(A)	Street Fair selling alcoholic beverages - 100,001 to 250,000 patrons, Maximum	\$14,578.00	100%	3.31%	\$15,060.56	\$15,061.00	100%	3.10%	\$15,527.43	\$15,527.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(4)(A)	Street Fair selling alcoholic beverages - over 250,000 patrons, Maximum	\$29,156.00	100%	3.31%	\$30,121.11	\$30,121.00	100%	3.10%	\$31,054.87	\$31,055.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(4)(A)	Street Fair where alcoholic beverages are not served, Maximum	\$3,706.00	100%	3.31%	\$3,828.81	\$3,829.00	100%	3.10%	\$3,947.50	\$3,948.00	100%

Fire Department - Street Fair Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 21-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 21-22 Fee (rounded)	FY 21-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(1)(A)	Street Fair Application	\$420.00	100%	3.31%	\$434.10	\$434.00	100%	3.10%	\$447.56	\$448.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(1)(B)(i)	Street Fair Inspection - first day, 1-10 vendors	\$596.00	100%	3.31%	\$615.63	\$616.00	100%	3.10%	\$634.72	\$635.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(1)(B)(i)	Street Fair Inspection - first day, 11-20 vendors	\$1,192.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,231.27	\$1,231.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,269.44	\$1,269.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(1)(B)(i)	Street Fair Inspection - first day, 21-30 vendors	\$1,788.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,846.90	\$1,847.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,904.15	\$1,904.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(1)(B)(i)	Street Fair Inspection - first day, 31 vendors and over	\$2,384.00	100%	3.31%	\$2,462.53	\$2,463.00	100%	3.10%	\$2,538.87	\$2,539.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(1)(B)(ii)	Street Fair Inspection - each consecutive day, 1-20 vendors	\$596.00	100%	3.31%	\$615.63	\$616.00	100%	3.10%	\$634.72	\$635.00	100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)(1)(B)(ii)	Street Fair Inspection - each consecutive day, 21 vendors and over	\$1,192.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,231.27	\$1,231.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,269.44	\$1,269.00	100%

Municipal Transportation Agency - Street Fair Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Approved by MTA Board of Directors)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 July 1 - January 3 Fee (Approved by MTA Board of Directors)	FY 2020-21 July 1 - January 3 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 January 4 - June 30 Fee (Approved by MTA Board of Directors)	FY 2020-21 January 4 - June 30 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Approved by MTA Board of Directors)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Neighborhood Block Party - More than 120 days in Advance	\$99	<100%	\$99	<100%	\$50	<100%	\$50	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Neighborhood Block Party - 90-120 days in advance	\$200	<100%	\$200	<100%	\$75	<100%	\$75	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Neighborhood Block Party - 60-89 Days in Advance	\$325	<100%	\$325	<100%	\$100	<100%	\$100	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Neighborhood Block Party - Fewer than 60 days	\$450	<100%	\$450	<100%	\$150	<100%	\$150	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Neighborhood Block Party - Fewer than 30 days	\$875	<100%	\$875	<100%	\$300	<100%	\$300	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Community Events - More than 120 days in advance*	N/A		N/A		\$100	<100%	\$100	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Community Events - 90-120 days in advance*	N/A		N/A		\$150	<100%	\$150	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Community Events - At Least 60 Days in Advance	N/A		N/A		\$200	<100%	\$200	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Community Events - Fewer than 60 days	N/A		N/A		\$250	<100%	\$250	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Community Events - Fewer than 30 days	N/A		N/A		\$300	<100%	\$500	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	Community Events - Fewer than 7 days	N/A		N/A		\$500	<100%	\$750	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	All Other Events - More than 120 days in advance*	\$600	<100%	\$600	<100%	\$1,100	<100%	\$1,100	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	All Other Events - 90-120 days in advance*	\$850	<100%	\$850	<100%	\$1,250	<100%	\$1,325	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	All Other Events - At Least 60 Days in Advance	\$1,100	<100%	\$1,100	<100%	\$1,500	<100%	\$1,600	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	All Other Events - Fewer than 60 days	\$1,350	<100%	\$1,350	<100%	\$1,750	<100%	\$2,000	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	All Other Events - Fewer than 30 days	\$1,575	<100%	\$1,575	<100%	\$2,000	<100%	\$2,200	<100%
Transportation Code Article 6 Sec 6.6(f)	All Other Events - Fewer than 7 days	\$2,500	<100%	\$2,500	<100%	\$2,500	<100%	\$2,750	<100%
* New in FY 2016-17 & FY 2017-18									



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Police Emergency Alarm License Fee – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Police Code Article 37, Section 3720 authorizes the Controller to adjust the Police Emergency Alarm License Fee set in this section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Per Section 3720, fees are to be increased in \$5 increments only when cumulative CPI changes since the last fee adjustment justify an increase or decrease of at least five dollars. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted by the Treasurer/Tax Collector to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. Based on cumulative CPI changes, in FY 2020-21 the Police Emergency Alarm License Fee for commercial units will not increase. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Police and Treasurer/Tax Collector, Chief Fiscal Officers

Police Department/TTX - Emergency Alarm Fee

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)*	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)*	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)*	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Police Code Article 37 Sec 3720 (a)	Commercial Premises Alarm License - Original or annual renewal	\$80.00	<100%	3.31%	\$80.54	\$80.00	<100%	3.10%	\$83.04	\$85.00	<100%
Police Code Article 37 Sec 3720 (a)	Residential Premises Alarm License - Original or annual renewal	\$50.00	<100%	3.31%	\$51.78	\$50.00	<100%	3.10%	\$53.38	\$55.00	<100%

**Note: Fees are increased or decreased in \$5 increments only when cumulative annual CPI adjustments justify an increase or decrease of at least \$5.*



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Administrator – Entertainment Commission
Municipal Transportation Agency
Police Department

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board
Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Public Nuisances Permit, Filing and License Fees; Taxi Permit Fees – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Police Code Article 1, Section 2.31 authorizes the Controller to adjust the Public Nuisances Permit, Filing, and License Fees set in Sections 2.26, 2.26.1, 2.27, and 2.27.1 to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI). The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Proposition A supersedes the above sections of the Police Code and other local codes, and gives the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) exclusive authority to adjust fees governing taxi permits. The MTA Board of Directors has approved the relevant taxi permit fees included in the Police Code, for FY 2020-21.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the cost of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedules

cc: Budget Analyst, Mayor's Budget Office, City Administrator, Police Dept, and MTA Chief Fiscal Officer

Police Department - Permits and Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
				3.31%				3.10%			
Permit Filing Fees											
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Permit Amendment (unless otherwise specified)	\$333.00	100%	3.31%	\$343.84	\$344.00	100%	3.10%	\$354.50	\$354.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Permit Renewal (unless otherwise specified)	\$748.00	100%	3.31%	\$773.23	\$773.00	100%	3.10%	\$797.20	\$797.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Auto Wrecker	\$1,382.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,427.86	\$1,428.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,472.12	\$1,472.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Balloon and Kite Advertising	\$83.00	100%	3.31%	\$85.63	\$86.00	100%	3.10%	\$88.29	\$88.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Bingo Game	\$333.00	100%	3.31%	\$343.84	\$344.00	100%	3.10%	\$354.50	\$354.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Charitable Organizations - Certificate of Registration - Sales Solicitations	\$168.00	100%	3.31%	\$173.79	\$174.00	100%	3.10%	\$179.18	\$179.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Charitable Organizations - Certificate of Registration - Non-Sales Solicitations	\$128.00	100%	3.31%	\$132.54	\$133.00	100%	3.10%	\$136.64	\$137.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Charitable Organizations - Certificate of Registration - Document Copies	\$33.00	100%	3.31%	\$33.76	\$34.00	100%	3.10%	\$34.81	\$35.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Charitable Organizations - Certificate of Registration - ID Card	\$33.00	100%	3.31%	\$33.76	\$34.00	100%	3.10%	\$34.81	\$35.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Commercial Parking (garage or lot)	\$943.00	100%	3.31%	\$973.99	\$974.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,004.19	\$1,004.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Dealer in Firearms and/or Ammunition	\$1,650.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,704.19	\$1,704.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,757.02	\$1,757.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Dealer in Firearms and/or Ammunition - Renewal	\$471.00	100%	3.31%	\$486.37	\$486.00	100%	3.10%	\$501.45	\$501.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Discharge of Cannon	\$822.00	100%	3.31%	\$848.97	\$849.00	100%	3.10%	\$875.29	\$875.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Driverless Auto Rental	\$1,343.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,387.85	\$1,388.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,430.88	\$1,431.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Encounter Studio - Owner	\$1,150.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,187.80	\$1,188.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,224.62	\$1,225.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Encounter Studio - Employee	\$320.00	100%	3.31%	\$330.08	\$330.00	100%	3.10%	\$340.31	\$340.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Escort Service - Owner	\$1,262.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,304.09	\$1,304.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,344.51	\$1,345.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Escort Service - Employee	\$482.00	100%	3.31%	\$497.63	\$498.00	100%	3.10%	\$513.05	\$513.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Fortuneteller	\$82.00	100%	3.31%	\$85.03	\$85.00	100%	3.10%	\$87.66	\$88.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Funeral Procession Escort	\$468.00	100%	3.31%	\$483.87	\$484.00	100%	3.10%	\$498.87	\$499.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Funeral Procession Escort - Employee	\$72.00	100%	3.31%	\$74.46	\$74.00	100%	3.10%	\$76.77	\$77.00	100%

Police Department - Permits and Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Junk Dealer - Junk Yard	\$1,756.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,814.21	\$1,814.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,870.45	\$1,870.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Junk Dealer - Without Junk Yard	\$992.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,025.25	\$1,025.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,057.04	\$1,057.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Licensed Tour Guide: Owner - Walking	\$454.00	100%	3.31%	\$468.93	\$469.00	100%	3.10%	\$483.47	\$483.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Licensed Tour Guide: Owner - Buses	\$1,138.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,175.30	\$1,175.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,211.74	\$1,212.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Licensed Tour Guide: Owner - Bicycle/Segway/Other Mechanism	\$563.00	100%	3.31%	\$581.71	\$582.00	100%	3.10%	\$599.75	\$600.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Licensed Tour Guide: Employee	\$133.00	100%	3.31%	\$137.71	\$138.00	100%	3.10%	\$141.98	\$142.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Horse Drawn Vehicle	\$1,089.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,124.89	\$1,125.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,159.76	\$1,160.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Miniature Golf Course	\$736.00	100%	3.31%	\$760.45	\$760.00	100%	3.10%	\$784.03	\$784.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Mobile Caterer	\$1,412.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,458.39	\$1,458.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,503.60	\$1,504.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Mobile Caterer - Additional Stop	\$332.00	100%	3.31%	\$343.23	\$343.00	100%	3.10%	\$353.87	\$354.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Mobile Caterer - Assistant	\$414.00	100%	3.31%	\$427.37	\$427.00	100%	3.10%	\$440.61	\$441.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Mobile Caterer - Transfer of Stop	\$1,060.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,095.12	\$1,095.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,129.07	\$1,129.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Museum	\$834.00	100%	3.31%	\$861.41	\$861.00	100%	3.10%	\$888.11	\$888.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Nude Models in Public Photographic Studio - Owner	\$1,116.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,152.79	\$1,153.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,188.53	\$1,189.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Nude Models in Public Photographic Studio - Employee	\$320.00	100%	3.31%	\$330.08	\$330.00	100%	3.10%	\$340.31	\$340.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Off-Heliport Landing Site	\$862.00	100%	3.31%	\$890.23	\$890.00	100%	3.10%	\$917.82	\$918.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Outcall Massage	\$597.00	100%	3.31%	\$617.01	\$617.00	100%	3.10%	\$636.14	\$636.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Pawnbroker	\$1,196.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,235.31	\$1,235.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,273.61	\$1,274.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Peddler - Food for Human Consumption	\$1,065.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,100.47	\$1,100.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,134.58	\$1,135.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Peddler - Nonfood	\$661.00	100%	3.31%	\$682.67	\$683.00	100%	3.10%	\$703.83	\$704.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Peddler - Employee	\$208.00	100%	3.31%	\$215.06	\$215.00	100%	3.10%	\$221.72	\$222.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Pedicab Driver	\$213.00	100%	3.31%	\$220.05	\$220.00	100%	3.10%	\$226.88	\$227.00	100%

Police Department - Permits and Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Pedicab Owner - First Pedicab	\$576.00	100%	3.31%	\$595.15	\$595.00	100%	3.10%	\$613.60	\$614.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Pedicab Owner - Each Additional Pedicab	\$208.00	100%	3.31%	\$215.06	\$215.00	100%	3.10%	\$221.72	\$222.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Photographer, Public Place - Owner	\$819.00	100%	3.31%	\$846.47	\$846.00	100%	3.10%	\$872.71	\$873.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Photographer, Public Place - Solicitor	\$536.00	100%	3.31%	\$553.89	\$554.00	100%	3.10%	\$571.06	\$571.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Photographic Solicitor - Owner	\$819.00	100%	3.31%	\$846.47	\$846.00	100%	3.10%	\$872.71	\$873.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Photographic Solicitor - Employee	\$293.00	100%	3.31%	\$302.57	\$303.00	100%	3.10%	\$311.95	\$312.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Poker	\$1,628.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,681.42	\$1,681.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,733.54	\$1,734.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Poker - Permit Amendment	\$332.00	100%	3.31%	\$343.23	\$343.00	100%	3.10%	\$353.87	\$354.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Public Bathhouse	\$1,779.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,838.34	\$1,838.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,895.33	\$1,895.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Public Outcry Sales	\$1,466.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,514.13	\$1,514.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,561.07	\$1,561.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Recreational Equipment Vendor	\$520.00	100%	3.31%	\$536.73	\$537.00	100%	3.10%	\$553.37	\$553.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Second Hand Dealer	\$247.00	100%	3.31%	\$255.06	\$255.00	100%	3.10%	\$262.97	\$263.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Second Hand Dealer - Auto Accessories	\$1,389.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,435.36	\$1,435.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,479.86	\$1,480.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Shooting Gallery	\$1,145.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,182.80	\$1,183.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,219.47	\$1,219.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Skating Rink	\$877.00	100%	3.31%	\$906.15	\$906.00	100%	3.10%	\$934.25	\$934.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Tow Car driver	\$737.00	100%	3.31%	\$761.44	\$761.00	100%	3.10%	\$785.05	\$785.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Tow Car Firm	\$1,309.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,352.84	\$1,353.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,394.78	\$1,395.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Trade-In Dealer	\$1,343.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,387.85	\$1,388.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,430.88	\$1,431.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Valet Parking - Fixed Location	\$1,145.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,182.80	\$1,183.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,219.47	\$1,219.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Valet Parking - Annual Special Event	\$1,145.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,182.80	\$1,183.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,219.47	\$1,219.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Vehicle for Hire, Nonmotorized	\$1,214.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,253.79	\$1,254.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,292.66	\$1,293.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Advertising and notices	\$208.00	100%	3.31%	\$214.72	\$215.00	100%	3.10%	\$221.37	\$221.00	100%

Police Department - Permits and Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Backgrounds	\$85.00	100%	3.31%	\$87.52	\$88.00	100%	3.10%	\$90.23	\$90.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Fingerprints	\$112.00	100%	3.31%	\$116.21	\$116.00	100%	3.10%	\$119.81	\$120.00	100%
Annual License Fees											
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Auto Wrecker	\$662.00	100%	3.31%	\$684.41	\$684.00	100%	3.10%	\$705.63	\$706.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Dealer in Firearms and/or Ammunition	\$618.00	100%	3.31%	\$638.91	\$639.00	100%	3.10%	\$658.72	\$659.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Discharge of Cannon (per day)	\$112.00	100%	3.31%	\$115.67	\$116.00	100%	3.10%	\$119.25	\$119.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Driverless Auto Rental	\$618.00	100%	3.31%	\$638.91	\$639.00	100%	3.10%	\$658.72	\$659.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Encounter Studio - Owner	\$455.00	100%	3.31%	\$470.12	\$470.00	100%	3.10%	\$484.69	\$485.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Encounter Studio - Employee	\$113.00	100%	3.31%	\$116.28	\$116.00	100%	3.10%	\$119.89	\$120.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Escort Service - Owner	\$691.00	100%	3.31%	\$713.93	\$714.00	100%	3.10%	\$736.06	\$736.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Escort Service - Employee	\$123.00	100%	3.31%	\$127.54	\$128.00	100%	3.10%	\$131.49	\$131.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	General Soliciting Agent	\$698.00	100%	3.31%	\$721.43	\$721.00	100%	3.10%	\$743.80	\$744.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Licensed Tour Guide: Owner - Buses (per vehicle)	\$1,202.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,242.29	\$1,242.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,280.80	\$1,281.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Licensed Tour Guide: Owner - Other Motorized Vehicles (per vehicle)	\$242.00	100%	3.31%	\$249.86	\$250.00	100%	3.10%	\$257.61	\$258.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Licensed Tour Guide: Owner - Bicycle/Segway/Other (per mechanism)	\$242.00	100%	3.31%	\$249.86	\$250.00	100%	3.10%	\$257.61	\$258.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Licensed Tour Guide: Owner - Walking	\$242.00	100%	3.31%	\$249.86	\$250.00	100%	3.10%	\$257.61	\$258.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Miniature Golf Course	\$255.00	100%	3.31%	\$263.92	\$264.00	100%	3.10%	\$272.10	\$272.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Mobile Caterer	\$898.00	100%	3.31%	\$928.18	\$928.00	100%	3.10%	\$956.96	\$957.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Mobile Caterer - Assistant	\$63.00	100%	3.31%	\$65.44	\$65.00	100%	3.10%	\$67.47	\$67.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Museum	\$160.00	100%	3.31%	\$165.04	\$165.00	100%	3.10%	\$170.16	\$170.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Nude Models in Public Photographic Studio - Owner	\$662.00	100%	3.31%	\$684.41	\$684.00	100%	3.10%	\$705.63	\$706.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Nude Models in Public Photographic Studio - Employee	\$163.00	100%	3.31%	\$168.07	\$168.00	100%	3.10%	\$173.28	\$173.00	100%

Police Department - Permits and Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Off-Heliport Landing Site (per day)	\$98.00	100%	3.31%	\$101.61	\$102.00	100%	3.10%	\$104.76	\$105.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Pawnbroker	\$721.00	100%	3.31%	\$745.19	\$745.00	100%	3.10%	\$768.29	\$768.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Peddler - Food for Human Consumption	\$966.00	100%	3.31%	\$997.63	\$998.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,028.56	\$1,029.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Peddler - Nonfood	\$258.00	100%	3.31%	\$266.32	\$266.00	100%	3.10%	\$274.57	\$275.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Peddler - Employee	\$105.00	100%	3.31%	\$108.18	\$108.00	100%	3.10%	\$111.53	\$112.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Pedicab Driver	\$82.00	100%	3.31%	\$84.99	\$85.00	100%	3.10%	\$87.63	\$88.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Photographer, Public Place - Owner	\$309.00	100%	3.31%	\$318.88	\$319.00	100%	3.10%	\$328.76	\$329.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Photographer, Public Place - Solicitor	\$150.00	100%	3.31%	\$155.29	\$155.00	100%	3.10%	\$160.10	\$160.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Photographic Solicitor - Owner	\$259.00	100%	3.31%	\$267.76	\$268.00	100%	3.10%	\$276.06	\$276.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Photographic Solicitor - Employee	\$150.00	100%	3.31%	\$155.29	\$155.00	100%	3.10%	\$160.10	\$160.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Poker	\$442.00	100%	3.31%	\$456.91	\$457.00	100%	3.10%	\$471.08	\$471.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Public Bathhouse	\$598.00	100%	3.31%	\$617.95	\$618.00	100%	3.10%	\$637.11	\$637.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Public Outcry Sales	\$419.00	100%	3.31%	\$432.63	\$433.00	100%	3.10%	\$446.04	\$446.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Recreational Equipment Vendor	\$436.00	100%	3.31%	\$450.52	\$451.00	100%	3.10%	\$464.49	\$464.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Tow Car driver	\$93.00	100%	3.31%	\$96.49	\$96.00	100%	3.10%	\$99.49	\$99.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Tow Car Firm - First Tow Truck	\$737.00	100%	3.31%	\$761.09	\$761.00	100%	3.10%	\$784.69	\$785.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Tow Car Firm - Each Additional Truck	\$289.00	100%	3.31%	\$299.07	\$299.00	100%	3.10%	\$308.34	\$308.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Trade-In Dealer	\$820.00	100%	3.31%	\$846.72	\$847.00	100%	3.10%	\$872.97	\$873.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Valet Parking - Fixed Location	\$384.00	100%	3.31%	\$396.84	\$397.00	100%	3.10%	\$409.14	\$409.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Valet Parking - Annual Special Event	\$259.00	100%	3.31%	\$267.76	\$268.00	100%	3.10%	\$276.06	\$276.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Vehicle for Hire, Nonmotorized	\$259.00	100%	3.31%	\$267.76	\$268.00	100%	3.10%	\$276.06	\$276.00	100%

City Administrator - Entertainment Commission - Permits and Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
				3.31%				3.10%			
Permit Filing Fees											
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Fixed Place Outdoor Amplified Sound	\$1,777.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,835.30	\$1,835.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,892.20	\$1,892.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Fixed Place Outdoor Amplified Sound - Amendment to Permit	\$853.00	<100%	3.31%	\$880.95	\$881.00	<100%	3.10%	\$908.25	\$908.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	One Time Indoor or Outdoor Entertainment Event	\$470.00	<100%	3.31%	\$485.82	\$486.00	<100%	3.10%	\$500.88	\$501.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	One time Outdoor Amplified Sound (Up to 4 hrs)	\$455.00	<100%	3.31%	\$469.62	\$470.00	<100%	3.10%	\$484.18	\$484.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	One time Outdoor Amplified Sound - Each additional hour	\$78.00	<100%	3.31%	\$80.97	\$81.00	<100%	3.10%	\$83.48	\$83.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Sound Monitoring Fee	\$62.00	<100%	3.31%	\$63.70	\$64.00	<100%	3.10%	\$65.67	\$66.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Sound Truck (per 12-hr day)	\$455.00	<100%	3.31%	\$469.62	\$470.00	<100%	3.10%	\$484.18	\$484.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Permit Amendment (unless otherwise specified)	\$323.00	100%	3.31%	\$333.60	\$334.00	<100%	3.10%	\$343.94	\$344.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Billiard Parlor	\$723.00	<100%	3.31%	\$746.73	\$747.00	<100%	3.10%	\$769.88	\$770.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Dance Hall Keeper	\$2,221.00	<100%	3.31%	\$2,294.80	\$2,295.00	<100%	3.10%	\$2,365.94	\$2,366.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Dance Hall - Amendment to Permit	\$1,047.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,081.51	\$1,082.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,115.04	\$1,115.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Dance Hall - One Night Dance	\$63.00	<100%	3.31%	\$65.29	\$65.00	<100%	3.10%	\$67.32	\$67.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Extended Hours Permit	\$2,172.00	<100%	3.31%	\$2,243.76	\$2,244.00	<100%	3.10%	\$2,313.31	\$2,313.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Extended Hours Permit - Amendment to Permit	\$1,047.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,081.51	\$1,082.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,115.04	\$1,115.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Itinerant Show	\$1,079.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,114.76	\$1,115.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,149.31	\$1,149.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Itinerant Show/Nonprofit (Article 15 Sec.1017.2)	\$160.00	<100%	3.31%	\$165.02	\$165.00	<100%	3.10%	\$170.13	\$170.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Limited Live Performance	\$491.00	<100%	3.31%	\$506.92	\$507.00	<100%	3.10%	\$522.64	\$523.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Limited Live Performance - Amendment to Permit	\$164.00	<100%	3.31%	\$169.77	\$170.00	<100%	3.10%	\$175.03	\$175.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Masked Ball	\$1,235.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,276.21	\$1,276.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,315.77	\$1,316.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Mechanical Amusement Devices	\$901.00	<100%	3.31%	\$930.74	\$931.00	<100%	3.10%	\$959.60	\$960.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Mechanical Contrivance	\$901.00	<100%	3.31%	\$930.74	\$931.00	<100%	3.10%	\$959.60	\$960.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Place of Entertainment	\$2,172.00	<100%	3.31%	\$2,243.76	\$2,244.00	<100%	3.10%	\$2,313.31	\$2,313.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Place of Entertainment - Amendment to Permit	\$1,047.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,081.51	\$1,082.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,115.04	\$1,115.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26	Rodeo Exhibition/Wild West Show	\$1,032.00	<100%	3.31%	\$1,066.08	\$1,066.00	<100%	3.10%	\$1,099.13	\$1,099.00	<100%

City Administrator - Entertainment Commission - Permits and Services

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Annual License Fees											
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Fixed Place Outdoor Amplified Sound	\$593.00	100%	3.31%	\$612.13	\$612.00	100%	3.10%	\$631.10	\$631.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Billiard Parlor - First Table	\$197.00	100%	3.31%	\$203.01	\$203.00	100%	3.10%	\$209.30	\$209.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Billiard Parlor - Each Additional Table	\$18.00	100%	3.31%	\$18.99	\$19.00	100%	3.10%	\$19.58	\$20.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Dance Hall Keeper	\$554.00	100%	3.31%	\$572.22	\$572.00	100%	3.10%	\$589.96	\$590.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Extended Hours Permit	\$656.00	100%	3.31%	\$677.88	\$678.00	100%	3.10%	\$698.89	\$699.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Limited Live Performance	\$194.00	100%	3.31%	\$200.63	\$201.00	100%	3.10%	\$206.85	\$207.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Masked Ball (per day)	\$313.00	100%	3.31%	\$322.91	\$323.00	100%	3.10%	\$332.92	\$333.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Mechanical Amusement Devices - First Machine	\$372.00	100%	3.31%	\$384.64	\$385.00	100%	3.10%	\$396.57	\$397.00	100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27	Place of Entertainment	\$632.00	100%	3.31%	\$652.94	\$653.00	100%	3.10%	\$673.19	\$673.00	100%

Municipal Transportation Agency - Taxi Permit Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Approved by MTA Board of Directors)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Approved by MTA Board of Directors)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Approved by MTA Board of Directors)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Driver Permit Application							
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Driver Permit Application	N/A		N/A		N/A	
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Monthly Ramp Taxi Medallion Use Fee	N/A		N/A		N/A	
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Monthly Taxi Medallion Use Fee (8000 Series)	\$1,000.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Taxicab Radio Dispatch Service	\$7,326.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Color Scheme Change	\$491.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Lost Medallion	\$129.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme New 1-5 medallions	\$3,269.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme New 6-15 medallions	\$3,646.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme New 16-49 medallions	\$6,826.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.26.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme New 50 or more medallions	\$8,528.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Driver Renewal							
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Driver Renewal	\$127.00	<100%		<100%		<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Medallion Holder Renewal	NA		NA		NA	
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Medallion Holder Renewal for Pre-K Medallions and Pre-K Corporate Medallions	\$1,227.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Medallion Holder Renewal for Post-K Medallions	\$614.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme Permit 1-5 medallions	\$1,107.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme Permit 6-15 medallions	\$2,549.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme Permit 16-49 medallions	\$5,841.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme Permit 50-149 medallions	\$8,761.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Motor Vehicle for Hire-Color Scheme Permit over 150 medallions	\$11,681.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%
Police Code Article 1 Sec 2.27.1	Dispatch Renewal	\$8,094.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%	\$0.00	<100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Health

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Massage Practitioner Fees – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 1, Section 35, and Health Code Article 29, Section 29.42 authorizes the Controller to adjust the Massage Practitioner Fees as appropriate to ensure that the program recovers the costs of operation without producing revenue which is significantly more than such costs. The Controller can make such fee adjustments without further action by the Board of Supervisors. If applicable, adjusted rates become operative on July 1, 2020 for Fiscal Year 2020-21 and July 1, 2021 for Fiscal Year 2021-22. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Health, Chief Fiscal Officer

Department of Public Health - Massage Practitioner Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.40	Massage Practitioner Application Fee	\$191.00	<100%	\$ 210.30	\$210.00	<100%	\$ 231.33	\$231.00	<100%
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.40	Massage Practitioner Annual License Fee	\$155.00	<100%	\$ 170.21	\$170.00	<100%	\$ 187.23	\$187.00	<100%
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.41 (a)	Massage Establishment Application Fee	\$892.00	<100%	\$ 980.95	\$981.00	<100%	\$ 1,079.04	\$1,079.00	<100%
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.41 (a)	Massage Establishment Annual License Fee	\$1,528.00	<100%	\$ 1,680.57	\$1,681.00	<100%	\$ 1,848.63	\$1,849.00	<100%
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.41 (b)	Solo Practitioner Massage Establishment Application Fee	\$635.00	<100%	\$ 699.04	\$699.00	<100%	\$ 768.95	\$769.00	<100%
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.41 (b)	Solo Practitioner Massage Establishment Annual License Fee	\$754.00	<100%	\$ 829.53	\$830.00	<100%	\$ 912.49	\$912.00	<100%
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.41 (c)	Outcall Massage Services Permit Application Fee	\$471.00	<100%	\$ 517.76	\$518.00	<100%	\$ 569.53	\$570.00	<100%
Health Code Article 29 Sec 29.41 (c)	Outcall Massage Services Annual License Fee	\$385.00	<100%	\$ 423.64	\$424.00	<100%	\$ 466.01	\$466.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 1Sec 35 (f)	Environmental Health Inspection Services, Permit Review and Training Services Fee	\$206.00	<100%	\$ 212.50	\$212.00	<100%	\$ 219.08	\$219.00	<100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Health

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Department of Public Health – Application, Permit and Ambulance Fees

The San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 1, Section 35(h), Article 2, Section 249.1(c), Article 2, Section 76.1(c), and Health Code Article 11, Section 609.2 authorize the Controller to adjust Department of Public Health application, permit fees, private ambulance and EMS/EMT fees for the upcoming fiscal year as appropriate to ensure that the programs recover the costs of operation without producing revenue that is significantly more than such costs. Adjusted rates become operative on July 1, 2020 for Fiscal Year 2020-21 and July 1, 2021 for Fiscal Year 2021-22. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedules

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Health Chief Fiscal Officers

Department of Public Health - Food, Waste, Events

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 1, Section 35	CP APPLICATION FEE	\$357.00	100%	\$368.37	\$368.00	100%	\$379.79	\$380.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 1, Section 35	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH INSPECTOR - INSPECTION SERVICES, PERMIT REVIEW, OR TRAINING SERVICES (hourly rate)	\$206.00	100%	\$212.50	\$212.00	100%	\$219.08	\$219.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 1, Section 35	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECHNICIAN - INSPECTION SERVICES, PERMIT REVIEW, OR TRAINING SERVICES (class fee)	\$191.00	100%	\$197.32	\$197.00	100%	\$203.44	\$203.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 1, Section 35	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TECHNICIAN - INSPECTION SERVICES, PERMIT REVIEW, OR TRAINING SERVICES - AFTER HOURS (hourly rate)	\$191.00	100%	\$197.32	\$197.00	<100%	\$203.44	\$203.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 120	WASH LAUNDRIES	\$239.00	100%	\$247.10	\$247.00	100%	\$254.76	\$255.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 120	AUTOMATIC LAUNDRY - FACILITIES	\$50.00	100%	\$51.27	\$51.00	100%	\$52.86	\$53.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 120	AUTOMATIC LAUNDRY - PER MACHINE	\$14.00	100%	\$13.95	\$14.00	100%	\$14.38	\$14.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS A-1: RETAIL MKTS W/O PREP - UNDER 5,001	\$696.00	100%	\$719.30	\$719.00	100%	\$741.60	\$742.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS A-2: RETAIL MKTS W/O PREP 5,001 - 10,000	\$910.00	100%	\$940.56	\$941.00	100%	\$969.72	\$970.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS A-3: RETAIL MKTS W/O PREP 10,001 - 20,000	\$1,133.00	100%	\$1,170.48	\$1,170.00	100%	\$1,206.77	\$1,207.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS A-4: RETAIL MKTS W/O PREP - OVER 20,000	\$1,373.00	100%	\$1,418.94	\$1,419.00	100%	\$1,462.92	\$1,463.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS B-1: RETAIL MKTS W PREP - UNDER 5,001	\$745.00	100%	\$769.75	\$770.00	100%	\$793.61	\$794.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS B-2: RETAIL MKTS W PREP - 5,001 - 10,000	\$966.00	100%	\$997.53	\$998.00	100%	\$1,028.45	\$1,028.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS B-3 RETAIL MKTS W PREP - 10,001 - 20,000	\$1,174.00	100%	\$1,212.50	\$1,212.00	100%	\$1,250.09	\$1,250.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS B-4: RETAIL MKTS - OVER 20,000 ("Supermarket") w/ 1 Food Prep Station	\$1,328.00	100%	\$1,372.14	\$1,372.00	100%	\$1,414.67	\$1,415.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS B-4: RETAIL MKTS - OVER 20,000 ("Supermarket") w/ 2-3 Food Prep Station	\$1,494.00	100%	\$1,543.66	\$1,544.00	100%	\$1,591.52	\$1,592.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS B-4: RETAIL MKTS - OVER 20,000 ("Supermarket") w/ 4+ Food Prep Station	\$1,660.00	100%	\$1,715.17	\$1,715.00	100%	\$1,768.34	\$1,768.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS C: RETAIL BAKERIES - Without Food Prep	\$809.00	100%	\$835.94	\$836.00	100%	\$861.85	\$862.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS C: RETAIL BAKERIES - With Food Prep	\$1,387.00	100%	\$1,433.06	\$1,433.00	100%	\$1,477.48	\$1,477.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS E: CERTIFIED FARMERS MARKETS	\$1,117.00	100%	\$1,154.08	\$1,154.00	100%	\$1,189.86	\$1,190.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS F: WHOLESALE FOOD MARKETS with Retail	\$745.00	100%	\$769.75	\$770.00	100%	\$793.61	\$794.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS G: FOOD MANUFACT / PROCESSING	\$768.00	100%	\$793.64	\$794.00	100%	\$818.24	\$818.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 248	CLASS H: More than \$1000 INVENTORY	Refer to Class A	100%	Refer to Class A	Refer to Class A	100%	Refer to Class A	Refer to Class A	100%

Department of Public Health - Food, Waste, Events

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class A. RESTAURANTS - UNDER 1,000 SQ FT	\$945.00	100%	\$976.41	\$976.00	100%	\$1,006.68	\$1,007.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class A. RESTAURANTS - 1,000 - 2,000 SQ FT	\$1,245.00	100%	\$1,286.68	\$1,287.00	100%	\$1,326.56	\$1,327.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class A. RESTAURANTS - OVER 2,000 SQ FT	\$1,426.00	100%	\$1,473.33	\$1,473.00	100%	\$1,519.00	\$1,519.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class B. BARS / TAVERNS - Without Food Prep	\$806.00	100%	\$833.17	\$833.00	100%	\$859.00	\$859.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class B. BARS / TAVERNS - With Food Prep	\$1,022.00	100%	\$1,055.35	\$1,055.00	100%	\$1,088.07	\$1,088.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class C. TAKE-OUTS	\$1,131.00	100%	\$1,168.01	\$1,168.00	100%	\$1,204.22	\$1,204.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class D. FAST FOOD OUTLETS	\$1,279.00	100%	\$1,321.28	\$1,321.00	100%	\$1,362.24	\$1,362.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class E. CATERING FACILITIES - No Cooking	\$618.00	100%	\$638.46	\$638.00	100%	\$658.25	\$658.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class E. CATERING FACILITIES - Cooking	\$1,102.00	100%	\$1,138.34	\$1,138.00	100%	\$1,173.63	\$1,174.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class F. TEMPORARY FACILITIES	\$189.00	100%	\$195.19	\$195.00	100%	\$201.24	\$201.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class G. COMMISSARIES - Commissary for Mobile Food Facility servicing	\$618.00	100%	\$638.46	\$638.00	100%	\$658.25	\$658.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class G. COMMISSARIES - Commissary for cooking	\$1,073.00	100%	\$1,108.67	\$1,109.00	100%	\$1,143.04	\$1,143.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class G. COMMISSARIES - Cooking school	\$618.00	100%	\$638.46	\$638.00	100%	\$658.25	\$658.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class G. COMMISSARIES - Limited service charitable feeding operation	\$0.00	100%	\$0.00	\$0.00	100%	\$0.00	\$0.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class G. COMMISSARIES - Host facility	\$824.00	100%	\$851.27	\$851.00	100%	\$877.66	\$878.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class G. COMMISSARIES - Shared Kitchen Complex, less than 2,000 square feet	\$824.00	100%	\$851.27	\$851.00	100%	\$877.66	\$878.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class G. COMMISSARIES - Shared Kitchen Complex, 2,000 square feet or more	\$1,030.00	100%	\$1,064.09	\$1,064.00	100%	\$1,097.08	\$1,097.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class H-1. MOBILE FOOD FACILITY 1	\$209.00	100%	\$216.16	\$216.00	100%	\$222.86	\$223.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class H-2. MOBILE FOOD FACILITY 2	\$209.00	100%	\$216.16	\$216.00	100%	\$222.86	\$223.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class H-3. MOBILE FOOD FACILITY 3	\$209.00	100%	\$216.16	\$216.00	100%	\$222.86	\$223.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class H-4. MOBILE FOOD FACILITY 4	\$837.00	100%	\$864.61	\$865.00	100%	\$891.41	\$891.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class H-5. MOBILE FOOD FACILITY 5	\$837.00	100%	\$864.61	\$865.00	100%	\$891.41	\$891.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class I. STADIUM CONCESSIONS (PERM)	\$763.00	100%	\$788.51	\$789.00	100%	\$812.95	\$813.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class J. VENDING MACHINES - Base Fee	\$227.00	100%	\$234.75	\$235.00	100%	\$242.02	\$242.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class K. BED AND BREAKFAST	\$1,211.00	100%	\$1,250.82	\$1,251.00	100%	\$1,289.60	\$1,290.00	100%

Department of Public Health - Food, Waste, Events

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class L. BOARDING HOUSES	\$304.00	100%	\$313.85	\$314.00	100%	\$323.58	\$324.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class M. SCHOOL CAFETERIAS (PRIVATE/wo Prep)	\$367.00	100%	\$379.38	\$379.00	100%	\$391.14	\$391.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class M. SCHOOL CAFETERIAS (PRIVATE/w Prep)	\$567.00	100%	\$585.59	\$586.00	100%	\$603.74	\$604.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class N. HOSPITAL KITCHENS	\$1,140.00	100%	\$1,178.71	\$1,178.00	100%	\$1,215.25	\$1,215.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class O. LICENSED HEALTH CARE FACILITY	\$1,258.00	100%	\$1,299.15	\$1,299.00	100%	\$1,339.42	\$1,339.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class P. CATERER	\$405.00	100%	\$418.13	\$418.00	100%	\$431.09	\$431.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class Q. EMPLOYEE CAFETERIAS (w/ only limited Food Prep)	\$719.00	100%	\$743.24	\$743.00	100%	\$766.28	\$766.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.1	Class Q. EMPLOYEE CAFETERIAS (with Food Prep)	\$1,107.00	100%	\$1,143.45	\$1,143.00	100%	\$1,178.89	\$1,179.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.6	GARBAGE TRUCK, PER VEHICLE	\$2,987.00	<100%	\$3,085.47	\$3,085.00	<100%	\$3,181.12	\$3,181.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.11	SPECIAL EVENT PERMIT APPLICATION - EVENT SPONSOR	\$160.00	100%	\$165.19	\$165.00	100%	\$170.31	\$170.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.11	SPECIAL EVENT PERMIT APPLICATION - FOOD OPERATOR LOW IN POTENTIAL HAZARD	\$44.00	100%	\$45.61	\$46.00	100%	\$47.03	\$47.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.11	SPECIAL EVENT PERMIT APPLICATION - FOOD OPERATOR HIGH IN POTENTIAL HAZARD	\$115.00	100%	\$118.54	\$119.00	100%	\$122.21	\$122.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.11	PERMIT FEE, LOW IN POTENTIAL HAZARD, PER LOCATION, UP TO 2 DAYS	\$66.00	100%	\$67.86	\$68.00	100%	\$69.97	\$70.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.11	PERMIT FEE, LOW IN POTENTIAL HAZARD, PER LOCATION, EACH ADDITIONAL DAY	\$30.00	100%	\$30.78	\$31.00	100%	\$31.73	\$32.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.11	PERMIT FEE, HIGH IN POTENTIAL HAZARD, PER LOCATION, UP TO 2 DAYS	\$102.00	100%	\$104.95	\$105.00	100%	\$108.20	\$108.00	100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.11	PERMIT FEE, HIGH IN POTENTIAL HAZARD, PER LOCATION, EACH ADDITIONAL DAY	\$44.00	100%	\$45.62	\$46.00	100%	\$47.04	\$47.00	100%
Health Code Article 19H Sec 19H.7	TOBACCO SALES APPLICATION FEE	\$100.00	<100%	\$110.78	\$110.00	<100%	\$114.21	\$114.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulation Code Article 2 Sec. 249.16	TOBACCO SALES - ANNUAL LICENSING FEE	\$382.00	<100%	\$420.89	\$420.00	<100%	\$433.94	\$433.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Section 249.21	FOOD FACILITY SURCHARGE	\$293.00	<100%	\$303.06	\$303.00	<100%	\$312.45	\$312.00	<100%
Health Code Article 22A Sec. 22A.19	HAZARDOUS WASTE SOIL TESTING FEE-INITIAL FEE	\$783.00	<100%	\$808.92	\$809.00	<100%	\$833.99	\$834.00	<100%
Health Code Article 22A Sec. 22A.19	HAZARDOUS WASTE SOIL TESTING FEE-HOURLY RATE (EXCEEDING THREE HOURS)	\$261.00	<100%	\$269.64	\$270.00	<100%	\$278.00	\$278.00	<100%
Health Code Article 11, Section 609.1	REINSPECTION FEE EATING PLACES, PER HOUR	\$206.00	100%	\$212.50	\$212.00	100%	\$219.08	\$219.00	100%
Health Code Article 11, Section 609.1	REINSPECTION FEE FOOD, BEV, & HUMAN CONS., PER HOUR	\$206.00	100%	\$212.50	\$212.00	100%	\$219.08	\$219.00	100%
Health Code Article 11, Section 609.1	REINSPECTION FEE MISC, PER HOUR	\$206.00	100%	\$212.50	\$212.00	100%	\$219.08	\$219.00	100%
Health Code Article 11, Section 609.1	REINSPECTION FEE MISC., PER HOUR	\$206.00	100%	\$212.50	\$212.00	100%	\$219.08	\$219.00	100%

Department of Public Health - Swimming Pools, Wells, Backflow

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.7	SWIMMING POOLS - SIX-MONTH	\$638.00	<100%	\$ 659.47	\$659.00	<100%	\$ 679.91	\$680.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.7	SWIMMING POOLS - YEAR-ROUND	\$702.00	<100%	\$ 725.41	\$725.00	<100%	\$ 747.90	\$748.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.13	WELLS AND WELL WATER	\$80.00	<100%	\$ 82.52	\$83.00	<100%	\$ 85.08	\$85.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.14	BACKFLOW PREVENTION OR CROSS- CONNECTION CONTROL DEVICE- INITIAL APPLICATION	\$188.00	<100%	\$ 193.82	\$194.00	<100%	\$ 199.83	\$200.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.14	BACKFLOW PREVENTION OR CROSS- CONNECTION CONTROL DEVICE- TRAINING FOR CERTIFICATION	\$136.00	<100%	\$ 140.36	\$140.00	<100%	\$ 144.71	\$145.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.14	BACKFLOW PREVENTION OR CROSS- CONNECTION CONTROL DEVICE- EXAMINATION FOR CERTIFICATION	\$99.00	<100%	\$ 102.49	\$102.00	<100%	\$ 105.66	\$106.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.14	BACKFLOW PREVENTION OR CROSS- CONNECTION CONTROL DEVICE- SEALS OR TAGS (EACH)	\$13.00	<100%	\$ 13.37	\$13.00	<100%	\$ 13.78	\$14.00	<100%
Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.14	BACKFLOW PREVENTION OR CROSS- CONNECTION CONTROL DEVICE- ANNUAL LICENSE AND RECERTIFICATION	\$99.00	<100%	\$ 102.05	\$102.00	<100%	\$ 105.22	\$105.00	<100%

Department of Emergency Management - EMS Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(a)	Certificate of Operation- Initial application fee	\$ 11,802.00	<100%	\$ 12,192.88	\$ 12,193.00	<100%	\$ 12,570.86	\$ 12,571.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(a)	Certificate of Operation- Annual renewal fee	\$ 5,901.00	100%	\$ 6,096.44	\$ 6,096.00	100%	\$ 6,285.43	\$ 6,285.00	100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(b)	Annual ambulance permit fee, per vehicle	\$ 1,888.00	100%	\$ 1,950.82	\$ 1,951.00	100%	\$ 2,011.29	\$ 2,011.00	100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(c)(1)	EMS Training Program Initial Application, for Paramedic Program	\$ 2,094.00	<100%	\$ 2,163.50	\$ 2,163.00	<100%	\$ 2,230.57	\$ 2,231.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(c)(1)	EMS Training Program Initial Application, for EMT Program	\$ 1,399.00	<100%	\$ 1,445.57	\$ 1,446.00	<100%	\$ 1,490.38	\$ 1,490.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(c)(1)	EMS Training Program Initial Application, for Continuing Education Program	\$ 702.00	<100%	\$ 725.48	\$ 725.00	<100%	\$ 747.97	\$ 748.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(c)(2)	EMS Training Program Renewal, for Paramedic Program	\$ 1,050.00	<100%	\$ 1,084.99	\$ 1,085.00	<100%	\$ 1,118.62	\$ 1,119.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(c)(2)	EMS Training Program Renewal, for EMT Program	\$ 767.00	<100%	\$ 792.42	\$ 792.00	<100%	\$ 816.98	\$ 817.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(c)(2)	EMS Training Program Renewal, for Continuing Education Program	\$ 425.00	100%	\$ 439.39	\$ 439.00	100%	\$ 453.01	\$ 453.00	100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(d)(1)	Initial EMT Certificate	\$ 171.00	100%	\$ 177.05	\$ 177.00	100%	\$ 182.54	\$ 183.00	100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(d)(2)	Renewal of EMT Certificate, not including EMT-Paramedic (payable every two years beginning FY 2010-11)	\$ 126.00	<100%	\$ 130.63	\$ 131.00	<100%	\$ 134.68	\$ 135.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(d)(3)	Application for Initial EMT-Paramedic Accreditation	\$ 37.00	<100%	\$ 37.79	\$ 38.00	<100%	\$ 38.96	\$ 39.00	<100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(e)(1)	Receiving Hospital	\$ 18,000.00	100%	\$ 18,595.80	\$ 18,596.00	100%	\$ 19,172.27	\$ 19,172.00	100%
Business and Tax Regulations Code Article 2 Sec 249.8(e)(2)	STEMI Heart Attack Center	\$ 22,000.00	100%	\$ 22,728.20	\$ 22,728.00	100%	\$ 23,432.77	\$ 23,433.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Health

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Residential and Commercial Lien and Alternate Water Source Fees – Municipal Code
Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Health Code Article 6, Section 291.7(b) and Article 12C, Section 12C.7(b) authorize the Controller to adjust fees set in these sections for the upcoming fiscal year as appropriate to ensure that the programs recover the costs of operation without producing revenue that is significantly more than such costs. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Health, Chief Fiscal Officer

Department of Public Health - Commercial Lien Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Cost Recovery)	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Health Code Article 6 Sec 291.7	Residential Lien Fees for Administrative Expenses - Higher of Fee Amount or 10% of amount owed	\$112.00	100%	\$115.56	\$116.00	100%	\$119.14	\$119.00	100%
Health Code Article 6 Sec 291.7	Commercial Lien Fees for Administrative Expenses - Higher of Fee Amount or 10% of amount owed	\$163.00	100%	\$168.69	\$169.00	100%	\$173.92	\$174.00	100%
Health Code Article 12C Sec. 12C.7	Application Fee - Rainwater	\$1,664.00	<100%	\$1,830.74	\$1,831.00	<100%	\$2,013.81	\$2,014.00	<100%
Health Code Article 12C Sec. 12C.7	Application Fee - NSF 350 systems	\$2,873.00	<100%	\$3,160.26	\$3,160.00	<100%	\$3,476.29	\$3,476.00	<100%
Health Code Article 12C Sec. 12C.7	Application Fee - Foundation Drainage	\$5,424.00	<100%	\$5,966.49	\$5,966.00	<100%	\$6,563.14	\$6,563.00	<100%
Health Code Article 12C Sec. 12C.7	Application Fee - Graywater	\$5,424.00	<100%	\$5,966.49	\$5,966.00	<100%	\$6,563.14	\$6,563.00	<100%
Health Code Article 12C Sec. 12C.7	Application Fee - Black water	\$9,738.00	100%	\$10,711.70	\$10,712.00	100%	\$11,782.87	\$11,783.00	100%
Health Code Article 12C Sec. 12C.7	Application Fee - Transfer of any permit	\$247.00	100%	\$271.52	\$272.00	100%	\$298.68	\$299.00	100%
Health Code Article 12C Sec. 12C.7	Application Fee - District Scale (per hour for review/on-site inspection; applicable amount above, plus)	\$206.00	100%	\$226.26	\$226.00	100%	\$248.88	\$249.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Works

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Department of Public Works Permit Fees and Occupancy Assessments—Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Public Works Code Article 2.1, Section 2.1.2, and Article 15, Section 724.1 authorize the Controller to adjust the fees and occupancy assessment costs which are established for the permit categories and uses set forth in Sections 2.1.1, 724.1, 802, 806, and 810 to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Works and Public Health Chief Fiscal Officer

Department of Public Works - Street Permits

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (a)	Street Flower Market Permit - Annual fee	\$143.00	<100%	3.31%	147.23	\$147.00	<100%	3.10%	151.79	\$152.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (a)	Street Flower Market Permit - Inspection Fee (per sq. ft.)	\$9.00	<100%	3.31%	9.53	\$10.00	<100%	3.10%	9.83	\$10.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (b)	Tables & Chairs Permit - Renewal, no prior enforcement, annual fee	\$71.00	<100%	3.31%	73.62	\$74.00	<100%	3.10%	75.91	\$76.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (b)	Tables & Chairs Permit - Renewal, no prior enforcement, inspection fee (per sq. ft.)	\$7.00	<100%	3.31%	7.14	\$7.00	<100%	3.10%	7.37	\$7.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (b)	Tables & Chairs Permit - New, annual fee	\$144.00	<100%	3.31%	148.42	\$148.00	<100%	3.10%	153.02	\$153.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (b)	Tables & Chairs Permit - New, inspection fee (per sq. ft.)	\$8.00	<100%	3.31%	8.34	\$8.00	<100%	3.10%	8.60	\$9.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (b)	Tables & Chairs Permit - Renewal, prior enforcement action, annual fee	\$144.00	<100%	3.31%	148.42	\$148.00	<100%	3.10%	153.02	\$153.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (b)	Tables & Chairs Permit - Renewal, prior enforcement action, inspection fee (per sq. ft.)	\$9.00	<100%	3.31%	9.53	\$10.00	<100%	3.10%	9.83	\$10.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (c)	Display Merchandise Permit - Administrative fee	\$155.00	<100%	3.31%	160.30	\$160.00	<100%	3.10%	165.27	\$165.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (c)	Display Merchandise Permit - Inspection fee (per sq. ft.)	\$10.00	<100%	3.31%	10.71	\$11.00	<100%	3.10%	11.05	\$11.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (d)	Street Improvement Permit - In right-of-way	\$1,449.00	<100%	3.31%	1,497.02	\$1,497.00	<100%	3.10%	1,543.39	\$1,543.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (d)(i)	Street Improvement Permit - Sidewalk repair (per 100 sq. ft.)	\$22.00	<100%	3.31%	22.59	\$23.00	<100%	3.10%	23.29	\$23.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (e)	Special Sidewalk Permit	\$518.00	<100%	3.31%	535.43	\$535.00	<100%	3.10%	552.02	\$552.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (f)(i)	Automobile Driveway Permit - Standard	\$165.00	<100%	3.31%	170.97	\$171.00	<100%	3.10%	176.27	\$176.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (f)(ii)	Automobile Driveway Permit - Overwide	\$1,335.00	100%	3.31%	1,379.50	\$1,380.00	100%	3.10%	1,422.23	\$1,422.00	100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (g)(i)	Pipe Barrier Permit - Standard	\$1,335.00	100%	3.31%	1,379.50	\$1,380.00	100%	3.10%	1,422.23	\$1,422.00	100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (g)(ii)	Pipe Barrier Permit - Security bollard barrier	\$2,677.00	100%	3.31%	2,766.09	\$2,766.00	100%	3.10%	2,851.76	\$2,852.00	100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (h)(iii)	Automobile Driveway Permit - assessment (per sf)	\$5.00	n/a: assessment	3.31%	4.77	\$5.00	n/a: assessment	3.10%	4.92	\$5.00	n/a: assessment
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (h)(i)	Sidewalk Encroachment Permit - Standard	\$1,293.00	<100%	3.31%	1,335.58	\$1,336.00	<100%	3.10%	1,376.95	\$1,377.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (h)(ii)	Sidewalk Encroachment Permit - Underground storage tank abandonment	\$380.00	<100%	3.31%	392.97	\$393.00	<100%	3.10%	405.15	\$405.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (h)(iii)	Sidewalk Encroachment Permit -Standard (per sq. ft.)	\$5.00	n/a: assessment	3.31%	4.77	\$5.00	n/a: assessment	3.10%	4.92	\$5.00	n/a: assessment
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (h)(iii)	Sidewalk Encroachment Permit - Underground vault (right-of-way permit)	\$1,341.00	<100%	3.31%	1,385.44	\$1,385.00	<100%	3.10%	1,428.35	\$1,428.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (h)(iii)	Sidewalk Encroachment Permit - Underground vault (per sq. ft.)	\$17.00	n/a: assessment	3.31%	17.84	\$18.00	n/a: assessment	3.10%	18.40	\$18.00	n/a: assessment
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (i)(i)	Debris Box Permit - 7 Day	\$115.00	100%	3.31%	118.74	\$119.00	100%	3.10%	122.42	\$122.00	100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (i)(ii)	Debris Box Permit - Annual	\$760.00	<100%	3.31%	784.72	\$785.00	<100%	3.10%	809.03	\$809.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (j)	Street Encroachment Permit	\$5,018.00	<100%	3.31%	5,184.31	\$5,184.00	<100%	3.10%	5,344.88	\$5,345.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (k)	Commemorative Plaque Permit	\$1,601.00	<100%	3.31%	1,653.72	\$1,654.00	<100%	3.10%	1,704.94	\$1,705.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (l)	Permit associated with a Street Improvement Permit - Additional permits	\$184.00	<100%	3.31%	189.96	\$190.00	<100%	3.10%	195.85	\$196.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (m)	Permit per per subsections (d), (e) or (f) associated with a DPW Notice to Repair - per permit	\$484.00	<100%	3.31%	499.82	\$500.00	<100%	3.10%	515.30	\$515.00	<100%

Department of Public Works - Street Permits

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (n)	Permit per per subsections (e), (g) or (h)(i) associated with subdivision map approval - per permit	\$184.00	<100%	3.31%	189.96	\$190.00	<100%	3.10%	195.85	\$196.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (o)	Sidewalk width change fee	\$4,934.00	<100%	3.31%	5,097.64	\$5,098.00	<100%	3.10%	5,255.52	\$5,256.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (p)	Nighttime Work Permit	\$132.00	<100%	3.31%	136.55	\$137.00	<100%	3.10%	140.78	\$141.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (q)	Preapplication Meeting/Staff Consultation Fee (first 2 hours)	\$465.00	<100%	3.31%	480.81	\$481.00	<100%	3.10%	495.71	\$496.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (q)	Preapplication Meeting/Staff Consultation Fee (per each hour above 2 hours)	\$232.00	<100%	3.31%	239.83	\$240.00	<100%	3.10%	247.26	\$247.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (r)(i)	Autonomous Delivery Device Testing Application fee for one device	\$925.00	<100%	3.31%	955.76	\$956.00	<100%	3.10%	985.37	\$985.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (r)(i)	Autonomous Delivery Device Testing Application fee for two devices	\$1,657.00	<100%	3.31%	1,711.46	\$1,711.00	<100%	3.10%	1,764.47	\$1,764.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (r)(i)	Autonomous Delivery Device Testing Application fee for three devices	\$2,146.00	<100%	3.31%	2,217.13	\$2,217.00	<100%	3.10%	2,285.80	\$2,286.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (r)(ii)	Autonomous Delivery Device Testing - Permit extension fee for one device	\$597.00	<100%	3.31%	616.80	\$617.00	<100%	3.10%	635.91	\$636.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (r)(ii)	Autonomous Delivery Device Testing - Permit extension fee for two devices	\$1,086.00	<100%	3.31%	1,122.47	\$1,122.00	<100%	3.10%	1,157.24	\$1,157.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (r)(ii)	Autonomous Delivery Device Testing - Permit extension fee for three devices	\$1,576.00	<100%	3.31%	1,628.12	\$1,628.00	<100%	3.10%	1,678.55	\$1,679.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.1 Section 2.1.1 (r)(iii)	Autonomous Delivery Device Testing - Referrals to Department of Public Health per hour	\$205.00	<100%	3.31%	212.28	\$212.00	<100%	3.10%	218.86	\$219.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.41	Excavation project - Small - Administrative fee (per permit)	\$97.00	<100%	3.31%	99.74	\$100.00	<100%	3.10%	102.83	\$103.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.41	Excavation project - Medium - Administrative fee (per block)	\$122.00	<100%	3.31%	125.87	\$126.00	<100%	3.10%	129.77	\$130.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.41	Excavation project - Large - Administrative fee (per block)	\$162.00	<100%	3.31%	167.41	\$167.00	<100%	3.10%	172.60	\$173.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.41	Excavation project - Contractor Parking Plan Required - Plan Review	\$158.00	<100%	3.31%	163.40	\$163.00	<100%	3.10%	168.47	\$168.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.41	Excavation project - Contractor Parking Plan Required - Modification Requests	\$64.00	<100%	3.31%	65.61	\$66.00	<100%	3.10%	67.65	\$68.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.42	Excavation project - Small - Inspection fee (per permit)	\$23.00	<100%	3.31%	23.76	\$24.00	<100%	3.10%	24.50	\$25.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.42	Excavation project - Medium - Inspection fee (per day)	\$80.00	<100%	3.31%	83.12	\$83.00	<100%	3.10%	85.70	\$86.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.42	Excavation project - Large - Inspection fee (per day)	\$118.00	<100%	3.31%	122.30	\$122.00	<100%	3.10%	126.09	\$126.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 2.4 Section 2.4.42	Excavation project - Contractor Parking Plan Required - Inspection Fee	\$390.00	<100%	3.31%	402.72	\$403.00	<100%	3.10%	415.20	\$415.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.7 Section 184.78 (j)	Banner permit - Processing fee (per 20 banners)	\$95.00	<100%	3.31%	98.55	\$99.00	<100%	3.10%	101.61	\$102.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.7 Section 184.78 (k)	Banner permit - Inspection fee (per 20 banners)	\$192.00	<100%	3.31%	198.29	\$198.00	<100%	3.10%	204.44	\$204.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (a)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - New - Filing fee	\$160.00	<100%	3.31%	165.04	\$165.00	<100%	3.10%	170.16	\$170.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (a)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - New - Notification fee (per location)	\$255.00	<100%	3.31%	263.57	\$264.00	<100%	3.10%	271.74	\$272.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (a)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - New - Inspection fee (per location, up to 2 locations)	\$487.00	<100%	3.31%	503.38	\$503.00	<100%	3.10%	518.97	\$519.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (a)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - New - Inspection fee (per location more than 2 locations)	\$244.00	<100%	3.31%	251.70	\$252.00	<100%	3.10%	259.50	\$260.00	<100%

Department of Public Works - Street Permits

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (c)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - Modification - Filing fee	\$108.00	<100%	3.31%	111.62	\$112.00	<100%	3.10%	115.08	\$115.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (c)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - Modification - Notification fee (per location)	\$255.00	<100%	3.31%	263.57	\$264.00	<100%	3.10%	271.74	\$272.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (c)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - Modification - Inspection fee (per location)	\$244.00	<100%	3.31%	251.70	\$252.00	<100%	3.10%	259.50	\$260.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (d)(1)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - Renewal - Filing fee (no violations)	\$160.00	<100%	3.31%	165.04	\$165.00	<100%	3.10%	170.16	\$170.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (d)(1)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - Renewal - Additional Processing fee (violations)	\$203.00	<100%	3.31%	210.14	\$210.00	<100%	3.10%	216.65	\$217.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (d)(1)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - Renewal - Inspection fee (violations, up to 2 locations)	\$733.00	<100%	3.31%	757.42	\$757.00	<100%	3.10%	780.88	\$781.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 5.8 Section 184.83 (d)(1)	Mobile Food Facility Permit - Renewal - Inspection fee (violations, per location more than 2)	\$367.00	<100%	3.31%	378.72	\$379.00	<100%	3.10%	390.45	\$390.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.1 (a)	Temporary Occupancy of Street - Building construction (per month, per 20 linear feet)	\$20.00	<100%	3.31%	20.21	\$20.00	<100%	3.10%	20.84	\$21.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.1 (a)	Temporary Occupancy of Street - Building construction - Right-of-way assessment (per month, per 20 linear feet)	\$128.00	n/a: assessment	3.31%	131.80	\$132.00	n/a: assessment	3.10%	135.89	\$136.00	n/a: assessment
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.1 (a)(1)	Temporary Occupancy - Contractor Parking Plan Required - Plan Review	\$155.00	<100%	3.31%	160.30	\$160.00	<100%	3.10%	165.27	\$165.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.1 (a)(1)	Temporary Occupancy - Contractor Parking Plan Required - Modification Requests	\$63.00	<100%	3.31%	65.32	\$65.00	<100%	3.10%	67.35	\$67.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.1 (a)(2)	Temporary Occupancy - Contractor Parking Plan Required - Inspection Fee	\$513.00	<100%	3.31%	529.49	\$529.00	<100%	3.10%	545.89	\$546.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.1 (b)	Temporary occupancy of street - Other uses (per day)	\$74.00	100%	3.31%	76.01	\$76.00	100%	3.10%	78.37	\$78.00	100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.7	Additional Street Space - Processing New	\$518.00	<100%	3.31%	535.43	\$535.00	<100%	3.10%	552.02	\$552.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.7	Additional Street Space - Processing Renewal	\$293.00	<100%	3.31%	302.74	\$303.00	<100%	3.10%	312.12	\$312.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.8	Additional Street Space - R/W assessment (>80')	\$6.00	<100%	3.31%	5.96	\$6.00	<100%	3.10%	6.15	\$6.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 724.8	Additional Street Space - R/W assessment (80' and over)	\$15.00	<100%	3.31%	15.46	\$15.00	<100%	3.10%	15.94	\$16.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 802 & 807 (f)	In-Lieu Tree Fee	\$2,122.00	<100%	3.31%	2,192.69	\$2,193.00	<100%	3.10%	2,260.60	\$2,261.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 806 (b)(3)(A)(i)	Tree Removal Permit Application Fee – Non Construction for 1-3 trees	\$400.00	<100%	3.31%	413.14	\$413.00	<100%	3.10%	425.94	\$426.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 806 (b)(3)(A)(i)	Tree Removal Permit Application Fee – Construction Related for 1-3 trees	\$806.00	<100%	3.31%	832.23	\$832.00	<100%	3.10%	858.01	\$858.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 806 (b)(3)(A)(i)	Tree Removal Permit Application Fee – for 4-9 trees	\$1,072.00	<100%	3.31%	1,107.64	\$1,108.00	<100%	3.10%	1,141.95	\$1,142.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 806 (b)(3)(A)(i)	Tree Removal Permit Application Fee – for 10 or more trees	\$1,611.00	<100%	3.31%	1,664.41	\$1,664.00	<100%	3.10%	1,715.96	\$1,716.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 810B (c)	Sidewalk Landscape Permits - 1 property	\$296.00	<100%	3.31%	306.31	\$306.00	<100%	3.10%	315.80	\$316.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 810B (c)	Sidewalk Landscape Permits - 2-4 properties	\$255.00	<100%	3.31%	263.57	\$264.00	<100%	3.10%	271.74	\$272.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 16 Section 810B (c)	Sidewalk Landscape Permits - 5+ properties	\$221.00	<100%	3.31%	227.97	\$228.00	<100%	3.10%	235.04	\$235.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 726 (b)(1)	Mobile Storage Containers (Annual)	\$734.00	<100%	3.31%	758.62	\$759.00	<100%	3.10%	782.12	\$782.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 726 (c)(2)	Mobile Storage Containers (1 day)	\$74.00	<100%	3.31%	76.01	\$76.00	<100%	3.10%	78.37	\$78.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 726 (c)(2)	Mobile Storage Containers (2-3 days)	\$147.00	<100%	3.31%	152.00	\$152.00	<100%	3.10%	156.71	\$157.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 726 (c)(2)	Mobile Storage Containers (4+ days) for first 3 days	\$147.00	<100%	3.31%	152.00	\$152.00	<100%	3.10%	156.71	\$157.00	<100%
Public Works Code Article 15 Section 726 (c)(2)	Mobile Storage Containers (4+ days) for each additional day above 3 per container	\$74.00	<100%	3.31%	76.01	\$76.00	<100%	3.10%	78.37	\$78.00	<100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Works

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Department of Public Works Subdivision Fees—Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Subdivision Code Division 1, Article 3, Section 1315 authorizes the Controller to adjust the subdivision fees to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Works, Chief Fiscal Officer

Department of Public Works - Subdivision Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(1)	Air Space - up to four lots	\$12,094.00	100%	3.31%	12,494.18	\$12,494.00	100%	3.10%	12,881.50	\$12,882.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(1)	Air Space - each additional lot (5 or more lots)	\$704.00	100%	3.31%	727.21	\$727.00	100%	3.10%	749.75	\$750.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(2)	Lot Subdivision Final Map	\$11,867.00	100%	3.31%	12,260.30	\$12,260.00	100%	3.10%	12,640.37	\$12,640.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(3)	Condominium Conversion	\$11,725.00	100%	3.31%	12,113.33	\$12,113.00	100%	3.10%	12,488.84	\$12,489.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(4)	Parcel Map	\$10,831.00	100%	3.31%	11,189.30	\$11,189.00	100%	3.10%	11,536.17	\$11,536.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(5)	Lot Merger Re-subdivision	\$9,766.00	100%	3.31%	10,088.90	\$10,089.00	100%	3.10%	10,401.66	\$10,402.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(6)	Amended Map	\$3,804.00	100%	3.31%	3,929.99	\$3,930.00	100%	3.10%	4,051.82	\$4,052.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(7)	Lot Line Adjustment	\$3,804.00	100%	3.31%	3,929.99	\$3,930.00	100%	3.10%	4,051.82	\$4,052.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(8)	Lot Merger	\$3,631.00	100%	3.31%	3,751.07	\$3,751.00	100%	3.10%	3,867.35	\$3,867.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(9)	Certificate of Compliance	\$3,009.00	100%	3.31%	3,108.21	\$3,108.00	100%	3.10%	3,204.56	\$3,205.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(10)	Certificate of Correction	\$3,009.00	100%	3.31%	3,108.21	\$3,108.00	100%	3.10%	3,204.56	\$3,205.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(11)	Record of Survey	\$713.00	100%	3.31%	736.15	\$736.00	100%	3.10%	758.98	\$759.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (a)(12)	Survey Monument Setting	\$3,752.00	100%	3.31%	3,875.90	\$3,876.00	100%	3.10%	3,996.05	\$3,996.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (b)	Cost of Appeal under Section 1314	\$351.00	100%	3.31%	362.97	\$363.00	100%	3.10%	374.22	\$374.00	100%
Subdivision Code Division 1 Article 3 Sec 1315 (e)(2)	DBI Review Fee	\$470.00	100%	3.31%	485.66	\$486.00	100%	3.10%	500.71	\$501.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Recreation & Park Department

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Recreation & Park Fees – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Park Code Article 12, Section 12.20 authorizes the Controller to adjust the fees set in Article 12 to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code section may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Recreation & Park, Chief Fiscal Officer

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Inflation Factor for FY 2020-21 Fee Auto Increase as per Code Section						3.31%							
Inflation Factor for FY 2021-22 Fee Auto Increase as per Code Section						3.10%							
Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee		
PROGRAM - GOLF													
1	C	Harding Golf Green Fees	Sec 12.12.1a	Yes	Per Round								
		Weekday (Monday - Thursday)											
		Resident				\$ 54.34	\$ 54.00	\$ 56.14	\$ 56.00	\$ 57.88	\$ 58.00		
		Resident - Twilight				\$ 42.85	\$ 43.00	\$ 44.26	\$ 44.00	\$ 45.64	\$ 46.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 20.90	\$ 21.00	\$ 21.59	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.26	\$ 22.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 38.67	\$ 39.00	\$ 39.94	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.18	\$ 41.00		
		Tournament				\$ 130.63	\$ 131.00	\$ 134.95	\$ 135.00	\$ 139.13	\$ 139.00		
		Weekend (Friday - Sunday)											
		Resident				\$ 68.97	\$ 69.00	\$ 71.25	\$ 71.00	\$ 73.46	\$ 73.00		
		Resident - Twilight				\$ 52.25	\$ 52.00	\$ 53.98	\$ 54.00	\$ 55.65	\$ 56.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 26.13	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.99	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.83	\$ 28.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 68.97	\$ 69.00	\$ 71.25	\$ 71.00	\$ 73.46	\$ 73.00		
		Tournament				\$ 141.08	\$ 141.00	\$ 145.74	\$ 146.00	\$ 150.26	\$ 150.00		
		Same-day replay (Residents)				30% of originally purchased round							
2	C	Fleming Golf Green Fees	Sec 12.12.2	Yes	Per Round								
		Weekday (Monday - Friday noon)											
		Resident				\$ 22.99	\$ 23.00	\$ 23.75	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.49	\$ 24.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 12.54	\$ 13.00	\$ 12.96	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.36	\$ 13.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 16.72	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.27	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.81	\$ 18.00		
		Tournament				\$ 33.44	\$ 33.00	\$ 34.55	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.62	\$ 36.00		
		Weekend (Friday noon - Sunday)											
		Resident				\$ 25.08	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.91	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.71	\$ 27.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 15.68	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.19	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.70	\$ 17.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 21.95	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.67	\$ 23.00	\$ 23.37	\$ 23.00		
		Tournament				\$ 44.94	\$ 45.00	\$ 46.42	\$ 46.00	\$ 47.86	\$ 48.00		
3	M	Lincoln Golf Green Fees	Sec 12.12.3	Yes	Per Round								
		Weekday (Monday - Friday noon)											
		Resident				\$ 25.08	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.91	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.71	\$ 27.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 12.54	\$ 13.00	\$ 12.96	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.36	\$ 13.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 14.63	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.11	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.58	\$ 16.00		
		Tournament				\$ 45.98	\$ 46.00	\$ 47.50	\$ 48.00	\$ 48.97	\$ 49.00		
		Weekend (Friday noon - Sunday)											
		Resident				\$ 30.31	\$ 30.00	\$ 31.31	\$ 31.00	\$ 32.28	\$ 32.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 17.77	\$ 18.00	\$ 18.35	\$ 18.00	\$ 18.92	\$ 19.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 22.99	\$ 23.00	\$ 23.75	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.49	\$ 24.00		
		Tournament				\$ 56.43	\$ 56.00	\$ 58.30	\$ 58.00	\$ 60.11	\$ 60.00		
4	M	Sharp Park Golf Green Fees	Sec 12.12.4	Yes	Per Round								
		Weekday (Monday - Friday noon)											
		Resident				\$ 26.13	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.99	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.83	\$ 28.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 13.59	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.03	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.47	\$ 14.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 15.68	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.19	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.70	\$ 17.00		
		Tournament				\$ 49.12	\$ 49.00	\$ 50.74	\$ 51.00	\$ 52.31	\$ 52.00		
		Weekend (Friday noon - Sunday)											
		Resident				\$ 31.35	\$ 31.00	\$ 32.39	\$ 32.00	\$ 33.39	\$ 33.00		
		Resident - Junior				\$ 18.81	\$ 19.00	\$ 19.43	\$ 19.00	\$ 20.04	\$ 20.00		
		Resident - Senior				\$ 24.04	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.83	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.60	\$ 26.00		
		Tournament				\$ 59.57	\$ 60.00	\$ 61.54	\$ 62.00	\$ 63.44	\$ 63.00		
5	M	Golden Gate Golf Green Fees	Sec 12.12.5	Yes	Per Round								
		Weekday (Monday - Friday noon)											

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Resident				\$ 12.54	\$ 13.00	\$ 12.96	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.36	\$ 13.00
		Resident - Junior				\$ 6.27	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.68	\$ 7.00
		Resident - Senior				\$ 9.41	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.72	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.02	\$ 10.00
		Tournament				\$ 19.86	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.51	\$ 21.00	\$ 21.15	\$ 21.00
		Weekend (Friday noon - Sunday)									
		Resident				\$ 14.63	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.11	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.58	\$ 16.00
		Resident - Junior				\$ 8.36	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.64	\$ 9.00	\$ 8.90	\$ 9.00
		Resident - Senior				\$ 12.54	\$ 13.00	\$ 12.96	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.36	\$ 13.00
		Tournament				\$ 28.22	\$ 28.00	\$ 29.15	\$ 29.00	\$ 30.05	\$ 30.00
6	M	McLaren Park (Gleneagles) Golf	Sec 12.12.6	Yes	Per Round						
		Weekday (Monday - Thursday)									
		Resident - 9 holes				\$ 25.08	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.91	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.71	\$ 27.00
		Resident - 18 holes				\$ 33.44	\$ 33.00	\$ 34.55	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.62	\$ 36.00
		Resident - Junior - 9 holes				\$ 15.68	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.19	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.70	\$ 17.00
		Resident - Senior - 9 holes				\$ 20.90	\$ 21.00	\$ 21.59	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.26	\$ 22.00
		Weekend (Friday - Sunday)									
		Resident - 9 holes				\$ 29.26	\$ 29.00	\$ 30.23	\$ 30.00	\$ 31.17	\$ 31.00
		Resident - 18 holes				\$ 41.80	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.18	\$ 43.00	\$ 44.52	\$ 45.00
		Resident - Junior - 9 holes				N/A		N/A		N/A	
		Resident - Senior - 9 holes				N/A		N/A		N/A	
7	M	Resident Golf Cards	Sec 12.12	Yes	Per Purchase						
		Resident Golf Card - San Francisco				\$ 94.05	\$ 94.00	\$ 97.16	\$ 97.00	\$ 100.18	\$ 100.00
		Resident Golf Card - Pacifica				\$ 62.70	\$ 63.00	\$ 64.78	\$ 65.00	\$ 66.78	\$ 67.00
		Replacement of Resident Golf Cards				\$ 26.13	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.99	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.83	\$ 28.00
		Return of application for resident golf card for misinformation				\$ 5.23	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.40	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.57	\$ 6.00
8	M	Flexible Pricing	Sec 12.12	Yes	Per Rental						
		The Department General Manager or his or her designee may impose a fee or charge for all other golf-related services or items, and may approve temporary increases and/or decreases in those fees and charges from time to time, based on one or more of the following factors: the type of use, fluctuations in customer demand at particular times or on particular days or dates or as among different Golf Courses, rates at comparable courses, and course conditions.									
		The Department General Manager or his or her designee may also apply the factors identified to approve the following temporary increases and/or decreases to any category of Resident Rates and any category of Tournament Rates:									
		(1) discounts of up to 50% for Resident Rates									
		(2) increases of up to 50% for Tournament Rates, and									
		(3) increases of up to 25% for Resident Rates									
9	M	Reservations	Sec 12.12	Yes	Per Rental						
		Reservation fee for any advance reservation made between 8 and 30 days before reserved tee time				\$ 15.68	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.19	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.70	\$ 17.00
10	M	Special Projects Maintenance Fee	Sec 12.12	Yes							
		Special Maintenance Fee				\$ 2.09	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.16	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.00
		Harding Park, Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, Golden Gate Park, non Juniors, per 9 holes									
		PROGRAM - GOLDEN GATE PARK									
11	M	Tennis Fees	Sec. 12.41	Yes							
		Adult Resident Weekdays				\$ 8.36	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.64	\$ 9.00	\$ 8.90	\$ 9.00
		Adult Non-Resident Weekdays				\$ 12.54	\$ 13.00	\$ 12.96	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.36	\$ 13.00
		Adult Resident Weekday Evenings				\$ 9.41	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.72	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.02	\$ 10.00
		Adult Non-Resident Weekday Evenings				\$ 15.68	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.19	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.70	\$ 17.00
		Senior Residents				\$ 4.18	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.32	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.45	\$ 4.00
		Senior Non-Residents				\$ 6.27	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.48	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.68	\$ 7.00
		Youth Non-Residents				\$ 12.54	\$ 13.00	\$ 12.96	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.36	\$ 13.00
		Leagues/Tournaments				\$ 18.81	\$ 19.00	\$ 19.43	\$ 19.00	\$ 20.04	\$ 20.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		PROGRAM - GOLDEN GATE PARK									
12	C	Carousel Admission	Sec 12.09	Yes	Admissions						
		Children 5 & under free accompanied by adult				Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
		Children 12 and under				\$ 0.70	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.72	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.74	\$ 1.00
		Adults				\$ 2.10	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.00
13	C	Botanical Garden	Sec 12.46d	Yes	Admissions						
		Adults				\$ 9.19	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.49	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.78	\$ 10.00
		Youth (12-17)/Seniors (65+)				\$ 6.56	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.78	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.99	\$ 7.00
		Child (5-11)				\$ 2.62	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.71	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.80	\$ 3.00
		Family				\$ 19.68	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.34	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.97	\$ 21.00
14	C	Japanese Tea Garden	Sec 12.05	Yes	Admissions						
		Adult - SF resident				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Senior, 65+, - SF resident				\$ 4.04	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.17	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.00
		Child, 5-11 years, - SF resident				\$ 2.69	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.78	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.87	\$ 3.00
		Youth, 12-17 years, - SF resident				\$ 4.04	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.17	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.00
		Senior, 65+, - Non Resident				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Adult - Non Resident				\$ 9.43	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.74	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.04	\$ 10.00
		Youth, 12-17 years,- Non Resident				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Child, 5-11 years- Non Resident				\$ 2.69	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.78	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.87	\$ 3.00
		Japanese Tea Garden Restoration Surcharge				\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.03	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.07	\$ 1.00
		Wedding - Reservation fee, plus hourly rate				\$ 404.04	\$ 404.00	\$ 417.42	\$ 417.00	\$ 430.36	\$ 430.00
		Wedding - hourly rate, plus reservation fee				\$ 134.68	\$ 135.00	\$ 139.14	\$ 139.00	\$ 143.45	\$ 143.00
		Commission to designate 3 free hours per week									
		With respect to the non-resident Adult fees, the Department General Manager or the General Manager's designee may once a year approve a temporary increase of up to 50% applicable during the months of March through October only, and/or may approve decreases at any time, based on one or more of the following factors: fluctuations in customer demand at particular times or on particular days or dates, rates at comparable facilities, adverse weather conditions, and facility conditions.									
15	C	Kezar Parking	Sec 12.08	Yes	Time at lot						
		0-1 hour				\$ 3.37	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.48	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.59	\$ 4.00
		1-2 hours				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		2-3 hours				\$ 9.43	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.74	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.04	\$ 10.00
		3-4 hours				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.34	\$ 14.00
		4-5 hours				\$ 16.16	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.69	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.21	\$ 17.00
		5-6 hours				\$ 18.85	\$ 19.00	\$ 19.48	\$ 19.00	\$ 20.08	\$ 20.00
		6-7 hours				\$ 21.54	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.26	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.95	\$ 23.00
		7-24 hours				\$ 24.24	\$ 24.00	\$ 25.04	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.82	\$ 26.00
		Special Event Parking				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.34	\$ 14.00
		Validation				\$ 1.81	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.87	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.93	\$ 2.00
		Monthly - Resident Rate				\$ 210.09	\$ 210.00	\$ 217.04	\$ 217.00	\$ 223.77	\$ 224.00
		Commercial Rate - 5 days per week, M-F				\$ 243.26	\$ 243.00	\$ 251.31	\$ 251.00	\$ 259.10	\$ 259.00
		Monthly - Senior Rate				\$ 80.79	\$ 81.00	\$ 83.47	\$ 83.00	\$ 86.05	\$ 86.00
		Lost Ticket Fee				\$ 24.24	\$ 24.00	\$ 25.04	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.82	\$ 26.00
		Validated Ticket Books (100 Stickers per book)				\$ 201.98	\$ 202.00	\$ 208.67	\$ 209.00	\$ 215.14	\$ 215.00
		Other RecPark Property - hourly rate, maximum				\$ 0.67	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.70	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.72	\$ 1.00
16	C	County Fair Building and Botanical Garden Facility Rentals	Sec 12.46	Yes	Rental						
		Garden Club Room Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.35	\$ 14.00
		Garden Club Room Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Garden Club Fee Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Garden Club Fee Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.35	\$ 14.00
		Garden Club Fee Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 134.68	\$ 135.00	\$ 139.14	\$ 139.00	\$ 143.45	\$ 143.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g.. per sq. ft./)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Garden Club Fee Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Recreation Room Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.35	\$ 14.00
		Recreation Room Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.35	\$ 14.00
		Recreation Fee Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Recreation Fee Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Recreation Fee Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 134.68	\$ 135.00	\$ 139.14	\$ 139.00	\$ 143.45	\$ 143.00
		Recreation Fee Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 80.81	\$ 81.00	\$ 83.48	\$ 83.00	\$ 86.07	\$ 86.00
		Auditorium Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Auditorium Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 26.94	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.83	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.69	\$ 29.00
		Auditorium Fee Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Auditorium Fee Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 53.87	\$ 54.00	\$ 55.66	\$ 56.00	\$ 57.38	\$ 57.00
		Auditorium Fee Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 202.02	\$ 202.00	\$ 208.71	\$ 209.00	\$ 215.18	\$ 215.00
		Auditorium Fee Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 121.21	\$ 121.00	\$ 125.23	\$ 125.00	\$ 129.11	\$ 129.00
		Gallery Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Gallery Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Gallery Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Gallery Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 101.01	\$ 101.00	\$ 104.35	\$ 104.00	\$ 107.59	\$ 108.00
		Gallery Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 202.02	\$ 202.00	\$ 208.71	\$ 209.00	\$ 215.18	\$ 215.00
		Gallery Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 242.43	\$ 242.00	\$ 250.45	\$ 250.00	\$ 258.21	\$ 258.00
		Entire Facility Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ 47.14	\$ 47.00	\$ 48.70	\$ 49.00	\$ 50.21	\$ 50.00
		Entire Facility Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 80.81	\$ 81.00	\$ 83.48	\$ 83.00	\$ 86.07	\$ 86.00
		Entire Facility Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ 101.01	\$ 101.00	\$ 104.35	\$ 104.00	\$ 107.59	\$ 108.00
		Entire Facility Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 188.55	\$ 189.00	\$ 194.79	\$ 195.00	\$ 200.83	\$ 201.00
		Entire Facility Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 202.02	\$ 202.00	\$ 208.71	\$ 209.00	\$ 215.18	\$ 215.00
		Entire Facility Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 525.26	\$ 525.00	\$ 542.64	\$ 543.00	\$ 559.46	\$ 559.00
		Commercial Kitchen Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Commercial Kitchen Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Commercial Kitchen Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Commercial Kitchen Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 20.20	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.87	\$ 21.00	\$ 21.52	\$ 22.00
		Commercial Kitchen Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Commercial Kitchen Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Patio Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Patio Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Patio Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Patio Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 20.20	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.87	\$ 21.00	\$ 21.52	\$ 22.00
		Patio Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Patio Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Courtyard Garden Club Fee Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Courtyard Garden Club Fee Hourly Rate				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.35	\$ 14.00
		Courtyard Individual or Nonprofit Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Courtyard Individual or Nonprofit Hourly Rate				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Courtyard Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Courtyard Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 121.21	\$ 121.00	\$ 125.23	\$ 125.00	\$ 129.11	\$ 129.00
		Demonstration Garden Individual or Non Profit Reservation Fee				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
		Demonstration Garden Individual or Non Profit Hourly Rate				\$ 505.05	\$ 505.00	\$ 521.77	\$ 522.00	\$ 537.95	\$ 538.00
		Demonstration Garden Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 673.41	\$ 673.00	\$ 695.70	\$ 696.00	\$ 717.26	\$ 717.00
		Demonstration Garden Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 1,010.11	\$ 1,010.00	\$ 1,043.54	\$ 1,044.00	\$ 1,075.89	\$ 1,076.00
		Fragrance Garden Individual or Non Profit Reservation Fee				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
		Fragrance Garden Individual or Non Profit Hourly Rate				\$ 505.05	\$ 505.00	\$ 521.77	\$ 522.00	\$ 537.95	\$ 538.00
		Fragrance Garden Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 673.41	\$ 673.00	\$ 695.70	\$ 696.00	\$ 717.26	\$ 717.00
		Fragrance Garden Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 1,010.11	\$ 1,010.00	\$ 1,043.54	\$ 1,044.00	\$ 1,075.89	\$ 1,076.00
		Redwood Grove Individual or Non Profit Reservation Fee				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
		Redwood Grove Individual or Non Profit Hourly Rate				\$ 505.05	\$ 505.00	\$ 521.77	\$ 522.00	\$ 537.95	\$ 538.00
		Redwood Grove Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 673.41	\$ 673.00	\$ 695.70	\$ 696.00	\$ 717.26	\$ 717.00
		Redwood Grove Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 1,010.11	\$ 1,010.00	\$ 1,043.54	\$ 1,044.00	\$ 1,075.89	\$ 1,076.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft./)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Rhododendron Garden Individual or Non Profit Reservation Fee				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
		Rhododendron Garden Individual or Non Profit Hourly Rate				\$ 505.05	\$ 505.00	\$ 521.77	\$ 522.00	\$ 537.95	\$ 538.00
		Rhododendron Garden Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 673.41	\$ 673.00	\$ 695.70	\$ 696.00	\$ 717.26	\$ 717.00
		Rhododendron Garden Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 1,010.11	\$ 1,010.00	\$ 1,043.54	\$ 1,044.00	\$ 1,075.89	\$ 1,076.00
		Fountain Plaza Individual or Non Profit Reservation Fee				\$ 1,010.11	\$ 1,010.00	\$ 1,043.54	\$ 1,044.00	\$ 1,075.89	\$ 1,076.00
		Fountain Plaza Individual or Non Profit Hourly Rate				\$ 1,178.46	\$ 1,178.00	\$ 1,217.47	\$ 1,217.00	\$ 1,255.21	\$ 1,255.00
		Fountain Plaza Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 2,020.22	\$ 2,020.00	\$ 2,087.09	\$ 2,087.00	\$ 2,151.78	\$ 2,152.00
		Fountain Plaza Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 2,356.92	\$ 2,357.00	\$ 2,434.93	\$ 2,435.00	\$ 2,510.42	\$ 2,510.00
		Great Meadow Individual or Non Profit Reservation Fee				\$ 1,010.11	\$ 1,010.00	\$ 1,043.54	\$ 1,044.00	\$ 1,075.89	\$ 1,076.00
		Great Meadow Individual or Non Profit Hourly Rate				\$ 1,178.46	\$ 1,178.00	\$ 1,217.47	\$ 1,217.00	\$ 1,255.21	\$ 1,255.00
		Great Meadow Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 2,020.22	\$ 2,020.00	\$ 2,087.09	\$ 2,087.00	\$ 2,151.78	\$ 2,152.00
		Great Meadow Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 2,356.92	\$ 2,357.00	\$ 2,434.93	\$ 2,435.00	\$ 2,510.42	\$ 2,510.00
		Zellerback Garden Individual or Non Profit Reservation Fee				\$ 1,010.11	\$ 1,010.00	\$ 1,043.54	\$ 1,044.00	\$ 1,075.89	\$ 1,076.00
		Zellerback Garden Individual or Non Profit Hourly Rate				\$ 1,178.46	\$ 1,178.00	\$ 1,217.47	\$ 1,217.00	\$ 1,255.21	\$ 1,255.00
		Zellerback Garden Corporate Event Reservation Fee				\$ 2,020.22	\$ 2,020.00	\$ 2,087.09	\$ 2,087.00	\$ 2,151.78	\$ 2,152.00
		Zellerback Garden Corporate Event Hourly Rate				\$ 2,356.92	\$ 2,357.00	\$ 2,434.93	\$ 2,435.00	\$ 2,510.42	\$ 2,510.00
		With respect to the non-resident Adult fees, the Department General Manager or the General Manager's designee may once a year approve a temporary increase of up to 50% applicable on Saturdays and Sundays only, and/or may approve decreases at any time, based on one or more of the following factors: fluctuations in customer demand at particular times or on particular days or dates, rates at comparable facilities, adverse weather conditions, and facility conditions.									
17	C	GGP Concourse Underground Parking	Sec. 12.35	Yes							
		Weekday, fee is per hour				\$ 5.65	\$ 5.75	\$ 5.84	\$ 5.75	\$ 6.02	\$ 6.00
		Weekday, maximum fee				\$ 32.81	\$ 32.75	\$ 33.89	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.94	\$ 35.00
		Weekend, fee is per hour				\$ 6.28	\$ 6.25	\$ 6.49	\$ 6.50	\$ 6.69	\$ 6.75
		Weekend, maximum fee				\$ 36.74	\$ 36.75	\$ 37.96	\$ 38.00	\$ 39.14	\$ 39.25
		After 6 p.m.				\$ 18.84	\$ 18.75	\$ 19.46	\$ 19.50	\$ 20.06	\$ 20.00
		Monthly Parking				\$ 262.46	\$ 262.50	\$ 271.15	\$ 271.25	\$ 279.55	\$ 279.50
		PROGRAM - CITYWIDE SERVICES									
18	C	Coit Tower Admission	Sec 12.06a	Yes	Admission						
		Adult				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Adult Non-Resident				\$ 9.19	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.49	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.78	\$ 10.00
		Senior				\$ 4.04	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.17	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.00
		Senior Non-Resident				\$ 6.56	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.78	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.99	\$ 7.00
		Youth 12-17 years				\$ 4.04	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.17	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.00
		Youth 12-17 years, Non-Resident				\$ 6.56	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.78	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.99	\$ 7.00
		Child (5-11 years)				\$ 2.02	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.00
		Child (5-11 years), Non-Resident				\$ 2.62	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.71	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.80	\$ 3.00
		Audio Tours - rental with entrance fee				\$ 1.44	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.49	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.53	\$ 2.00
		Audio Tours - rental without entrance fee				\$ 4.32	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.47	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.60	\$ 5.00
		With respect to the non-resident Adult fees, the Department General Manager or the General Manager's designee may once a year approve a temporary increase of up to 50% applicable during the hours of 11am to 4pm only, and/or may approve decreases at any time, based on one or more of the following factors: fluctuations in customer demand at particular times or on particular days or dates, rates at comparable facilities, adverse weather conditions, and facility conditions.									
19	C	Stadium Rentals	Sec 12.42	Yes	Rental						
		The General Manager is authorized to enter into short-term, not to exceed 14 cumulative days, revocable license agreements, for the use of Kezar Stadium, Kezar Pavilion, and Boxer Stadium at rates that reflect market rates for comparable events at comparable Bay Area venues, provided that prior to the commencement of the license the licensee shall tender in full all sums due under the license and shall provide to the City a sufficient security deposit, in the form of cash, a letter of credit or other instrument, to protect the City in the event of loss or damage to the City in connection with the license.									

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
20	C	Conservatory of Flowers	Sec 12.34	Yes	Admission						
		Conservatory of Flowers Admission - adult SF Resident				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Admission - adult Non-Resident				\$ 9.43	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.74	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.04	\$ 10.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Admission - youth & seniors SF Resident				\$ 4.04	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.17	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Admission - youth & seniors Non-Resident				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Admission - children 5-11 SF Resident				\$ 2.02	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.15	\$ 2.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Admission - children 5-11 Non-Resident				\$ 2.69	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.78	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.87	\$ 3.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Rental Fees - After Hours Tours				\$ 808.09	\$ 808.00	\$ 834.83	\$ 835.00	\$ 860.71	\$ 861.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Rental Fees - Event				\$ 1,683.51	\$ 1,684.00	\$ 1,739.24	\$ 1,739.00	\$ 1,793.15	\$ 1,793.00
		Conservatory of Flowers Special Tours for Garden Club, Botanical Garden, or University Botanical Program' fee is per person				\$ 4.04	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.17	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.00
		Conservatory & Reception Space Rental Fees - Wedding ceremony				\$ 4,040.43	\$ 4,040.00	\$ 4,174.17	\$ 4,174.00	\$ 4,303.57	\$ 4,304.00
		Conservatory & Reception Space Rental Fees - Wedding ceremony & Reception				\$ 1,952.88	\$ 1,953.00	\$ 2,017.52	\$ 2,018.00	\$ 2,080.06	\$ 2,080.00
		Conservatory & Reception Space Rental Fees - Corporate Event				\$ 2,020.22	\$ 2,020.00	\$ 2,087.09	\$ 2,087.00	\$ 2,151.78	\$ 2,152.00
		Conservatory & Reception Space Rental Fees - All Other Events				\$ 1,683.51	\$ 1,684.00	\$ 1,739.24	\$ 1,739.00	\$ 1,793.15	\$ 1,793.00
		Conservatory & Reception Space Rental Fees - Children's (5 to 13) Birthday Party				\$ 269.36	\$ 269.00	\$ 278.28	\$ 278.00	\$ 286.90	\$ 287.00
		With respect to the non-resident Adult fees, the Department General Manager or the General Manager's designee may once a year approve a temporary increase of up to 50% applicable on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays only, and/or may approve decreases at any time, based on one or more of the following factors: fluctuations in customer demand at particular times or on particular days or dates, rates at comparable facilities, adverse weather conditions, and facility conditions.									
21	C	Athletic Field Reservation	Sec 12.36	Yes	Reservation						
		Facility Fee Per Hour S.F. Residents				\$ 33.66	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Facility Fee Per Hour Non Residents				\$ 87.53	\$ 88.00	\$ 90.42	\$ 90.00	\$ 93.23	\$ 93.00
		Facility Fee Per Hour, Not-for-profit				\$ 33.66	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Facility Fee Per Hour For-profit				\$ 87.53	\$ 88.00	\$ 90.42	\$ 90.00	\$ 93.23	\$ 93.00
		Lighted per Hour				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.34	\$ 14.00
		Exclusive Use/ Tournaments, per day				\$ 60.59	\$ 61.00	\$ 62.60	\$ 63.00	\$ 64.54	\$ 65.00
		Baselines for Softball, baseball, per booking				\$ 80.79	\$ 81.00	\$ 83.47	\$ 83.00	\$ 86.05	\$ 86.00
		Fieldlines per booking				\$ 161.58	\$ 162.00	\$ 166.93	\$ 167.00	\$ 172.11	\$ 172.00
		Gaelic Football, per booking				\$ 242.38	\$ 242.00	\$ 250.40	\$ 250.00	\$ 258.16	\$ 258.00
		Football (5 yards), per booking				\$ 215.45	\$ 215.00	\$ 222.58	\$ 223.00	\$ 229.48	\$ 229.00
		Application for Not for Profit Certification				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
22	C	Lake Merced Boat Storage	Sec 12.38	Yes	Per Boat						
		Boat Storage (per boat)				\$ 36.74	\$ 37.00	\$ 37.96	\$ 38.00	\$ 39.14	\$ 39.00
23	C	Photo Center Fees	Sec 12.29	Yes	Membership						
		Adult Annual Membership, Unlimited use				\$ 361.66	\$ 362.00	\$ 373.63	\$ 374.00	\$ 385.21	\$ 385.00
		Youth Annual Membership, Unlimited use				\$ 180.83	\$ 181.00	\$ 186.82	\$ 187.00	\$ 192.61	\$ 193.00
		Adult - 6 months membership fee				\$ 72.33	\$ 72.00	\$ 74.73	\$ 75.00	\$ 77.04	\$ 77.00
		Each time use with membership				\$ 7.23	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.47	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.70	\$ 8.00
		Junior (under 18) - 6 months membership fee				\$ 36.17	\$ 36.00	\$ 37.36	\$ 37.00	\$ 38.52	\$ 39.00
		Each time use with membership				\$ 7.23	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.47	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.70	\$ 8.00
		Senior (62 and over) - 6 months membership fee				\$ 36.17	\$ 36.00	\$ 37.36	\$ 37.00	\$ 38.52	\$ 39.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Each time use with membership				\$ 7.23	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.47	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.70	\$ 8.00
24	C	Stern Grove Clubhouse/Trocadero Rental	Sec 12.21(a)	Yes	Rental						
		Monday - Thursday - fee is hourly rate, six (6) hour minimum rental				\$ 161.58	\$ 162.00	\$ 166.93	\$ 167.00	\$ 172.11	\$ 172.00
		Friday - Sunday - fee is hourly rate, six (6) hour minimum rental				\$ 188.52	\$ 189.00	\$ 194.76	\$ 195.00	\$ 200.79	\$ 201.00
		Legal Holidays - fee is hourly rate, six (6) hour minimum rental				\$ 188.52	\$ 189.00	\$ 194.76	\$ 195.00	\$ 200.79	\$ 201.00
25	C	Facilities Rental	Sec 12.21(b)	Yes	Rental						
		Class AAA Clubhouses Fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 94.26	\$ 94.00	\$ 97.38	\$ 97.00	\$ 100.40	\$ 100.00
		Class A Rec Center Clubhouse - fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 60.59	\$ 61.00	\$ 62.60	\$ 63.00	\$ 64.54	\$ 65.00
		Class B Large Clubhouse - fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 47.13	\$ 47.00	\$ 48.69	\$ 49.00	\$ 50.20	\$ 50.00
		Class C Small Clubhouse - fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 33.66	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Class AA Gyms - fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 168.32	\$ 168.00	\$ 173.89	\$ 174.00	\$ 179.28	\$ 179.00
		Class A Gyms - fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 134.65	\$ 135.00	\$ 139.11	\$ 139.00	\$ 143.42	\$ 143.00
		Class B Gyms - fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 100.99	\$ 101.00	\$ 104.33	\$ 104.00	\$ 107.57	\$ 108.00
		Class C Gyms - fee is per hour, two hour minimum PLUS staff time at prevailing rate				\$ 67.33	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.56	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.71	\$ 72.00
		Lake Merced Boathouse; Non-Profit Meeting Mon-Thu1				\$ 49.14	\$ 49.00	\$ 50.77	\$ 51.00	\$ 52.34	\$ 52.00
		Lake Merced Boathouse; Non-Profit Meeting Fri-Sun1				\$ 122.86	\$ 123.00	\$ 126.92	\$ 127.00	\$ 130.86	\$ 131.00
		Lake Merced Boathouse; Non-Profit Event Mon-Thu1				\$ 92.14	\$ 92.00	\$ 95.19	\$ 95.00	\$ 98.14	\$ 98.00
		Lake Merced Boathouse; Non-Profit Event Fri-Sun1				\$ 122.86	\$ 123.00	\$ 126.92	\$ 127.00	\$ 130.86	\$ 131.00
		Lake Merced Boathouse; Private Meeting or Event Mon-Thu1				\$ 153.57	\$ 154.00	\$ 158.65	\$ 159.00	\$ 163.57	\$ 164.00
		Lake Merced Boathouse; Private Meeting or Event Fri-Sun1				\$ 245.71	\$ 246.00	\$ 253.85	\$ 254.00	\$ 261.72	\$ 262.00
		1- A booking of the Lake Merced Boathouse from 8am to 4pm or from 5pm to midnight shall be charged a maximum of six (6) hours.									
		Event = food/drink served, Meeting = neither food nor drink served.									
26	C	Picnic Areas Reservation Fees	Sec 12.23a-c	Yes	Reservation						
		Picnics at Pioneer Log Cabin, Pine Lake, Stern Grove East									
		1-50 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 76.43	\$ 76.00	\$ 78.96	\$ 79.00	\$ 81.41	\$ 81.00
		51-100 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 113.17	\$ 113.00	\$ 116.92	\$ 117.00	\$ 120.54	\$ 121.00
		101-200 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 151.39	\$ 151.00	\$ 156.40	\$ 156.00	\$ 161.25	\$ 161.00
		201-300 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 227.82	\$ 228.00	\$ 235.36	\$ 235.00	\$ 242.65	\$ 243.00
		Picnics at all other locations									
		1-50 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 38.21	\$ 38.00	\$ 39.48	\$ 39.00	\$ 40.70	\$ 41.00
		51-100 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 76.43	\$ 76.00	\$ 78.96	\$ 79.00	\$ 81.41	\$ 81.00
		101-200 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 113.17	\$ 113.00	\$ 116.92	\$ 117.00	\$ 120.54	\$ 121.00
		201-400 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 189.60	\$ 190.00	\$ 195.88	\$ 196.00	\$ 201.95	\$ 202.00
		more than 400 participants - fee is per day, per site				\$ 379.20	\$ 379.00	\$ 391.76	\$ 392.00	\$ 403.90	\$ 404.00
		Company/Business Picnic									
		1 to 200 participants (per day, per site)				\$ 302.78	\$ 303.00	\$ 312.80	\$ 313.00	\$ 322.49	\$ 322.00
		201 to 300 participants (per day, per site)				\$ 379.20	\$ 379.00	\$ 391.76	\$ 392.00	\$ 403.90	\$ 404.00
		301 to 500 participants (per day, per site)				\$ 530.59	\$ 531.00	\$ 548.15	\$ 548.00	\$ 565.15	\$ 565.00
		501 to 750 participants (per day, per site)				\$ 758.41	\$ 758.00	\$ 783.51	\$ 784.00	\$ 807.80	\$ 808.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Over 750 participants (per day, per site)				\$ 1,137.61	\$ 1,138.00	\$ 1,175.27	\$ 1,175.00	\$ 1,211.70	\$ 1,212.00
		Picnic hosted by business WITH special events - minimum fee, to be negotiated				\$ 1,516.82	\$ 1,517.00	\$ 1,567.02	\$ 1,567.00	\$ 1,615.60	\$ 1,616.00
27	C	Wedding Sites Reservation Fees & Hourly Rates	Sec 12.07	Yes	Reservations						
		Chain of Lakes Reservation Fee				\$ 279.71	\$ 280.00	\$ 288.96	\$ 289.00	\$ 297.92	\$ 298.00
		Chain of Lakes Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 69.93	\$ 70.00	\$ 72.24	\$ 72.00	\$ 74.48	\$ 74.00
		Fushia Garden Reservation Fee				\$ 279.71	\$ 280.00	\$ 288.96	\$ 289.00	\$ 297.92	\$ 298.00
		Fuschia Garden Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 69.93	\$ 70.00	\$ 72.24	\$ 72.00	\$ 74.48	\$ 74.00
		Portals of the Past Reservation Fee				\$ 279.71	\$ 280.00	\$ 288.96	\$ 289.00	\$ 297.92	\$ 298.00
		Portals of the Past Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 69.93	\$ 70.00	\$ 72.24	\$ 72.00	\$ 74.48	\$ 74.00
		Rose Garden Reservation Fee				\$ 279.71	\$ 280.00	\$ 288.96	\$ 289.00	\$ 297.92	\$ 298.00
		Rose Garden Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 69.93	\$ 70.00	\$ 72.24	\$ 72.00	\$ 74.48	\$ 74.00
		Chinese Pavilion Reservation Fee				\$ 489.48	\$ 489.00	\$ 505.69	\$ 506.00	\$ 521.36	\$ 521.00
		Chinese Pavilion Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 139.85	\$ 140.00	\$ 144.48	\$ 144.00	\$ 148.96	\$ 149.00
		Queen Wilhelmina Garden Reservation Fee				\$ 489.48	\$ 489.00	\$ 505.69	\$ 506.00	\$ 521.36	\$ 521.00
		Queen Wilhelmina Garden Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 139.85	\$ 140.00	\$ 144.48	\$ 144.00	\$ 148.96	\$ 149.00
		Shakespeare Garden Reservation Fee				\$ 489.48	\$ 489.00	\$ 505.69	\$ 506.00	\$ 521.36	\$ 521.00
		Shakespeare Garden Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 139.85	\$ 140.00	\$ 144.48	\$ 144.00	\$ 148.96	\$ 149.00
		Palace of Fine Arts Rotunda Reservation Fee				\$ 489.48	\$ 489.00	\$ 505.69	\$ 506.00	\$ 521.36	\$ 521.00
		Palace of Fine Arts Rotunda Hourly Rate - two hour minimum				\$ 139.85	\$ 140.00	\$ 144.48	\$ 144.00	\$ 148.96	\$ 149.00
28	C	Special Events	Sec 12.22a,c,f	Yes	Events						
		GGP Lindley Meadow Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 13,468.11	\$ 13,468.00	\$ 13,913.90	\$ 13,914.00	\$ 14,345.23	\$ 14,345.00
		GGP Lindley Meadow Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 6,734.05	\$ 6,734.00	\$ 6,956.95	\$ 6,957.00	\$ 7,172.62	\$ 7,173.00
		GGP Speedway Meadow Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 24,242.59	\$ 24,243.00	\$ 25,045.02	\$ 25,045.00	\$ 25,821.42	\$ 25,821.00
		GGP Speedway Meadow Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 12,121.30	\$ 12,121.00	\$ 12,522.51	\$ 12,523.00	\$ 12,910.71	\$ 12,911.00
		GGP Marx Meadow Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 3,367.03	\$ 3,367.00	\$ 3,478.48	\$ 3,478.00	\$ 3,586.31	\$ 3,586.00
		GGP Marx Meadow Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 1,683.51	\$ 1,684.00	\$ 1,739.24	\$ 1,739.00	\$ 1,793.15	\$ 1,793.00
		GGP Sharon Meadow Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 16,161.73	\$ 16,162.00	\$ 16,696.68	\$ 16,697.00	\$ 17,214.28	\$ 17,214.00
		GGP Sharon Meadow Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 8,080.86	\$ 8,081.00	\$ 8,348.34	\$ 8,348.00	\$ 8,607.14	\$ 8,607.00
		GGP Polo Field Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 67,340.54	\$ 67,341.00	\$ 69,569.51	\$ 69,570.00	\$ 71,726.16	\$ 71,726.00
		GGP Polo Field Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 33,670.27	\$ 33,670.00	\$ 34,784.75	\$ 34,785.00	\$ 35,863.08	\$ 35,863.00
		GGP Music Concourse Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 3,367.03	\$ 3,367.00	\$ 3,478.48	\$ 3,478.00	\$ 3,586.31	\$ 3,586.00
		GGP Music Concourse Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 1,683.51	\$ 1,684.00	\$ 1,739.24	\$ 1,739.00	\$ 1,793.15	\$ 1,793.00
		Civic Center Plaza Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 33,670.27	\$ 33,670.00	\$ 34,784.75	\$ 34,785.00	\$ 35,863.08	\$ 35,863.00
		Civic Center Plaza Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 16,835.13	\$ 16,835.00	\$ 17,392.38	\$ 17,392.00	\$ 17,931.54	\$ 17,932.00
		Justin Herman Plaza Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 9,427.68	\$ 9,428.00	\$ 9,739.73	\$ 9,740.00	\$ 10,041.66	\$ 10,042.00
		Justin Herman Plaza Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 4,713.84	\$ 4,714.00	\$ 4,869.87	\$ 4,870.00	\$ 5,020.83	\$ 5,021.00
		Marina Green East Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 10,101.08	\$ 10,101.00	\$ 10,435.43	\$ 10,435.00	\$ 10,758.92	\$ 10,759.00
		Marina Green East Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 5,050.54	\$ 5,051.00	\$ 5,217.71	\$ 5,218.00	\$ 5,379.46	\$ 5,379.00
		Marina Green West Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 1,077.45	\$ 1,077.00	\$ 1,113.11	\$ 1,113.00	\$ 1,147.62	\$ 1,148.00
		Marina Green West Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 538.72	\$ 539.00	\$ 556.56	\$ 557.00	\$ 573.81	\$ 574.00
		Jerry Garcia Amphitheater Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 4,309.79	\$ 4,310.00	\$ 4,452.45	\$ 4,452.00	\$ 4,590.47	\$ 4,590.00
		Jerry Garcia Amphitheater Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 2,154.90	\$ 2,155.00	\$ 2,226.22	\$ 2,226.00	\$ 2,295.24	\$ 2,295.00
		Portsmouth Square Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 673.41	\$ 673.00	\$ 695.70	\$ 696.00	\$ 717.26	\$ 717.00
		Portsmouth Square Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
		Union Square Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 10,101.08	\$ 10,101.00	\$ 10,435.43	\$ 10,435.00	\$ 10,758.92	\$ 10,759.00
		Union Square Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 5,050.54	\$ 5,051.00	\$ 5,217.71	\$ 5,218.00	\$ 5,379.46	\$ 5,379.00
		Washington Square Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 4,309.79	\$ 4,310.00	\$ 4,452.45	\$ 4,452.00	\$ 4,590.47	\$ 4,590.00
		Washington Square Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 2,154.90	\$ 2,155.00	\$ 2,226.22	\$ 2,226.00	\$ 2,295.24	\$ 2,295.00
		Mission Dolores Park Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 16,161.73	\$ 16,162.00	\$ 16,696.68	\$ 16,697.00	\$ 17,214.28	\$ 17,214.00
		Mission Dolores Park Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 8,080.86	\$ 8,081.00	\$ 8,348.34	\$ 8,348.00	\$ 8,607.14	\$ 8,607.00
		Precita Park Event Fee - Commercial				\$ 6,734.05	\$ 6,734.00	\$ 6,956.95	\$ 6,957.00	\$ 7,172.62	\$ 7,173.00
		Precita Park Event Fee - Non-Profit				\$ 3,367.03	\$ 3,367.00	\$ 3,478.48	\$ 3,478.00	\$ 3,586.31	\$ 3,586.00
		Event Fee - Other Sites, fee is per person x site capacity				\$ 1.35	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.39	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.43	\$ 1.00
		School Outdoor Events - first 4 hours				\$ 151.39	\$ 151.00	\$ 156.40	\$ 156.00	\$ 161.25	\$ 161.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		School Outdoor Events - each additional hour				\$ 38.21	\$ 38.00	\$ 39.48	\$ 39.00	\$ 40.70	\$ 41.00
		Athletic Events with requiring a road closure - per participant				\$ 1.47	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.52	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.57	\$ 2.00
		Amateur Arts Productions no admission charge - weekday, per day				\$ 227.82	\$ 228.00	\$ 235.36	\$ 235.00	\$ 242.65	\$ 243.00
		Amateur Arts Productions no admission charge - weekday, 2 consecutive days				\$ 379.20	\$ 379.00	\$ 391.76	\$ 392.00	\$ 403.90	\$ 404.00
		Amateur Arts Productions no admission charge - non-holiday weekend, per day				\$ 302.78	\$ 303.00	\$ 312.80	\$ 313.00	\$ 322.49	\$ 322.00
		Amateur Arts Productions no admission charge - non-holiday weekend, 2 consecutive days				\$ 530.59	\$ 531.00	\$ 548.15	\$ 548.00	\$ 565.15	\$ 565.00
		Amateur Arts Productions no admission charge - holiday weekend, 2 consecutive days				\$ 758.41	\$ 758.00	\$ 783.51	\$ 784.00	\$ 807.80	\$ 808.00
29	C	Film / Video / Photography	Sec 12.24	Yes	Shoot/Filming						
		Commercial Photography shoots - simple, per day, per site				\$ 302.78	\$ 303.00	\$ 312.80	\$ 313.00	\$ 322.49	\$ 322.00
		Commercial Photography shoots - large crew, per day, per site, minimum				\$ 758.41	\$ 758.00	\$ 783.51	\$ 784.00	\$ 807.80	\$ 808.00
		Commercial Filming - documentary, per day, per site				\$ 302.78	\$ 303.00	\$ 312.80	\$ 313.00	\$ 322.49	\$ 322.00
		Commercial Filming - outdoor simple, per day, per site				\$ 758.41	\$ 758.00	\$ 783.51	\$ 784.00	\$ 807.80	\$ 808.00
		Commercial Filming - large productions, per day, per site				\$ 1,516.82	\$ 1,517.00	\$ 1,567.02	\$ 1,567.00	\$ 1,615.60	\$ 1,616.00
		Commercial Filming - facility property usage, per day, per site minimum				\$ 7,585.55	\$ 7,586.00	\$ 7,836.64	\$ 7,837.00	\$ 8,079.57	\$ 8,080.00
30	C	Encroachment Fee - minimum fee	Sec 12.25	Yes	Encroachment	\$ 758.41	\$ 758.00	\$ 783.51	\$ 784.00	\$ 807.80	\$ 808.00
31	C	Harvey Milk Center Rental Rates	Sec 12.47	Yes	Rental						
		Room Rental Rates									
		Group 1 = Museum Sponsored Groups									
		Ball Room				\$ 42.09	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.48	\$ 43.00	\$ 44.83	\$ 45.00
		Rehearsal Room				\$ 20.20	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.87	\$ 21.00	\$ 21.52	\$ 22.00
		Exhibit Room				\$ 16.84	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.39	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.93	\$ 18.00
		Portrait Studio				\$ 25.25	\$ 25.00	\$ 26.09	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.90	\$ 27.00
		Group 2 = Non-Profit Groups									
		Ball Room				\$ 84.18	\$ 84.00	\$ 86.96	\$ 87.00	\$ 89.66	\$ 90.00
		Rehearsal Room				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Exhibit Room				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Portrait Studio				\$ 50.51	\$ 51.00	\$ 52.18	\$ 52.00	\$ 53.79	\$ 54.00
		Group 3 = Other Groups									
		Ball Room				\$ 168.35	\$ 168.00	\$ 173.92	\$ 174.00	\$ 179.32	\$ 179.00
		Rehearsal Room				\$ 80.81	\$ 81.00	\$ 83.48	\$ 83.00	\$ 86.07	\$ 86.00
		Exhibit Room				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Portrait Studio				\$ 101.01	\$ 101.00	\$ 104.35	\$ 104.00	\$ 107.59	\$ 108.00
32	C	Randall Museum Rental Rates	Sec 12.47	Yes	Rental						
		Group 1 = Non profit groups aligned with facility's mission									
		Auditorium - fee is per hour				\$ 42.09	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.48	\$ 43.00	\$ 44.83	\$ 45.00
		Buckley or Art Room - fee is per hour				\$ 20.20	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.87	\$ 21.00	\$ 21.52	\$ 22.00
		Randall Room - fee is per hour				\$ 16.84	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.39	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.93	\$ 18.00
		Art Studio/Patio - fee is per hour				\$ 25.25	\$ 25.00	\$ 26.09	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.90	\$ 27.00
		Terrace Room - fee is per hour				\$ 16.84	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.39	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.93	\$ 18.00
		East Deck - fee is per hour				\$ 25.25	\$ 25.00	\$ 26.09	\$ 26.00	\$ 26.90	\$ 27.00
		Lobby - fee is per hour				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Kitchen - fee is per hour				\$ 16.84	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.39	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.93	\$ 18.00
		Parking Lot - fee is per hour				\$ 16.84	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.39	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.93	\$ 18.00
		Group 2 = Non-profit groups not aligned with Randall's mission									

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g.. per sq. ft./)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Auditorium - fee is per hour				\$ 84.18	\$ 84.00	\$ 86.96	\$ 87.00	\$ 89.66	\$ 90.00
		Buckley or Art Room - fee is per hour				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Randall Room - fee is per hour				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Art Studio/Patio - fee is per hour				\$ 50.51	\$ 51.00	\$ 52.18	\$ 52.00	\$ 53.79	\$ 54.00
		Terrace Room - fee is per hour				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		East Deck - fee is per hour				\$ 50.51	\$ 51.00	\$ 52.18	\$ 52.00	\$ 53.79	\$ 54.00
		Lobby - fee is per hour				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Kitchen - fee is per hour				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Parking Lot - fee is per hour				\$ 16.84	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.39	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.93	\$ 18.00
		Group 3 = Private Groups									
		Auditorium - fee is per hour				\$ 168.35	\$ 168.00	\$ 173.92	\$ 174.00	\$ 179.32	\$ 179.00
		Buckley or Art Room - fee is per hour				\$ 80.81	\$ 81.00	\$ 83.48	\$ 83.00	\$ 86.07	\$ 86.00
		Randall Room - fee is per hour				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Art Studio/Patio - fee is per hour				\$ 101.01	\$ 101.00	\$ 104.35	\$ 104.00	\$ 107.59	\$ 108.00
		Terrace Room - fee is per hour				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		East Deck - fee is per hour				\$ 101.01	\$ 101.00	\$ 104.35	\$ 104.00	\$ 107.59	\$ 108.00
		Lobby - fee is per hour				\$ 134.68	\$ 135.00	\$ 139.14	\$ 139.00	\$ 143.45	\$ 143.00
		Kitchen - fee is per hour				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Parking Lot - fee is per hour				\$ 16.84	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.39	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.93	\$ 18.00
33	C	Swimming Pool Entry Fees	Sec 12.40	Yes	Entry						
		Children - (0-17)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Children Admission - Rec swim and Lap swim				\$ 1.35	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.39	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.43	\$ 1.00
		Monthly Pass - not including lessons				\$ 21.55	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.26	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.95	\$ 23.00
		Summer Pass				\$ 26.94	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.83	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.69	\$ 29.00
		Yearly Swim Pass				\$ 228.91	\$ 229.00	\$ 236.49	\$ 236.00	\$ 243.82	\$ 244.00
		Water Exercise - fee is per 10-session pack				\$ 26.94	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.83	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.69	\$ 29.00
		Adult - (18-64)									
		Adult Admission - Recreation Swim and Lap Swim				\$ 6.73	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.96	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.17	\$ 7.00
		Water Exercise				\$ 9.43	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.74	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.04	\$ 10.00
		Monthly Swim Pass (not including lessons)				\$ 88.87	\$ 89.00	\$ 91.81	\$ 92.00	\$ 94.66	\$ 95.00
		Recreation Swim Scrip Ticket for 10 Sessions				\$ 60.59	\$ 61.00	\$ 62.60	\$ 63.00	\$ 64.54	\$ 65.00
		Yearly Swim Pass				\$ 807.92	\$ 808.00	\$ 834.67	\$ 835.00	\$ 860.54	\$ 861.00
		Water Exercise Scrip Ticket - 10 sessions				\$ 80.79	\$ 81.00	\$ 83.47	\$ 83.00	\$ 86.05	\$ 86.00
		Seniors (65+)									
		Senior Admission - Recreation swim and Lap swim				\$ 5.39	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.57	\$ 6.00	\$ 5.74	\$ 6.00
		Monthly Swim Pass (not including lessons)				\$ 47.14	\$ 47.00	\$ 48.70	\$ 49.00	\$ 50.21	\$ 50.00
		Recreation Swim Scrip Ticket for 10 Sessions				\$ 28.28	\$ 28.00	\$ 29.22	\$ 29.00	\$ 30.12	\$ 30.00
		Yearly Swim Pass				\$ 538.62	\$ 539.00	\$ 556.44	\$ 556.00	\$ 573.69	\$ 574.00
		Water Exercise Scrip Ticket - 10 sessions				\$ 41.75	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.13	\$ 43.00	\$ 44.47	\$ 44.00
		Economic Need									
		Monthly Swim Pass (not including lessons)				\$ 49.83	\$ 50.00	\$ 51.48	\$ 51.00	\$ 53.08	\$ 53.00
		Recreation Swim Scrip Ticket for 10 Sessions				\$ 28.28	\$ 28.00	\$ 29.22	\$ 29.00	\$ 30.12	\$ 30.00
		Yearly Swim Pass				\$ 538.62	\$ 539.00	\$ 556.44	\$ 556.00	\$ 573.69	\$ 574.00
		Water Exercise Scrip Ticket - 10 sessions				\$ 41.75	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.13	\$ 43.00	\$ 44.47	\$ 44.00
		Lessons									
		Preschool/Tiny Tots (with parent), fee is for 10 weeks/10 Sessions				\$ 71.38	\$ 71.00	\$ 73.74	\$ 74.00	\$ 76.03	\$ 76.00
		Youth 6 years / 48" inch 30 min, fee is for 10 weeks/10 Sessions				\$ 33.66	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Youth 6 years / 48" inch 40 min, fee is for 10 weeks/10 Sessions				\$ 56.55	\$ 57.00	\$ 58.43	\$ 58.00	\$ 60.24	\$ 60.00
		Adult, fee is for 10 weeks/10 Sessions				\$ 90.24	\$ 90.00	\$ 93.22	\$ 93.00	\$ 96.11	\$ 96.00
		Water Fitness (all ages) one class				\$ 9.43	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.74	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.04	\$ 10.00
		Semi-private (2-3 students per instructor) 5 classes/30 min				\$ 141.42	\$ 141.00	\$ 146.10	\$ 146.00	\$ 150.62	\$ 151.00
		Private 5 classes/30 min				\$ 215.49	\$ 215.00	\$ 222.62	\$ 223.00	\$ 229.52	\$ 230.00
		Pre-Competitive Swim Teams 10 classes/60 min				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft./)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Classes - fees do not included the cost of material or certification costs									
		CPR				\$ 84.85	\$ 85.00	\$ 87.66	\$ 88.00	\$ 90.37	\$ 90.00
		First Aid				\$ 71.38	\$ 71.00	\$ 73.74	\$ 74.00	\$ 76.03	\$ 76.00
		Lifeguard Training				\$ 141.42	\$ 141.00	\$ 146.10	\$ 146.00	\$ 150.62	\$ 151.00
		Lifeguard Training - Challenge				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Pet First Aid				\$ 49.83	\$ 50.00	\$ 51.48	\$ 51.00	\$ 53.08	\$ 53.00
		Stroke Clinic				\$ 168.35	\$ 168.00	\$ 173.92	\$ 174.00	\$ 179.32	\$ 179.00
		Title-22				\$ 141.42	\$ 141.00	\$ 146.10	\$ 146.00	\$ 150.62	\$ 151.00
		Water Safety Instructor				\$ 141.42	\$ 141.00	\$ 146.10	\$ 146.00	\$ 150.62	\$ 151.00
		Age Group/Masters/Marionettes swim teams									
		MOU + Age Group Teams/Marionettes - per hour				\$ 32.32	\$ 32.00	\$ 33.39	\$ 33.00	\$ 34.43	\$ 34.00
		MOU Master Swim Teams - per hour				\$ 61.95	\$ 62.00	\$ 64.00	\$ 64.00	\$ 65.99	\$ 66.00
		MOU Additional Lanes				\$ 8.08	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.35	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.61	\$ 9.00
		Pool Rentals per hour				\$ 127.92	\$ 128.00	\$ 132.16	\$ 132.00	\$ 136.25	\$ 136.00
		Pool Rentals per lane per hour				\$ 26.93	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.82	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.68	\$ 29.00
		Pool Rental - Special Event									
		Special Events 1-20 people, fee is per hour, two(2) hour minimum				\$ 235.64	\$ 236.00	\$ 243.44	\$ 243.00	\$ 250.99	\$ 251.00
		Special Event - every additional 10 People, fee is per hour, two(2) hour minimum				\$ 67.33	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.56	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.71	\$ 72.00
		Birthday Pool Package									
		Birthday Package- MLK or Sava Pool, 1-20 Residents				\$ 424.16	\$ 424.00	\$ 438.20	\$ 438.00	\$ 451.78	\$ 452.00
		Birthday Package- MLK or Sava Pool 1-20, Non-Residents				\$ 558.81	\$ 559.00	\$ 577.31	\$ 577.00	\$ 595.21	\$ 595.00
		Birthday Package- Hamilton Pool 1-20 People Residents				\$ 538.62	\$ 539.00	\$ 556.44	\$ 556.00	\$ 573.69	\$ 574.00
		Birthday Package- Hamilton Pool 1-20 People Non-Residents				\$ 740.60	\$ 741.00	\$ 765.11	\$ 765.00	\$ 788.83	\$ 789.00
		Birthday Package- Hamilton Pool- each additional participant				\$ 22.89	\$ 23.00	\$ 23.65	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.38	\$ 24.00
		Birthday Package- Hamilton Pool with Rec Director Activities- Resident				\$ 740.60	\$ 741.00	\$ 765.11	\$ 765.00	\$ 788.83	\$ 789.00
		Birthday Package- Hamilton Pool with Rec Director Activities- Non-Resident				\$ 875.25	\$ 875.00	\$ 904.22	\$ 904.00	\$ 932.25	\$ 932.00
		Birthday Package- Hamilton Pool with Rec Director Activities- each additional participant				\$ 29.62	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.60	\$ 31.00	\$ 31.55	\$ 32.00
34	C	Summer Day Camp	Sec 12.15	Yes	Enrollment						
		Standard - Resident				\$ 154.80	\$ 155.00	\$ 159.92	\$ 160.00	\$ 164.88	\$ 165.00
		Standard - Non-resident				\$ 226.06	\$ 226.00	\$ 233.54	\$ 234.00	\$ 240.78	\$ 241.00
		Specialty Camps - Resident				\$ 309.60	\$ 310.00	\$ 319.85	\$ 320.00	\$ 329.76	\$ 330.00
		Specialty Camps - Non-resident				\$ 452.11	\$ 452.00	\$ 467.08	\$ 467.00	\$ 481.56	\$ 482.00
		Tennis Camps - Resident				\$ 258.00	\$ 258.00	\$ 266.54	\$ 267.00	\$ 274.80	\$ 275.00
		Harvey Milk Center - Resident				\$ 237.11	\$ 237.00	\$ 244.96	\$ 245.00	\$ 252.56	\$ 253.00
		Randall Museum Day Camps				\$ 262.58	\$ 263.00	\$ 271.27	\$ 271.00	\$ 279.68	\$ 280.00
		Randall Museum Mather Youth Camp 5 days - Resident				\$ 360.10	\$ 360.00	\$ 372.02	\$ 372.00	\$ 383.55	\$ 384.00
		Randall Museum Mather Youth Camp 5 days - Non-resident				\$ 527.65	\$ 528.00	\$ 545.12	\$ 545.00	\$ 562.02	\$ 562.00
35	C	Sharon Art Studio Classes Fees	Sec 12.27	Yes	Class						
		Adults - Ceramics Class				\$ 226.35	\$ 226.00	\$ 233.84	\$ 234.00	\$ 241.09	\$ 241.00
		Adults - Glass Class				\$ 163.15	\$ 163.00	\$ 168.55	\$ 169.00	\$ 173.77	\$ 174.00
		Adults - Jewelry-General Class				\$ 163.15	\$ 163.00	\$ 168.55	\$ 169.00	\$ 173.77	\$ 174.00
		Adults - Jewelry-Enamel Class				\$ 130.20	\$ 130.00	\$ 134.51	\$ 135.00	\$ 138.68	\$ 139.00
		Adults - Drawing-General Class				\$ 119.05	\$ 119.00	\$ 122.99	\$ 123.00	\$ 126.81	\$ 127.00
		Adults - Mosaics Class				\$ 91.13	\$ 91.00	\$ 94.14	\$ 94.00	\$ 97.06	\$ 97.00
		Adults - Life Drawing				\$ 73.49	\$ 73.00	\$ 75.92	\$ 76.00	\$ 78.28	\$ 78.00
		PROGRAM - NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES									
36	C	Latchkey & Afterschool Programs	Sec 12.30	Yes	Students						

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft./)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		School year, M-F, per day (changed from per month in 2009)				\$ 4.85	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.01	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.16	\$ 5.00
37	C	Tiny Tots Program	Sec 12.39	Yes	Enrollment						
		Traditional Tiny Tots - fee is for 10-visit pack				\$ 44.09	\$ 44.00	\$ 45.55	\$ 46.00	\$ 46.97	\$ 47.00
		Play Groups - fee for drop in				\$ 4.41	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.56	\$ 5.00	\$ 4.70	\$ 5.00
		Play Groups - fee for 10-visit pack				\$ 29.40	\$ 29.00	\$ 30.37	\$ 30.00	\$ 31.31	\$ 31.00
		Kids' Gym - fee for drop in				\$ 5.88	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.07	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.26	\$ 6.00
		Kids' Gym - fee for 10-visit pack				\$ 44.09	\$ 44.00	\$ 45.55	\$ 46.00	\$ 46.97	\$ 47.00
		Arts and Crafts - fee for drop in				\$ 5.88	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.07	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.26	\$ 6.00
		Arts and Crafts - fee for 10-visit pack				\$ 44.09	\$ 44.00	\$ 45.55	\$ 46.00	\$ 46.97	\$ 47.00
		Special Programs - fee for drop in				\$ 4.41	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.56	\$ 5.00	\$ 4.70	\$ 5.00
		Special Programs - fee for 10-visit pack				\$ 29.40	\$ 29.00	\$ 30.37	\$ 30.00	\$ 31.31	\$ 31.00
38	C	Recreation Program Fees	Sec 12.44	Yes	Enrollment						
		Level 1 Step 1				\$ 0.35	\$ -	\$ 0.36	\$ -	\$ 0.37	\$ -
		Level 1 Step 2				\$ 0.70	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.72	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.74	\$ 1.00
		Level 1 Step 3				\$ 1.05	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.08	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.00
		Level 1 Step 4				\$ 1.40	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.44	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.49	\$ 1.00
		Level 1 Step 5				\$ 1.75	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.81	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.86	\$ 2.00
		Level 2 Step 1				\$ 2.10	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.17	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.00
		Level 2 Step 2				\$ 2.45	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.53	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.61	\$ 3.00
		Level 2 Step 3				\$ 2.80	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.89	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.98	\$ 3.00
		Level 2 Step 4				\$ 3.15	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.25	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.35	\$ 3.00
		Level 2 Step 5				\$ 4.20	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.33	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.47	\$ 4.00
		Level 3 Step 1				\$ 5.59	\$ 6.00	\$ 5.78	\$ 6.00	\$ 5.96	\$ 6.00
		Level 3 Step 2				\$ 6.99	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.22	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.45	\$ 7.00
		Level 3 Step 3				\$ 8.39	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.67	\$ 9.00	\$ 8.94	\$ 9.00
		Level 3 Step 4				\$ 9.79	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.11	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.43	\$ 10.00
		Level 3 Step 5				\$ 11.19	\$ 11.00	\$ 11.56	\$ 12.00	\$ 11.92	\$ 12.00
		Level 4 Step 1				\$ 16.78	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.34	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.88	\$ 18.00
		Level 4 Step 2				\$ 22.38	\$ 22.00	\$ 23.12	\$ 23.00	\$ 23.83	\$ 24.00
		Level 4 Step 3				\$ 27.97	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.90	\$ 29.00	\$ 29.79	\$ 30.00
		Level 4 Step 4				\$ 33.56	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.68	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.75	\$ 36.00
		Level 4 Step 5				\$ 39.16	\$ 39.00	\$ 40.45	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.71	\$ 42.00
39	C	Reservation Administrative Fees	Sec 12.45	Yes	Fee						
		Refund processing fee, or 20% of the fee, whichever is greater				\$ 13.99	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.45	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.90	\$ 15.00
		Program withdrawal fee, or 20% of the fee, whichever is greater				\$ 13.99	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.45	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.90	\$ 15.00
		Cancellation fee, or 20% of fee, whichever is greater for cancellation of facility rental reservation				\$ 27.97	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.90	\$ 29.00	\$ 29.79	\$ 30.00
		Application fee for special event, non-refundable				\$ 69.93	\$ 70.00	\$ 72.24	\$ 72.00	\$ 74.48	\$ 74.00
		Cancellation or reschedule of Athletic Field Permit				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
40	C	Athletic Leagues - Public Benefit Prog.	Sec 12.48	Yes	Enrollment						
		Public Benefit Youth (Min)				\$ 13.47	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.91	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.35	\$ 14.00
		Public Benefit Youth (Max)				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Public Benefit Adult (Min)				\$ 40.40	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.74	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00
		Public Benefit Adult (Max)				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Revenue Program Youth (Min)				\$ 33.67	\$ 34.00	\$ 34.78	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.86	\$ 36.00
		Revenue Program Youth (Max)				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Revenue Program Adult (Min)				\$ 67.34	\$ 67.00	\$ 69.57	\$ 70.00	\$ 71.73	\$ 72.00
		Revenue Program Adult (Max)				\$ 94.28	\$ 94.00	\$ 97.40	\$ 97.00	\$ 100.42	\$ 100.00
		For Profit Program Youth (Min)				\$ 74.07	\$ 74.00	\$ 76.53	\$ 77.00	\$ 78.90	\$ 79.00
		For Profit Program Youth (Max)				\$ 114.48	\$ 114.00	\$ 118.27	\$ 118.00	\$ 121.93	\$ 122.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		For Profit Program Adult (Min)				\$ 114.48	\$ 114.00	\$ 118.27	\$ 118.00	\$ 121.93	\$ 122.00
		For Profit Program Adult (Max)				\$ 134.68	\$ 135.00	\$ 139.14	\$ 139.00	\$ 143.45	\$ 143.00
		Leagues Futsol Youth				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
		Leagues Futsol Adult				\$ 606.06	\$ 606.00	\$ 626.13	\$ 626.00	\$ 645.54	\$ 646.00
		Leagues 7 a side Soccer Youth				\$ 336.70	\$ 337.00	\$ 347.85	\$ 348.00	\$ 358.63	\$ 359.00
		Leagues 7 a side Soccer Adult				\$ 606.06	\$ 606.00	\$ 626.13	\$ 626.00	\$ 645.54	\$ 646.00
		Leagues Women's Volleyball Adult Youth				\$ 417.51	\$ 418.00	\$ 431.33	\$ 431.00	\$ 444.70	\$ 445.00
		Leagues Women's Basketball Adult Youth				\$ 673.41	\$ 673.00	\$ 695.70	\$ 696.00	\$ 717.26	\$ 717.00
		Note: The Rec & Park Commission is authorized to establish SF residing families who meet low income eligibility. To satisfy income limit requirements, the applicant's household annual income levels must be at or lower than the amounts below:									
		Family of 2 - \$27,450, Family of 3 - \$30,850, Family of 4 - \$34,300, Family of 5 - \$37,050, and Family of 6 - \$39,800									
		PROGRAM - CAMP MATHER									
41	C	Camp Mather Fees	Sec 12.01a	Yes	Reservation						
		San Francisco Residents									
		2 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 557.05	\$ 557.00	\$ 575.49	\$ 575.00	\$ 593.33	\$ 593.00
		2 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 101.42	\$ 101.00	\$ 104.77	\$ 105.00	\$ 108.02	\$ 108.00
		3 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 755.47	\$ 755.00	\$ 780.47	\$ 780.00	\$ 804.67	\$ 805.00
		3 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 133.75	\$ 134.00	\$ 138.18	\$ 138.00	\$ 142.46	\$ 142.00
		4 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 933.31	\$ 933.00	\$ 964.21	\$ 964.00	\$ 994.10	\$ 994.00
		4 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 167.56	\$ 168.00	\$ 173.10	\$ 173.00	\$ 178.47	\$ 178.00
		5 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 1,089.11	\$ 1,089.00	\$ 1,125.16	\$ 1,125.00	\$ 1,160.04	\$ 1,160.00
		5 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 199.89	\$ 200.00	\$ 206.51	\$ 207.00	\$ 212.91	\$ 213.00
		6 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 1,222.86	\$ 1,223.00	\$ 1,263.34	\$ 1,263.00	\$ 1,302.50	\$ 1,303.00
		6 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 243.98	\$ 244.00	\$ 252.06	\$ 252.00	\$ 259.87	\$ 260.00
		4 Person Tent Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 220.47	\$ 220.00	\$ 227.77	\$ 228.00	\$ 234.83	\$ 235.00
		4 Person Tent Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 44.09	\$ 44.00	\$ 45.55	\$ 46.00	\$ 46.97	\$ 47.00
		6 Person Tent Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 288.08	\$ 288.00	\$ 297.61	\$ 298.00	\$ 306.84	\$ 307.00
		6 Person Tent Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 58.79	\$ 59.00	\$ 60.74	\$ 61.00	\$ 62.62	\$ 63.00
		Non Residents	Sec 12.01b	Yes	Reservation						
		2 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 667.28	\$ 667.00	\$ 689.37	\$ 689.00	\$ 710.74	\$ 711.00
		2 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 111.70	\$ 112.00	\$ 115.40	\$ 115.00	\$ 118.98	\$ 119.00
		3 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 924.49	\$ 924.00	\$ 955.09	\$ 955.00	\$ 984.70	\$ 985.00
		3 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 155.80	\$ 156.00	\$ 160.95	\$ 161.00	\$ 165.94	\$ 166.00
		4 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 1,111.16	\$ 1,111.00	\$ 1,147.94	\$ 1,148.00	\$ 1,183.52	\$ 1,184.00
		4 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 189.60	\$ 190.00	\$ 195.88	\$ 196.00	\$ 201.95	\$ 202.00
		5 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 1,300.76	\$ 1,301.00	\$ 1,343.81	\$ 1,344.00	\$ 1,385.47	\$ 1,385.00
		5 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 221.94	\$ 222.00	\$ 229.28	\$ 229.00	\$ 236.39	\$ 236.00
		6 Person Cabin Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 1,490.36	\$ 1,490.00	\$ 1,539.69	\$ 1,540.00	\$ 1,587.42	\$ 1,587.00
		6 Person Cabin Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 257.21	\$ 257.00	\$ 265.73	\$ 266.00	\$ 273.96	\$ 274.00
		4 Person Tent Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 289.55	\$ 290.00	\$ 299.13	\$ 299.00	\$ 308.40	\$ 308.00
		4 Person Tent Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 57.32	\$ 57.00	\$ 59.22	\$ 59.00	\$ 61.05	\$ 61.00
		6 Person Tent Size - Weekly Rate				\$ 388.02	\$ 388.00	\$ 400.87	\$ 401.00	\$ 413.29	\$ 413.00
		6 Person Tent Size - Nightly Rate				\$ 73.49	\$ 73.00	\$ 75.92	\$ 76.00	\$ 78.28	\$ 78.00
		Senior Camp, age 55+; includes cabin & meals for 4 days/nights & roundtrip transportation from SF	Sec 12.01c	Yes	Reservation						
		Residents				\$ 332.73	\$ 333.00	\$ 343.74	\$ 344.00	\$ 354.40	\$ 354.00
		Non-Residents				\$ 373.23	\$ 373.00	\$ 385.59	\$ 386.00	\$ 397.54	\$ 398.00
		Cancellation and Processing Fees	Sec 12.01	Yes	Fee						
		Cancellation 30 days prior to reservation date, processing fee with refundable deposit				\$ 72.33	\$ 72.00	\$ 74.72	\$ 75.00	\$ 77.04	\$ 77.00
		Cancellation less than 30 days prior to reservation date				no refund		no refund		no refund	
		Cancellation after final payment				50% of total fees, no refund of deposit deposit		50% of total fees, no refund of deposit deposit		50% of total fees, no refund of deposit deposit	
		Late payment penalty				5% on total amount due		5% on total amount due		5% on total amount due	
		Change of reservation				\$ 21.70	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.42	\$ 22.00	\$ 23.11	\$ 23.00

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Unauthorized overnight stay at camp				\$ 108.50	\$ 108.00	\$ 112.09	\$ 112.00	\$ 115.56	\$ 116.00
		Late check-out				\$ 108.50	\$ 108.00	\$ 112.09	\$ 112.00	\$ 115.56	\$ 116.00
		Day Use Fees	Sec 12.02	Yes	Use						
		Adult (Age 13 years plus)				\$ 17.64	\$ 18.00	\$ 18.22	\$ 18.00	\$ 18.79	\$ 19.00
		Youth (Ages 2 to 12 years)				\$ 8.82	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.11	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.39	\$ 9.00
		Infant (Under age 2)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Meal Fees - Overnight guests	Sec 12.03	Yes	Meals per Day/We						
		Adult (Age 13 years plus) - Weekly Rate				\$ 279.26	\$ 279.00	\$ 288.50	\$ 289.00	\$ 297.45	\$ 297.00
		Adult (Age 13 years plus) - Daily Rate				\$ 44.09	\$ 44.00	\$ 45.55	\$ 46.00	\$ 46.97	\$ 47.00
		Youth (Ages 2 to 12 years) - Weekly Rate				\$ 161.68	\$ 162.00	\$ 167.03	\$ 167.00	\$ 172.21	\$ 172.00
		Youth (Ages 2 to 12 years) - Daily Rate				\$ 23.52	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.29	\$ 24.00	\$ 25.05	\$ 25.00
		Infant (Under age 2) - Daily Rate				Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
		Infant (Under age 2) - Weekly Rate				Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
		Late payment of meal fees				5% charge		5% charge		5% charge	
		Number of meals change after reservation is final				\$ 21.70	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.42	\$ 22.00	\$ 23.11	\$ 23.00
		Meal Fees - Transient guests	Sec 12.03	Yes	Per Meal						
		Adult (Age 13 years plus) - Breakfast / Lunch				\$ 17.64	\$ 18.00	\$ 18.22	\$ 18.00	\$ 18.79	\$ 19.00
		Adult (Age 13 years plus) - Dinner				\$ 23.52	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.29	\$ 24.00	\$ 25.05	\$ 25.00
		Youth (Age 2 to 12 years) - Breakfast / Lunch				\$ 10.29	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.63	\$ 11.00	\$ 10.96	\$ 11.00
		Youth (Age 2 to 12 years) - Dinner				\$ 16.17	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.70	\$ 17.00	\$ 17.22	\$ 17.00
		Infant (Under age 2) - Breakfast / Lunch				Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
		Infant (Under age 2) - Dinner				Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
		Low income fee reduction - 50% reduction for SF Residents meeting income requirements	Sec 12.04	Yes							
		PROGRAM - YACHT HARBOR									
42	C	Marina Fees									
		West Harbor - fee is per foot/per month	Sec 12.11	Yes	Per License	3% or CPI, whichever is higher		3% or CPI, whichever is higher		3% or CPI, whichever is higher	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 25'				\$ 14.69		\$ 15.17		\$ 15.64	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 30'				\$ 14.89		\$ 15.38		\$ 15.86	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 35'				\$ 14.89		\$ 15.38		\$ 15.86	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 40'				\$ 18.06		\$ 18.66		\$ 19.24	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 45'				\$ 18.06		\$ 18.66		\$ 19.24	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 50'				\$ 18.47		\$ 19.08		\$ 19.67	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 60'				\$ 18.47		\$ 19.08		\$ 19.67	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 70'				\$ 18.86		\$ 19.49		\$ 20.09	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 80'				\$ 18.86		\$ 19.49		\$ 20.09	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 90'				\$ 18.86		\$ 19.49		\$ 20.09	
		East Harbor - fee is per foot/per month	Sec 12.11	Yes	Per License						
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 20'				\$ 10.61		\$ 10.97		\$ 11.31	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 25'				\$ 10.61		\$ 10.97		\$ 11.31	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 30'				\$ 10.76		\$ 11.12		\$ 11.46	
		Berthing License Fee - Berth Length: 35'				\$ 10.76		\$ 11.12		\$ 11.46	
		Guest Dock	Sec 12.11	Yes	Per Dock						
		Short Term Dock Fee - fee is per foot, per day				\$ 1.88		\$ 1.95		\$ 2.01	
		Pick up/Drop off - fee is per foot, per day				\$ 3.67		\$ 3.80		\$ 3.91	
		Pick up/Drop off - fee is per person, per day				\$ 1.47		\$ 1.52		\$ 1.57	
		Flexible Pricing- Notwithstanding the fees listed in subsections (d) (1) and (2), the Department General Manager or the General Manager's designee may impose temporary increases and/or decreases to said fees, based on one or more of the following factors: fluctuations in customer demand at particular times or on particular days or dates or as among different areas of the Marina Small Craft Harbor, rates at comparable facilities, weather conditions, and dock conditions.									
		Deposits	Sec 12.11	Yes	Per Deposit						

Recreation Park Department - Park Fees

Item	Fee Status M/N	Description	Code Authorization	Auto CPI Adjust Yes/No	Unit Basis (e.g., per sq. ft.)	FY 2019-20 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee	Rounded Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee	Rounded Fee
		Berth				One Month's Monthly Berthing License Fee		One Month's Monthly Berthing License Fee		One Month's Monthly Berthing License Fee	
		Electric Adapter				\$ 157.25	\$ 157.00	\$ 162.46	\$ 162.00	\$ 167.50	\$ 167.00
		Hazardous Material or Removal Fee				\$ 187.97	\$ 188.00	\$ 194.20	\$ 194.00	\$ 200.22	\$ 200.00
		Key for Visiting Boaters - fee is per day				\$ 62.66	\$ 63.00	\$ 64.74	\$ 65.00	\$ 66.74	\$ 67.00
		Parking	Sec 12.11	Yes	Per Space						
		Berth Parking for Owners and Partners Only - Two Stickers				Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
		Berth Parking for Owners and Partners Only - Additional Stickers - annual fee				\$ 150.70	\$ 151.00	\$ 155.69	\$ 156.00	\$ 160.52	\$ 161.00
		Marina Parking, Crew & Non-Owner - fee is per day				\$ 9.42	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.73	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.03	\$ 10.00
		Special Event Parking - fee is per day				\$ 9.42	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.73	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.03	\$ 10.00
		Trailer/Dingy Parking, for Regatta etc. - fee is per day				\$ 9.42	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.73	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.03	\$ 10.00
		Purchase Fees			Per Key						
		Key Purchase (Berth holders, Partners & Families) - fee is per key				\$ 31.40	\$ 31.00	\$ 32.44	\$ 32.00	\$ 33.44	\$ 33.00
		Services	Sec 12.11	Yes	Per Fee						
		Chain Fee (delinquent fees, unauthorized vessels) - fee is per incident				\$ 64.63	\$ 65.00	\$ 66.77	\$ 67.00	\$ 68.84	\$ 69.00
		Dock Box Cleaning Fee - fee is from Haz Mat Deposit				\$ 64.63	\$ 65.00	\$ 66.77	\$ 67.00	\$ 68.84	\$ 69.00
		Impound - fee is per incident				\$ 193.90	\$ 194.00	\$ 200.31	\$ 200.00	\$ 206.52	\$ 207.00
		Harbor Line Installation - fee is per line				\$ 38.78	\$ 39.00	\$ 40.06	\$ 40.00	\$ 41.30	\$ 41.00
		Labor (per incident)				\$ 64.63	\$ 65.00	\$ 66.77	\$ 67.00	\$ 68.84	\$ 69.00
		Labor (per hour, if greater than per incident amount)				\$ 96.95	\$ 97.00	\$ 100.16	\$ 100.00	\$ 103.26	\$ 103.00
		Labor (per hour after-hours)				\$ 125.58	\$ 126.00	\$ 129.74	\$ 130.00	\$ 133.76	\$ 134.00
		Late Fees				10% of initial fee		10% of initial fee		10% of initial fee	
		Pump Out Water - fee is for the first incident				\$ 96.95	\$ 97.00	\$ 100.16	\$ 100.00	\$ 103.26	\$ 103.00
		Pumped out Water - fee is for second and subsequent incidents				\$ 161.58	\$ 162.00	\$ 166.93	\$ 167.00	\$ 172.10	\$ 172.00
		Slip Transfer - Administrative fee				\$ 62.79	\$ 63.00	\$ 64.87	\$ 65.00	\$ 66.88	\$ 67.00
		Slip Transfer Fee - Berth Length: 35' and under, fee is per foot				\$ 188.40	\$ 188.00	\$ 194.64	\$ 195.00	\$ 200.67	\$ 201.00
		Slip Transfer Fee - Berth Length: 40' and 45', fee is per foot				\$ 251.39	\$ 251.00	\$ 259.71	\$ 260.00	\$ 267.76	\$ 268.00
		Slip Transfer Fee - Berth Length: 50' and up, fee is per foot				\$ 408.90	\$ 409.00	\$ 422.44	\$ 422.00	\$ 435.53	\$ 436.00
		Storage	Sec 12.11	Yes	Per Fee						
		Dock Box - fee is per month for each additional (first box free)				\$ 19.39	\$ 19.00	\$ 20.03	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.65	\$ 21.00
		Multi-hull Surcharge				additional 40% of monthly berth fee		additional 40% of monthly berth fee		additional 40% of monthly berth fee	
		Skiff, less than 20' and no power or dock box - fee is per month				\$ 129.26	\$ 129.00	\$ 133.54	\$ 134.00	\$ 137.68	\$ 138.00
		Small Boat Rack (Dingy, kayak or canoe) - - fee is per month				\$ 32.32	\$ 32.00	\$ 33.39	\$ 33.00	\$ 34.42	\$ 34.00
		Storage Lockers - fee is per month				\$ 32.32	\$ 32.00	\$ 33.39	\$ 33.00	\$ 34.42	\$ 34.00
		Wait List Fee - fee is per year				\$ 96.95	\$ 97.00	\$ 100.16	\$ 100.00	\$ 103.26	\$ 103.00

Fee Status:

- C Continuing
- M Modified
- N New
- D Discontinued



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Administrator-Office of Cannabis
Department of Public Health

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Cannabis Business Permit and License Fees

The San Francisco Business Tax and Regulation Code, Section 249.20, the San Francisco Health Code, Section 3304, and the San Francisco Health Code, Section 8A.5.(e) authorize the Controller to adjust the permit and license fees as appropriate to ensure that the program recovers the costs of operation without producing revenue which is significantly more than such costs. The rates shall become operative on July 1, 2020 for Fiscal Year 2020-21 and July 1, 2021 for Fiscal Year 2021-22. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online at:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
City Administrator and Department of Public Health Chief Fiscal Officers

Department of Public Health - Cannabis Business Permit License Fees

Department	Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Cultivation Facility-Plan Check Upon Application	3,980.18	<100%	4,111.92	<100%	4,239.39	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Cultivation Facility-Initial and annual inspection under 5,001 sq. feet	1,075.72	<100%	1,111.33	<100%	1,145.78	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Cultivation Facility-Initial and annual inspection 5,001-10,000 sq. feet	1,613.58	<100%	1,666.99	<100%	1,718.67	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Cultivation Facility-Initial and annual inspection 10,001-20,000 sq. feet	2,151.45	<100%	2,222.66	<100%	2,291.56	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Cultivation Facility-Initial and annual inspection over 20,000 sq. feet	2,689.31	<100%	2,778.32	<100%	2,864.45	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Manufacturing Facility and Cannabis Distributor- Initial inspection upon application and annual inspection fee	790.66	<100%	816.83	<100%	842.15	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Retailer, Medicinal Cannabis Retailer and Delivery-Only Cannabis Retailer-Initial inspection and annual inspection under 5,001 sq. feet	645.43	<100%	666.80	<100%	687.47	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Retailer, Medicinal Cannabis Retailer and Delivery-Only Cannabis Retailer-Initial inspection and annual inspection 5,001-10,000 sq. feet	968.15	<100%	1,000.20	<100%	1,031.20	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Retailer, Medicinal Cannabis Retailer and Delivery-Only Cannabis Retailer-Initial inspection and annual inspection under 10,001-20,000 sq. feet	1,398.44	<100%	1,444.73	<100%	1,489.51	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Retailer, Medicinal Cannabis Retailer and Delivery-Only Cannabis Retailer-Initial inspection and annual inspection over 20,000 sq. feet	1,613.58	<100%	1,666.99	<100%	1,718.67	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Manufacturing Facility and Cannabis Distributor- Plan check upon application	3,980.18	<100%	4,111.92	<100%	4,239.39	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Microbusiness - Initial inspection and annual inspection under 5,001 sq. feet	1,398.44	<100%	1,444.73	<100%	1,489.51	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Microbusiness - Initial inspection and annual inspection 5,001-10,000 sq. feet	2,151.45	<100%	2,222.66	<100%	2,291.56	<100%

Department of Public Health - Cannabis Business Permit License Fees

Department	Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Microbusiness - Initial inspection and annual inspection under 10,001-20,000 sq. feet	2,904.45	<100%	3,000.59	<100%	3,093.61	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Microbusiness - Initial inspection and annual inspection over 20,000 sq. feet	3,657.46	<100%	3,778.52	<100%	3,895.65	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Microbusiness - Plan check upon application	3,980.18	<100%	4,111.92	<100%	4,239.39	<100%
Department of Public Health	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	All permit categories - Hourly rate for additional work as needed	205.46	<100%	212.26	<100%	218.84	<100%
Department of Public Health	Health Code Article 33 Sec 3304	Medical Cannabis Dispensary - Application Permit	4,643.00	<100%	4,643.00	<100%	4,643.00	<100%
Department of Public Health	Health Code Article 8A.5	Consumption Consumption Permit - Prepackaged Cannabis Products – No Preparation	860.58	<100%	889.06	<100%	916.62	<100%
Department of Public Health	Health Code Article 8A.5	Consumption Consumption Permit - Limited Preparation of Cannabis Products	1,075.72	<100%	1,111.33	<100%	1,145.78	<100%
Department of Public Health	Health Code Article 8A.5	Consumption Consumption Permit - Cannabis Smoking – No Preparation	1,254.00	<100%	1,295.51	<100%	1,335.67	<100%

General Services Agency - City Administrator - Cannabis Business Permit License Fees

Department	Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Permit Application Fee	2,000.00	<100%	\$2,000	<100%	\$2,000	<100%
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Permit Amendment Hourly Rate	110.00	<100%	\$110	<100%	\$110	<100%
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	License Fee-First Year	3,000.00	<100%	\$3,000	<100%	\$3,000	<100%
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Annual License Fee (after first year)	5,000.00	<100%	\$5,000	<100%	\$5,000	<100%
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Event Permit-For events with an estimated attendance of 500 or fewer people	500.00	<100%	\$517	<100%	\$533	<100%
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Event Permit-For events with an estimated attendance of 501 – 1000 people	1,000.00	<100%	\$1,033	<100%	\$1,065	<100%
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Event Permit-For events with an estimated attendance of 1001 – 2500 people	1,500.00	<100%	\$1,550	<100%	\$1,598	<100%
ADM-Office of Cannabis	Business & Tax Regulations Code Article 2, Section 249.20	Cannabis Event Permit-For events with an estimated attendance of 2500 people or more	3,000.00	<100%	\$3,099	<100%	\$3,195	<100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Works
City Planning Commission
Recreation and Park Department
Department of Public Health

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Personal Wireless Service Facilities Permit Fees – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Public Works Code Article 25, Section 1527 authorizes the Controller to adjust the application fees for Personal Wireless Service Facilities Permits set in this section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases for Department of Public Works, City Planning Commission, Recreation and Park Department, and Department of Public Health effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area.

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Works, Planning, Public Health, and Recreation and Park Chief Fiscal Officers

Wireless Services Permit Fees

Department	Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Public Works	Public Works Code, Article 25, Section 1527(a)(1)	Personal Wireless Service Facilities Site Permit – Application fee	531.00	100%	3.31%	548.48	548.00	100%	3.10%	565.48	565.00	100%
Public Works	Public Works Code, Article 25, Section 1527(b)	Renewal fee for each Personal Wireless Service Facility	265.00	100%	3.31%	\$274.24	274.00	100%	3.10%	\$282.74	283.00	100%
Public Works	Public Works Code, Article 25, Section 1527©	Modification fee for each Personal Wireless Service Facility	399.00	100%	3.31%	\$411.97	412.00	100%	3.10%	\$424.74	425.00	100%
Public Works	Public Works Code, Article 25, Section 1527(d)(1)	Inspection fee for each Personal Wireless Service Facility	194.00	100%	3.31%	\$200.32	200.00	100%	3.10%	\$206.53	207.00	100%
City Planning	Public Works Code, Article 25, Section 1527(a)(2)(A)	Personal Wireless Service Facilities Site Permit – Application fee	246.00	100%	3.31%	\$253.69	254.00	100%	3.10%	\$261.55	262.00	100%
Recreation & Park	Public Works Code, Article 25, Section 1527(a)(2)(B)	Personal Wireless Service Facilities Site Permit – Application fee	162.00	100%	3.31%	\$166.94	167.00	100%	3.10%	\$172.11	172.00	100%
Public Health	Public Works Code, Article 25, Section 1527(a)(2)(C)	Personal Wireless Service Facilities Site Permit – Application fee	234.00	100%	3.31%	\$241.72	242.00	100%	3.10%	\$249.22	249.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor's Office of Housing

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Mayor's Office of Housing Administrative Fees – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 8, Section 8.43(d) authorizes the Controller to adjust the fees set in that section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Mayor's Office of Housing, Chief Fiscal Officer

Mayor's Office of Housing - Administrative Fees

Department	Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) Fee	\$776.00	100%	3.31%	\$801.29	\$801.00	100%	3.10%	\$826.13	\$826.00	100%
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	Fee for Refinance of Mortgage Credit Certificate	\$776.00	100%	3.31%	\$801.29	\$801.00	100%	3.10%	\$826.13	\$826.00	100%
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	Downpayment Assistance Loan Program Fee	\$646.00	100%	3.31%	\$667.74	\$668.00	100%	3.10%	\$688.44	\$688.00	100%
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	First-Time Homebuyer Program Administrative Fee	\$646.00	100%	3.31%	\$667.74	\$668.00	100%	3.10%	\$688.44	\$688.00	100%
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	Loan Subordination Fee (Single-Family Borrowers)	\$646.00	100%	3.31%	\$667.74	\$668.00	100%	3.10%	\$688.44	\$688.00	100%
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	Lender Participation Fee	\$969.00	100%	3.31%	\$1,001.48	\$1,001.00	100%	3.10%	\$1,032.53	\$1,033.00	100%
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	Lender Participation Renewal Fee	\$388.00	100%	3.31%	\$401.34	\$401.00	100%	3.10%	\$413.78	\$414.00	100%
Mayor	Administrative Code Chapter 8 Sec 8.43	Proposal Review Fee (formerly titled Loan Servicing Fee, Multifamily Rental Projects)	\$2,511.00	100%	3.31%	\$2,594.35	\$2,594.00	100%	3.10%	\$2,674.78	\$2,675.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Works

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Blight Inspection Fee—Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 80, Section 80.4 authorizes the Controller to annually adjust the Blight Inspection Fee to reflect the two-year average change in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The two-year CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.91%, and 3.20% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based upon the CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Works, Chief Fiscal Officer

Department of Public Works - Blight Fee

Department	Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2- year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2- year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Public Works	Administrative Code Chapter 80 Sec 80.4(b)	Blight Inspection Fee	\$332.00	100%	3.91%	\$344.50	\$345.00	100%	3.20%	\$355.53	\$356.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Department

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: City Planning Commission Services and Permits –
Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Planning Code Article 3.5, Section 350 authorizes the Controller to adjust certain fees in Sections 350 through 358 to reflect the two-year average change in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI). The two-year CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.91%, and 3.20% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based upon the CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Planning Department, Chief Fiscal Officer

City Planning - Planning Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Subscription to Planning Commission Agendas	\$ 48.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 49.56	\$ 50.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 51.15	\$ 51.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Subscription to Landmarks Board Agendas	\$ 48.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 49.56	\$ 50.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 51.15	\$ 51.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Monitoring Projects - Initial Fee	\$ 1,447.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,503.72	\$ 1,504.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,551.90	\$ 1,552.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Project Review - 5 or fewer dwelling units & affordable housing	\$ 472.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 490.37	\$ 490.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 506.08	\$ 506.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Project Review - all other projects	\$ 1,116.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,159.42	\$ 1,159.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,196.56	\$ 1,197.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Project Notifications for Individual - First address	\$ 41.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 44.42	\$ 44.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Project Notifications for Individual - Additional Addresses	\$ 16.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 16.95	\$ 17.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 17.50	\$ 17.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Project Notifications for Organization - First address	\$ 41.00	10 - 50% depending on block & lot	3.91%	\$ 43.04	\$ 43.00	10 - 50% depending on block & lot	3.20%	\$ 44.42	\$ 44.00	10 - 50% depending on block & lot
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Project Notifications for Organization - Additional addresses	\$ 16.00	10 - 50% depending on block & lot	3.91%	\$ 16.95	\$ 17.00	10 - 50% depending on block & lot	3.20%	\$ 17.50	\$ 17.00	10 - 50% depending on block & lot
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Zoning Administrator Written Determinations pursuant to Sec. 307(a) for zoning letters of conformance	\$ 157.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 163.02	\$ 163.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 168.25	\$ 168.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Other Zoning Administrator Written Determinations	\$ 707.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 734.25	\$ 734.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 757.78	\$ 758.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Preliminary Project Assessment (credited towards first project application filed)	\$ 5,672.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 5,893.59	\$ 5,894.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 6,082.42	\$ 6,082.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Surcharge for conditional use or planned unit development (See Note 1 below)	\$ 120.00	100%	N/A	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	100%	N/A	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - No Construction Cost, excluding extension of hours	\$ 2,306.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 2,395.78	\$ 2,396.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 2,472.54	\$ 2,473.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Construction Cost, extension of hours	\$ 1,648.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,712.39	\$ 1,712.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,767.25	\$ 1,767.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Wireless Telecommunications Services	\$ 5,765.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 5,990.10	\$ 5,990.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 6,182.02	\$ 6,182.00	100%

City Planning - Planning Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Estimated Construction Cost \$1-9,999	\$ 1,648.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,712.39	\$ 1,712.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,767.25	\$ 1,767.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Estimated Construction Cost \$10,000-999,999	\$ 1,648.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,712.39	\$ 1,712.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,767.25	\$ 1,767.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Estimated Construction Cost \$1,000,000-4,999,999	\$ 9,187.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 9,545.30	\$ 9,545.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 9,851.12	\$ 9,851.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Estimated Construction Cost \$5,000,000-9,999,999	\$ 45,529.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 47,306.53	\$ 47,307.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 48,822.20	\$ 48,822.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Estimated Construction Cost \$10,000,000-19,999,999	\$ 83,604.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 86,868.85	\$ 86,869.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 89,652.06	\$ 89,652.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Conditional Use/PUD - Estimated Construction Cost \$20,000,000 or more	\$ 123,285.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 128,099.21	\$ 128,099.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 132,203.40	\$ 132,203.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Variance - Estimated Construction Cost \$0-9,999	\$ 1,047.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,087.69	\$ 1,088.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,122.54	\$ 1,123.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Variance - Estimated Construction Cost \$10,000-19,999	\$ 2,333.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 2,424.47	\$ 2,424.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 2,502.15	\$ 2,502.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Variance - Estimated Construction Cost \$20,000+	\$ 4,751.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 4,936.32	\$ 4,936.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 5,094.48	\$ 5,094.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Downtown District Review and Coastal Zone Permit Hearing - Estimated Construction Cost \$0-9,999	\$ 328.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 340.39	\$ 340.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 351.30	\$ 351.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Downtown District Review and Coastal Zone Permit Hearing - Estimated Construction Cost \$10,000-999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 334.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 346.91	\$ 347.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 358.03	\$ 358.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Downtown District Review and Coastal Zone Permit Hearing - Estimated Construction Cost \$1,000,000-4,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 1,848.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,919.75	\$ 1,920.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,981.26	\$ 1,981.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Downtown District Review and Coastal Zone Permit Hearing - Estimated Construction Cost \$5,000,000-9,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 9,135.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 9,491.82	\$ 9,492.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 9,795.94	\$ 9,796.00	100%

City Planning - Planning Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Downtown District Review and Coastal Zone Permit Hearing - Estimated Construction Cost \$10,000,000-19,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 16,719.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 17,371.68	\$ 17,372.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 17,928.26	\$ 17,928.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Downtown District Review and Coastal Zone Permit Hearing - Estimated Construction Cost \$20,000,000 or more	\$ 24,685.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 25,649.32	\$ 25,649.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 26,471.10	\$ 26,471.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Downtown District Review and Coastal Zone Permit Hearing - Minor Change of Condition Only	\$ 1,224.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,271.58	\$ 1,272.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,312.32	\$ 1,312.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Discretionary Review Request	\$ 640.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 665.13	\$ 665.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 686.44	\$ 686.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Mandatory discretionary review	\$ 4,404.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 4,576.37	\$ 4,576.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 4,722.99	\$ 4,723.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Full Institutional Master Plan or Substantial Revision	\$ 15,706.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 16,319.21	\$ 16,319.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 16,842.06	\$ 16,842.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Abbreviated Institutional Master Plan	\$ 2,874.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 2,986.57	\$ 2,987.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 3,082.26	\$ 3,082.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	General Plan Referrals	\$ 4,241.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 4,406.83	\$ 4,407.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 4,548.02	\$ 4,548.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Reclassify property or Impose Interim Zoning Controls	\$ 9,035.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 9,387.49	\$ 9,387.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 9,688.26	\$ 9,688.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Setback Line	\$ 3,653.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 3,795.16	\$ 3,795.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 3,916.76	\$ 3,917.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Temporary Use Fee	\$ 523.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 543.84	\$ 544.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 561.27	\$ 561.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Amendment to Text of Planning Code	\$ 18,052.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 18,756.72	\$ 18,757.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 19,357.67	\$ 19,358.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Determinations Related to Service Station Conversions	\$ 3,566.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 3,705.18	\$ 3,705.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 3,823.89	\$ 3,824.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Appeals to the Board of Supervisors	\$ 640.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 664.66	\$ 665.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 685.95	\$ 686.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Exception in C-3 District	\$ 2,326.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 2,416.65	\$ 2,417.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 2,494.07	\$ 2,494.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Modifications in C-3 District	Same as Basic commission hearing fee schedule	100%	3.91%	Same as 352(a) above	Same as Basic commission hearing fee schedule	100%	3.20%	Same as 352(a) above	Same as Basic commission hearing fee schedule	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Office Development Limitation Projects	\$ 6,234.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 6,477.86	\$ 6,478.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 6,685.41	\$ 6,685.00	100%

City Planning - Planning Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Article 11 Designated Buildings: Significant or Contributory Building, Designation or Change of Boundary	\$ 8,042.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 8,355.88	\$ 8,356.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 8,623.60	\$ 8,624.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Article 11 Designated Buildings: Conservation District, Designation or Change of Boundary	\$ 8,042.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 8,355.88	\$ 8,356.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 8,623.60	\$ 8,624.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Article 11 Designated Buildings: Permit to alter a Significant or Contributory Building Within a Designated Conservation District	\$ 10,617.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 11,032.06	\$ 11,032.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 11,385.52	\$ 11,386.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Article 11 Designated Buildings: Alteration of a Contributory Building Located Outside a Conservation District	\$ 10,617.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 11,032.06	\$ 11,032.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 11,385.52	\$ 11,386.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Article 11 Designated Buildings: Significant or Contributory Building Demolition	\$ 10,617.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 11,032.06	\$ 11,032.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 11,385.52	\$ 11,386.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Statement of Eligibility	\$ 1,883.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,956.27	\$ 1,956.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 2,018.95	\$ 2,019.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Certificate of Transfer, Execution	\$ 543.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 564.71	\$ 565.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 582.80	\$ 583.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Certificate of Transfer of TDR	\$ 1,696.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,761.95	\$ 1,762.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,818.40	\$ 1,818.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$0-9,999	\$ 409.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 425.16	\$ 425.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 438.78	\$ 439.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$10,000-49,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 419.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 435.60	\$ 436.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 449.55	\$ 450.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$50,000-99,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 2,642.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 2,745.30	\$ 2,745.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 2,833.26	\$ 2,833.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$100,000-499,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 4,104.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 4,264.67	\$ 4,265.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 4,401.31	\$ 4,401.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$500,000-999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 16,879.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 17,538.62	\$ 17,539.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 18,100.54	\$ 18,101.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$1,000,000-4,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 20,919.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 21,735.47	\$ 21,735.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 22,431.86	\$ 22,432.00	100%

City Planning - Planning Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$5,000,000-99,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 33,603.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 34,915.52	\$ 34,916.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 36,034.18	\$ 36,034.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit Applications - Estimated Construction Cost \$100,000,000 or more	\$ 38,797.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 40,312.22	\$ 40,312.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 41,603.79	\$ 41,604.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Inspection fee for applications with verified violations	\$ 1,447.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,503.72	\$ 1,504.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,551.90	\$ 1,552.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Back Check Fee for Permit Revisions	\$ 261.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 271.27	\$ 271.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 279.96	\$ 280.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Shadow Impact Fee	\$ 599.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 622.09	\$ 622.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 642.03	\$ 642.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Public Notification	\$ 62.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 63.90	\$ 64.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 65.95	\$ 66.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Public Notification	\$ 62.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 63.90	\$ 64.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 65.95	\$ 66.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Permit for Solar Panels or solar equipment installation	\$ 176.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 182.59	\$ 183.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 188.44	\$ 188.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Building Permit Application for New Building - Estimated Construction Cost Less than \$100,000	\$ 2,845.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 2,956.58	\$ 2,957.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 3,051.30	\$ 3,051.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Building Permit Application for New Building - Estimated Construction Cost \$100,000-499,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 2,847.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 2,957.88	\$ 2,958.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 3,052.65	\$ 3,053.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Building Permit Application for New Building - Estimated Construction Cost \$500,000-\$999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 15,624.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 16,234.44	\$ 16,234.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 16,754.58	\$ 16,755.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Building Permit Application for New Building - Estimated Construction Cost \$1,000,000-\$4,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 20,723.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 21,532.02	\$ 21,532.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 22,221.89	\$ 22,222.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Building Permit Application for New Building - Estimated Construction Cost \$5,000,000-\$99,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 36,412.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 37,834.27	\$ 37,834.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 39,046.45	\$ 39,046.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Building Permit Application for New Building - Estimated Construction Cost \$100,000,000+	\$ 42,907.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 44,582.10	\$ 44,582.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 46,010.48	\$ 46,010.00	100%

City Planning - Planning Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Inspection fee for applications with verified violations	\$ 1,447.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,503.72	\$ 1,504.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,551.90	\$ 1,552.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Demolition Application	\$ 1,846.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,918.45	\$ 1,918.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,979.91	\$ 1,980.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Fire, Police, Heath Dept. Permit Application Review	\$ 156.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 161.72	\$ 162.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 166.90	\$ 167.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Sign Applications	\$ 163.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 169.54	\$ 170.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 174.98	\$ 175.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Landmarks Designation	\$ 335.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 348.22	\$ 348.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 359.37	\$ 359.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Historical Districts Designation, Amendment, Rescission	\$ 1,342.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,394.17	\$ 1,394.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,438.84	\$ 1,439.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Certificate of Appropriateness - Project with Estimated Cost < \$1,000	\$ 394.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 409.51	\$ 410.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 422.63	\$ 423.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Certificate of Appropriateness - Project with Estimated Cost < \$20,000	\$ 1,571.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,632.83	\$ 1,633.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,685.15	\$ 1,685.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Certificate of Appropriateness - Project with Estimated Cost > \$20,000	\$ 7,271.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 7,555.12	\$ 7,555.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 7,797.18	\$ 7,797.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Compatible Rehabilitation or Replacement Building	Same as for Conditional Use	100%	3.91%	Same as for Conditional Use	Same as for Conditional Use	100%	3.20%	Same as for Conditional Use	Same as for Conditional Use	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Processing and Administering an Application Under California Mills Act - Commercial Properties	\$ 6,139.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 6,378.66	\$ 6,379.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 6,583.02	\$ 6,583.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Processing and Administering an Application Under California Mills Act - Residential Properties	\$ 3,069.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 3,189.33	\$ 3,189.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 3,291.51	\$ 3,292.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Transportation Study	\$ 27,310.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 28,376.36	\$ 28,376.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 29,285.51	\$ 29,286.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	MTA Review of Transportation Impact Study	\$ 5,253.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 5,457.99	\$ 5,458.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 5,632.86	\$ 5,633.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Sign Relocation Agreement Application	\$ 1,568.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,628.92	\$ 1,629.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,681.11	\$ 1,681.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Sign Initial Inventory Processing	\$ 877.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 911.62	\$ 912.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 940.83	\$ 941.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Sign In-Lieu Application	\$ 501.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 520.37	\$ 520.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 537.04	\$ 537.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Sign Annual Inventory Maintenance	\$ 284.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 294.74	\$ 295.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 304.19	\$ 304.00	100%

City Planning - Planning Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Transportation Demand Management Program - Review *	\$ 6,425.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 6,675.81	\$ 6,676.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 6,889.69	\$ 6,890.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Transportation Demand Management Program - Periodic Compliance *	\$ 1,071.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,112.63	\$ 1,113.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,148.28	\$ 1,148.00	100%
Planning Code Article 3.5 Sec 350	Transportation Demand Management Program - Voluntary Plan Update Review *	\$ 1,392.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,446.42	\$ 1,446.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,492.77	\$ 1,493.00	100%
* On February 17, 2017 the Mayor approved Ordinance 34-17, which amended Planning Code Article 3.5 Section 350 to include new Transportation Demand Management fees.											



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Department

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: City Planning Commission Environmental Review Fees –
Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31 Article IV, Section 31.22 authorizes the Controller to adjust certain fees in Sections 31.22 and 31.23 to reflect the two-year average change in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI). The two-year CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.91%, and 3.20% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based upon the CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachment: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Planning Department, Chief Fiscal Officer

City Planning - Environmental Review Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$0 and \$9,999	\$ 1,371.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,424.16	\$ 1,424.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,469.79	\$ 1,470.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$10,000 and \$199,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 5,333.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 5,541.46	\$ 5,541.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 5,719.01	\$ 5,719.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$200,000 and \$999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 10,356.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 10,760.79	\$ 10,761.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 11,105.56	\$ 11,106.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$1,000,000 and \$9,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 26,342.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 27,370.83	\$ 27,371.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 28,247.77	\$ 28,248.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$10,000,000 and \$29,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 177,254.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 184,176.35	\$ 184,176.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 190,077.22	\$ 190,077.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$30,000,000 or more but less than \$49,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 280,568.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 291,524.74	\$ 291,525.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 300,864.97	\$ 300,865.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$50,000,000 and \$99,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 319,380.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 331,852.61	\$ 331,853.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 342,484.90	\$ 342,485.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Initial Study Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost is \$100,000,000 or more (plus percentage)	\$ 342,612.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 355,991.68	\$ 355,992.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 367,397.38	\$ 367,397.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(1)	Surcharge to cover costs of appeals to Board of Supervisors	\$ 120.00	100%	N/A	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	100%	N/A	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$0 and \$199,999	\$ 30,444.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 31,632.90	\$ 31,633.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 32,646.39	\$ 32,646.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$200,000 and \$999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 30,444.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 31,632.90	\$ 31,633.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 32,646.39	\$ 32,646.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$1,000,000 and \$9,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 36,711.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 38,144.67	\$ 38,145.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 39,366.79	\$ 39,367.00	100%

City Planning - Environmental Review Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$10,000,000 and \$29,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 83,204.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 86,452.81	\$ 86,453.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 89,222.69	\$ 89,223.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$30,000,000 and \$49,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 125,568.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 130,471.51	\$ 130,472.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 134,651.71	\$ 134,652.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$50,000,000 and \$99,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 137,114.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 142,468.66	\$ 142,469.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 147,033.25	\$ 147,033.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Outside Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost is \$100,000,000 or more (plus percentage)	\$ 166,225.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 172,716.52	\$ 172,717.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 178,250.22	\$ 178,250.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(3)	Appeal of Preliminary Negative Declaration to Planning Commission	\$ 640.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 664.66	\$ 665.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 685.95	\$ 686.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(4)	Appeal of Negative Declaration, EIR Certification, Categorical Exemption determination to the Board of Supervisors	\$ 640.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 664.66	\$ 665.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 685.95	\$ 686.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(5)	EIR Addendum or Negative Declaration Addendum/Reevaluation of a Modified Project (plus time and materials)	\$ 28,673.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 29,792.70	\$ 29,793.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 30,747.23	\$ 30,747.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(6)	Supplement to a Draft or Certified EIR	1/2 of the fee in Subsection (a)(2)	100%	3.91%	1/2 of the fee in Subsection (a)(2)	1/2 of the fee in Subsection (a)(2)	100%	3.20%	1/2 of the fee in Subsection (a)(2)	1/2 of the fee in Subsection (a)(2)	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(7)(A)	Certificate of Exemption from Environmental Review - Applications that require only a stamp	\$ 365.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 379.52	\$ 380.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 391.68	\$ 392.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(7)(A)	Certificate of Exemption from Environmental Review - Applications that include HRER Review or Require an Exemption Certificate (plus time and materials)	\$ 7,151.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 7,429.92	\$ 7,430.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 7,667.96	\$ 7,668.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (d)	Surcharge to cover costs of appeals to Board of Supervisors	\$ 120.00	100%	N/A	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	100%	N/A	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(7)(B)	Class 32 Categorical Exemption Certificate Applications (CEQA Review). Estimated Construction Cost between \$0 and \$9,999	\$ 13,149.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 13,662.59	\$ 13,663.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 14,100.33	\$ 14,100.00	100%

City Planning - Environmental Review Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(7)(B)	Class 32 Categorical Exemption Certificate Applications (CEQA Review). Estimated Construction Cost between \$10,000 \$199,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 13,149.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 13,662.59	\$ 13,663.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 14,100.33	\$ 14,100.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(7)(B)	Class 32 Categorical Exemption Certificate Applications (CEQA Review). Estimated Construction Cost between \$200,000 \$999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 13,582.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 14,112.54	\$ 14,113.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 14,564.69	\$ 14,565.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(7)(B)	Class 32 Categorical Exemption Certificate Applications (CEQA Review). Estimated Construction Cost between \$1,000,000 \$9,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 15,314.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 15,912.30	\$ 15,912.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 16,422.12	\$ 16,422.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(7)(B)	Class 32 Categorical Exemption Certificate Applications (CEQA Review). Estimated Construction Cost is \$10,000,000 or More (plus percentage)	\$ 21,310.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 22,142.37	\$ 22,142.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 22,851.80	\$ 22,852.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(8)	Certificate of Exemption from Environmental Review	\$ 2,996.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 3,113.08	\$ 3,113.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 3,212.82	\$ 3,213.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(8)	Determination of Substantial Adverse Change in Significant Historical Resource	\$ 4,155.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 4,316.84	\$ 4,317.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 4,455.15	\$ 4,455.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(9)	Preparation of Letter of Exemption from Environmental Review (plus time and materials)	\$ 365.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 379.52	\$ 380.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 391.68	\$ 392.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(10)	Review of Categorical Exemption Prepared by Another City Agency (e.g. MTA, PUC) (plus time and materials)	\$ 308.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 319.52	\$ 320.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 329.76	\$ 330.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.22 (a)(12)	Monitoring of Mitigation and Condition of Approval Monitoring; initial fee (plus time and materials)	\$ 1,447.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,503.72	\$ 1,504.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,551.90	\$ 1,552.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (a)(1)	Community Plan Fees - Class 1 and 3 Exemptions	Same as fees in Section (a)(8) and (10)	100%	3.91%	Same as fees in Section (a)(8) and (10)	Same as fees in Section (a)(8) and (10)	100%	3.20%	Same as fees in Section (a)(8) and (10)	Same as fees in Section (a)(8) and (10)	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (a)(2)	Community Plan Fees - Environmental document determination	\$ 15,966.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 16,589.17	\$ 16,589.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 17,120.68	\$ 17,121.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (a)(2)(i)	Community Plan Fees - Qualifies for Community exemption or exclusion	\$ 8,723.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 9,064.05	\$ 9,064.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 9,354.46	\$ 9,354.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$0 and \$9,999	\$ 1,707.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 1,773.69	\$ 1,774.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 1,830.51	\$ 1,831.00	100%

City Planning - Environmental Review Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$10,000 and \$199,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 7,093.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 7,369.92	\$ 7,370.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 7,606.05	\$ 7,606.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$200,000 and \$999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 13,344.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 13,864.74	\$ 13,865.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 14,308.96	\$ 14,309.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$1,000,000 and \$9,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 33,234.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 34,532.09	\$ 34,532.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 35,638.47	\$ 35,638.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$10,000,000 and \$29,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 220,987.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 229,616.61	\$ 229,617.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 236,973.34	\$ 236,973.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$30,000,000 or more but less than \$49,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 349,556.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 363,206.41	\$ 363,206.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 374,843.26	\$ 374,843.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$50,000,000 and \$99,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 397,984.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 413,525.60	\$ 413,526.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 426,774.63	\$ 426,775.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(1)	Intitial Study Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost is \$100,000,000 or more (plus percentage)	\$ 426,811.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 443,478.71	\$ 443,479.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 457,687.42	\$ 457,687.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$0 and \$199,999	\$ 37,887.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 39,366.68	\$ 39,367.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 40,627.96	\$ 40,628.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$200,000 and \$999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 37,887.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 39,366.68	\$ 39,367.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 40,627.96	\$ 40,628.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$1,000,000 and \$9,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 45,689.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 47,473.47	\$ 47,473.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 48,994.48	\$ 48,994.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$10,000,000 and \$29,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 103,545.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 107,588.36	\$ 107,588.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 111,035.41	\$ 111,035.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$30,000,000 and \$49,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 156,298.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 162,401.76	\$ 162,402.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 167,604.98	\$ 167,605.00	100%

City Planning - Environmental Review Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 2-year CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 2-year CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost between \$50,000,000 and \$99,999,999 (plus percentage)	\$ 170,784.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 177,453.30	\$ 177,453.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 183,138.77	\$ 183,139.00	100%
Admin Code Chapter 31 Article IV Sec 31.23.1 (b)(2)	Environmental Impact Report Within Plan Areas - Estimated Construction Cost is \$100,000,000 or more (plus percentage)	\$ 206,999.00	100%	3.91%	\$ 215,082.82	\$ 215,083.00	100%	3.20%	\$ 221,973.90	\$ 221,974.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Rent Arbitration Board

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Fee Increase

The San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 37A, Section 37A.2(d) requires the Controller to calculate the annual Rent Stabilization and Arbitration fee. The fee for each residential unit shall equal the projected annual cost of funding the Rent Board divided by the total number of residential units estimated to pay the fee minus any balance remaining in the fund, rounded to the next whole dollar. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

The Controller has updated the required calculations, and the resulting Rent Stabilization and Arbitration fee for FY 2020-21 and 2021-22. The fee for FY 2020-21 is \$50.00 per residential unit and \$25.00 per guest unit. The projected fee for FY 2021-22 is \$59.00 per residential unit and \$29.50 per guest unit. This projection is subject to change pending next year's Controller calculations.

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
City Administrator Chief Fiscal Officer



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor London Breed
Members, Board of Supervisors
Kevin Guy, Director, Office of Short-Term Rentals

FROM: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis, Controller's Office

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Short-Term Residential Rental Registry Fee – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

Chapter 41A of the Administrative Code requires the Controller to adjust the short-term rental registration fee to recover the costs of operating the Office of Short-Term Residential Rental Administration and Enforcement (OSTR) without producing revenue that is more than the costs of administering the short-term rental laws. Operational activities include registering hosts and enforcement of Chapter 41A. The applicable code section may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Given these requirements and available data on revenues, expenditures and the number of registrants, the short-term rental registration fee would remain at \$450 to fully recover costs. Absent subsequent action by the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors, this fee will become effective October 1, 2020. However, the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors may revise the fee downward to any level of cost recovery determined to most effectively serve the intent of Chapter 41A, which is to regulate the use of housing units for tourist and transient use. The interim FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22 budgets recover only the costs of code enforcement, and all other costs are supported by the General Fund. Any level of cost recovery below 100% is permissible under state and local law.

cc: Board of Supervisor's Budget & Legislative Analyst
Mayor's Budget Director
City Planning, Chief Fiscal Officer



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Public Health
Treasurer/Tax Collector

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Deemed Approved Off-Sale Alcohol Use Fee – Municipal Code Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 26.26 authorizes the Controller to adjust the Deemed Approved Off-Sale Alcohol Use Fee as appropriate to ensure that the program recovers the costs of operation without producing revenue which is significantly more than such costs. the Applicable code sections may be found online at:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Public Health and Treasurer/Tax Collector, Chief Fiscal Officers

Department of Public Health - Deemed Approved Off-Sale Alcohol Use Fee

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Administrative Code, Section 26.26	Deemed Approved Off-Sale Alcohol Use Fee	\$284.00	100%	3.31%	\$293.39	\$293.00	100%	3.10%	\$302.49	\$302.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor's Office of Housing

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

CC: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Mayor's Office of Housing Student Housing Monitoring Fee – Municipal Code
Authorized Fee Increases

The San Francisco Planning Code Article 4, Section 415.3 (e) (5) (C) authorizes the Controller to adjust the Student Housing Monitoring Fee in that section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Mayor's Office of Housing, Chief Fiscal Officer

Mayor's Office of Housing - Student Housing Monitoring Fee

Department	Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 CPI	FY 2020-21 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2020-21 Fee	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 CPI	FY 2021-22 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2021-22 Fee	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Mayor	Planning Code Article 4 Sec 415.3(e)(5)(C)	Student Housing Monitoring Fee	\$852.00	100%	3.31%	\$880.17	\$880.00	100%	3.10%	\$907.46	\$907.00	100%



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

FROM: Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector Administrative Fees – Municipal Code
Authorized Fee Increases

The Administrative Code Chapter 8, Section 8.34.1(h) authorizes the Controller to adjust the fees set in that section to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI) without further action by the Board of Supervisors. The CPI adjustment factor for fee increases effective July 1, 2020 is 3.31%, and 3.10% for fee increases effective July 1, 2021 based on Bureau of Labor Statistics data for CPI-All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA area. Administratively, the Controller grants departments the authority to round new fees to the nearest dollar, half dollar, or quarter, as appropriate. Applicable code sections may be found online here:

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/overview.

Please review the attached Fee Schedule and notify us of any further changes or updates. Based on the data submitted by the Treasurer/Tax Collector to the Controller, we have noted projected fee cost recoveries on the attached schedule. No fees appear to recover significantly more than the costs of providing the services.

Attachments: Fee Schedule

cc: Budget Analyst
Mayor's Budget Office
Treasurer/Tax Collector, Chief Fiscal Officers

Office of the Treasure & Tax Collector - Administrative Fees

Code Section	Fee Description	FY 2019-20 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2019-20 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2020-21 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2020-21 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2021-22 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2021-22 Estimated Cost Recovery
Administrative Code, Section 8.34.1(f)	Notice of Delinquency (each separate valuation)	\$45.00	100%	\$45.00	100%	\$45.00	100%
Administrative Code, Section 8.34.1(g)	Redemption of Tax-Defaulted Property	\$55.00	100%	\$55.00	100%	\$55.00	100%

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: 6-30-20 SFJPD 12i Semi-annual Report of Civil Detainers
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:47:00 PM
Attachments: [6-30-20 SFJPD Semi-Annual Report on Civil Detainers submitted.pdf](#)

From: Cowan, Sheryl (JUV) <sheryl.cowan@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 3:52 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: 6-30-20 SFJPD 12i Semi-annual Report of Civil Detainers

Subject: 6-30-20 SFJPD 12i Semi-annual Report of Civil Detainers

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Please find attached the Juvenile Probation Department's 6-30-20 Semi-annual Report on Civil Detainers being submitted to the Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,

Sheryl Cowan
Executive Assistant III
Chief Katherine Weinstein Miller, and
Assistant Chief Palminder Hernandez
San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department
375 Woodside Avenue, Room 243
San Francisco, CA 94127
(415) 753-7556
Sheryl.cowan@sfgov.org

Sheryl Cowan
Executive Assistant III
Chief Katherine Weinstein Miller, and
Assistant Chief Palminder Hernandez
San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department
375 Woodside Avenue, Room 243
San Francisco, CA 94127
(415) 753-7556
Sheryl.cowan@sfgov.org

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Issued: Results of SFMTA Cable Car Fare Collection Monitoring Program in Fiscal Year 2019-20
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:26:00 PM

From: Reports, Controller (CON) <controller.reports@sfgov.org>

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:24 PM

To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Bruss, Andrea (MYR) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Kirkpatrick, Kelly (MYR) <kelly.kirkpatrick@sfgov.org>; Groffenberger, Ashley (MYR) <ashley.groffenberger@sfgov.org>; Cretan, Jeff (MYR) <jeff.cretan@sfgov.org>; Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Anatolia Lubos <ALubos@sftc.org>; pkilkenny@sftc.org; Rose, Harvey (BUD) <harvey.rose@sfgov.org>; Campbell, Severin (BUD) <severin.campbell@sfgov.org>; Docs, SF (LIB) <sfdocs@sfpl.org>; CON-EVERYONE <con.everyone@sfgov.org>; Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA) <Jeffrey.Tumlin@sfmta.com>; Levenson, Leo (MTA) <Leo.Levenson@sfmta.com>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; Sakelaris, Kathleen (MTA) <Kathleen.Sakelaris@sfmta.com>; Hammons, Diana (MTA) <Diana.Hammons@sfmta.com>; Schouten, Fred (MTA) <Fred.Schouten@sfmta.com>; Jones, Brent (MTA) <Brent.Jones@sfmta.com>; Valaris, Wesley (MTA) <Wesley.Valaris@sfmta.com>; Boomer, Roberta (MTA) <Roberta.Boomer@sfmta.com>

Subject: Issued: Results of SFMTA Cable Car Fare Collection Monitoring Program in Fiscal Year 2019-20

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a memorandum on its assessment of SFMTA's Cable Car Fare Collection Monitoring Program in Fiscal Year 2019-20. The assessment found that the cable car fare collection procedures need improvement.

To view the memorandum, please visit our website at:

<http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2850>

This is a send-only e-mail address. For questions about the memorandum, please contact Acting Director of Audits Mark de la Rosa at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or 415-554-7574 or the CSA Audits Division at 415-554-7469.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController.




OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Jeffrey Tumlin, Director of Transportation
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

FROM: Mark de la Rosa, Acting Director of Audits 
Audits Division, City Services Auditor

DATE: July 6, 2020

SUBJECT: **Results of SFMTA Cable Car Fare Collection Monitoring Program in Fiscal Year 2019-20**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) monitored the cable car cash collection practices of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for the first three quarters of fiscal year 2019-20.¹ Through its monitoring program, CSA found that:

- Collections from auditors. Conductors did not collect fares from the auditors on 18 (30 percent) of 60 cable car rides taken, resulting in \$128 of foregone revenue. For the remaining 42 rides for which fares were collected, conductors properly provided receipts.
- Collections from other passengers. On 25 (42 percent) of the 60 cable car rides conducted, the auditors observed that conductors did not ask for fares or proof of payment from at least one passenger on each ride, resulting in maximum potential revenue loss of \$519 from an estimated 73 passengers. On seven cable car rides, auditors observed conductors collect fares on a hill, which violates SFMTA's policy prohibiting conductors from doing so. On one ride, an auditor observed a conductor accept a cash tip from a passenger, which is contrary to SFMTA's rules and the ethics policy of the City and County of San Francisco (City).

¹ Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, no rides were conducted after February 14, 2020, so the results in this report represent the monitoring conducted for fiscal year 2019-20.

BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVE & METHODOLOGY

Background

In accordance with its work plan, CSA monitored cable car cash fare collection practices at SFMTA in fiscal year 2019-20. CSA audited cable car fare collection practices in 2007 and 2017 and conducted a follow-up review in 2010. CSA also conducted a cable car cash fare monitoring program during fiscal year 2017-18.

SFMTA

SFMTA is responsible for operating and maintaining the City's network of surface transportation, which includes pedestrians, bicycles, transit, traffic, and parking. It regulates transit modes including bus, light rail, and cable car. SFMTA is governed by a board of directors whose members are appointed by the mayor. The San Francisco Charter establishes SFMTA's authority in several areas, including the regulation of cable car operations.

Cable Car Cash Fare Collection and Receiving Procedures

Each cable car is staffed by two SFMTA operators: a *grip operator* responsible for driving and a *conductor* who collects fares, manages the boarding of passengers, and assists in braking when the car is on a steep hill. Conductors must collect fares from all passengers and do so without compromising passenger safety. The conductor must be positioned on the rear platform for braking duties whenever the cable car is on a steep hill, come forward to collect fares when the car is on flat or nearly flat ground, and check the rear platform and boarding area before alerting the grip operator to continue with the ride. The grip operator is to help identify new passengers and point them out to the conductor.

The conductor must provide prenumbered receipts and proper change to passengers who paid their fares. If a passenger refuses a receipt, the conductor is to destroy that receipt immediately and not retain it as part of the conductor's unsold receipts. SFMTA staff reconciles the cash fare revenues returned by conductors to the number of receipts issued.

In April 2019 SFMTA began a pilot program to require pre-payment of cable car tickets at terminals. Thus, for most rides, auditors boarded mid-route, rather than at terminals, so that conductors would be required to accept cash payments. Consequently, auditors did not observe riders on these rides buying tickets at ticket booths or conductors accepting tickets.

Passengers can use cash to purchase a single-ride (one-way) ticket, which is \$8 for a regular fare for all riders or \$4 for the off-peak fare for seniors or persons with disabilities only, from 9 p.m. to 7 a.m.² Cable car conductors also sell one-day passports for \$24 each. All tickets and one-, three-, and seven-day passports can be purchased at ticket booths at Powell and Market, Bay and Taylor, and Hyde and Beach streets,³ at various vendor locations throughout San Francisco, and through

² These fare amounts took effect in January 2020 and remain in effect on the date of this memorandum.

³ Ticket booths are open every day from 7:45 a.m. to 8:45 p.m. except from 11 to 11:30 a.m. and 5:30 to 6 p.m., when they are closed.

SFMTA's mobile ticketing smartphone application. Passengers can also use a Clipper card to pay the cable car fare.

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

The objective of the monitoring was to determine whether cable car conductors properly collect fares from passengers and properly issue receipts to passengers when collecting cash fares. During the first three quarters of fiscal year 2019-20⁴, auditors took 60 rides on the three cable car lines, riding on weekdays and weekends and at different times of day.

The auditors took:

- 21 rides on the Powell and Mason line.
- 23 rides on the Powell and Hyde line.
- 16 rides on the California line.

Auditors mostly boarded cable cars in the middle of their routes to ensure that conductors collect cash fares and rode long enough (at least five stops) to give conductors an opportunity to ask for fares or proof of payment. Auditors paid cash fares when conductors asked for fares or provided proof of payment upon request, documented the results of their own fare collection experiences, and observed and documented when other passengers were not asked for fares or proof of payment. Given that there potentially were passengers that had prepaid fares or passports but were not asked to present proof of payment, all passengers that did not pay a fare or provide proof of payment were categorized as potential fares that were not collected.

This assessment is a nonaudit service. Generally accepted government auditing standards do not cover nonaudit services, which are defined as professional services other than audits or attestation engagements. Therefore, SFMTA is responsible for the substantive outcomes of the work performed during this assessment and is responsible to be in a position, in fact and appearance, to make an informed judgment on the results of the nonaudit service.

RESULTS

The 60 rides that CSA took do not constitute a statistical sample. Therefore, the results below should not be extrapolated to reflect the cable car operation's overall performance.

SFMTA Needs to Improve Its Cable Car Cash Fare Collection Procedures.

A fare was not collected from auditors on almost one-third of the rides they took. Conductors failed to collect fares from auditors on 18 (30 percent) of the 60 cable car rides taken, resulting in \$128 of uncollected fare revenue. Most of the 18 rides where fares were not collected occurred on weekdays, during commute hours, and/or when cars were relatively empty. Fares were not collected from auditors evenly among the three cable car lines.

⁴ Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, no rides were conducted after February 14, 2020, so the results in this report represent the monitoring conducted for fiscal year 2019-20.

No fare was collected from at least one other passenger on almost half of the rides auditors took. Besides not asking auditors for fares in some instances, conductors were observed not asking for fares or proof of payment from at least one other passenger during 25 (42 percent) of the 60 rides taken, resulting in the maximum potential revenue loss of \$519⁵ that could have been collected from an estimated 73 passengers.


The 25 rides in which conductors did not ask for fares or proof of payment from other passengers most often occurred on weekdays during commute hours, and on relatively empty cars. Auditors observed these instances more often on the California line, where 11 of the 25 rides involved conductors not asking for fares or proof of payment. This number excludes passengers who used another form of payment when asked by conductors, such as a passport or Clipper card. Conductors not asking for fares or proof of payment violates SFMTA's Rail Rule Book, which requires them to collect fares from all passengers.

On seven rides auditors observed conductors collect fares on a hill, which violates the SFMTA policy that requires the conductor to be on the rear platform to assist in braking instead of collecting fares. On one ride, an auditor observed a conductor accept a cash tip from a passenger, which is prohibited by both SFMTA's Rail Rule Book and the City's ethics policy.

The exhibit below shows the results of the 60 rides taken, including the details of the rides during which conductors did not ask for fares or proof of payment.

⁵ These passengers were not asked for payment or proof of payment. If all passengers intended to pay the fare with cash, SFMTA would have foregone the full \$519. If all passengers had prepaid passes such as passports, SFMTA would not have foregone any fare revenue.

Exhibit: Cable Car Fare Collection Results for 60 Rides Taken by Auditors in Fiscal Year 2019-20

		Total # of Rides Auditors Took	Auditors					Other Passengers					Estimated Value of Potentially Uncollected Fares ^c
			Fares Collected (in Cash)			Fares Not Collected		All Fares Collected ^a		At Least One Fare Not Collected		Potential Fares Not Collected ^b	
			# of Rides	%	# of Receipts Issued	# of Rides	%	# of Rides	%	# of Rides	%		
Cable Car Line	Powell & Mason	21	15	71%	15	6	29%	12	57%	9	43%	29	\$245
	Powell & Hyde	23	17	74%	17	6	26%	18	78%	5	22%	19	\$182
	California	16	10	63%	10	6	38%	5	31%	11	69%	25	\$220
TOTAL		60	42	70%	42	18	30%	35	58%	25	42%	73	\$647
Day of Week	Weekday	54	37	69%	37	17	31%	30	56%	24	44%	71	\$626
	Weekend	6	5	83%	5	1	17%	5	83%	1	17%	2	\$21
TOTAL		60	42	70%	42	18	30%	35	58%	25	42%	73	\$647
Time of Day ^d	Commuting	28	18	64%	18	10	36%	14	50%	14	50%	42	\$369
	Other Daytime	15	12	80%	12	3	20%	12	80%	3	20%	9	\$84
	Evening	17	12	71%	12	5	29%	9	53%	8	47%	22	\$194
TOTAL		60	42	70%	42	18	30%	35	58%	25	42%	73	\$647
Number of Passengers ^e	Very Crowded	19	16	84%	16	3	16%	14	74%	5	26%	22	\$176
	Moderately Crowded	22	15	68%	15	7	32%	13	59%	9	41%	22	\$209
	Relatively Empty	19	11	58%	11	8	42%	8	42%	11	58%	29	\$262
TOTAL		60	42	70%	42	18	30%	35	58%	25	42%	73	\$647

Notes:

- ^a This column includes rides where no one boarded mid-route.
- ^b Based on auditors' observations of other passengers who were not asked to pay fares or present proof of payment (excludes fares not collected from auditors).
- ^c Based on the number of times auditors were not asked to pay fares or present proof of payment plus the number of times auditors observed that other passengers were not asked to pay fares or present proof of payment multiplied by \$7, the one-way single ride fare price. Estimate accounts for SFMTA's January 2020 fare increase of \$1 per ride.
- ^d For this report, commuting hours are defined as 6 to 9 a.m. and 3 to 6 p.m. Other daytime hours are 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. Evening hours are 6 p.m. to 12:30 a.m.
- ^e For this report, *very crowded* is defined as more than 30 passengers, *moderately crowded* as 16 to 30 passengers, and *relatively empty* as fewer than 16 passengers.

cc: SFMTA

Leo Levenson
Julie Kirschbaum
Kathleen Sakelaris
Diana Hammons
Fred Schouten
Brent Jones
Wesley Valaris

Controller

Ben Rosenfield
Todd Rydstrom
Nicole Kelley
Kate Chalk
Snehi Basnet
Elaine Wong
Juan Pacheco

Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Citizens Audit Review Board
City Attorney
Civil Grand Jury
Mayor
Public Library

Attachment: Department Response



London Breed, Mayor

Gwyneth Borden, Chair
Amanda Eaken, Vice Chair

Cheryl Brinkman, Director
Steve Heminger, Director

Jeffrey Tumlin, Director of Transportation

June 26, 2020

Mark de la Rosa
Acting Director of Audits
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Results of SFMTA Cable Car Fare Collection Monitoring Program in Fiscal Year 2019-2020

Dear Mr. De la Rosa:

Thank you for forwarding the results of the Cable Car Fare Collection Monitoring Program for FY19-20. Staff has reviewed the draft memorandum and has no further comments.

I would like to thank you and your audit team for the monitoring work conducted on the cable cars and the accompanying report. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 701-4720.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey Tumlin".

Jeffrey Tumlin
Director of Transportation

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: SFPD's Annual Report on Gifts Received Up to \$10,000
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 3:49:00 PM
Attachments: [FY2019-2020 Gifts Received up to \\$10,000 -.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

From: Chiu, Katherine (POL) <Katherine.Chiu@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2020 9:20 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Leung, Patrick (POL) <patrick.n.leung@sfgov.org>; Tom, Risa (POL) <risa.tom@sfgov.org>; Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFPD's Annual Report on Gifts Received Up to \$10,000

Hi and good morning, Ms. Calvillo.

Attached is an advance copy of SFPD's Annual Report on Gifts Received Up to \$10,000.

The original hard copy is being sent to you via inter-office mail.

Please contact us if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Thanks,

~ Kathy



San Francisco Police Department
Fiscal Division
1245 3rd Street, 6th Floor, #6115-M
San Francisco, CA 94158
415-837-7211 (direct line)
415-837-7210 (main line)
katherine.chiu@sfgov.org



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

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



WILLIAM SCOTT
CHIEF OF POLICE

July 1, 2020

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:

Subject: Annual Report on Gifts Received up to \$10,000

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-305, this memo serves to provide the Board of Supervisors with a report on gifts up to \$10,000 received by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD).

During FY 19-20, SFPD received the following gifts:

- A \$6,000 gift from the SF Police Officers Association for the SFPD Wilderness Program (Calendar 11/13/2019)
- A \$5,000 gift from the children of deceased SFPD Sergeant Thomas Blackwell to purchase gym equipment for Northern Station (Calendar 11/13/2019)
- A \$80.00 gift from members of the community to be donated to the Police Activities League (Calendar 6/3/2020)
- A gift of 70-80 cases of water from Hint Company to the San Francisco Police Department for use during the COVID 19 Pandemic. Valued at approximately \$840 to \$1,440 (Calendar 6/3/2020)
- A gift of 1,000 surgical masks from the Fibrogen Corporation for officers to utilize during the COVID 19 Pandemic. Valued at approximately \$1,715. (Calendar 6/3/2020)

Please contact Patrick Leung at patrick.n.leung@sfgov.org or 415-837-7213 if you have any questions or need any additional information about the gifts SFPD received.

Sincerely,

William Scott
Chief of Police

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Treasure Island Annual Report
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 7:51:00 AM
Attachments: [Treasure Island Marina - Resolution No. 153-19 File.pdf](#)

From: Beck, Bob (MYR) <bob.beck@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:34 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Treasure Island Annual Report

The attached is provided as required under Resolution No. 153-19.

If there is any additional information that I can provide, please, don't hesitate to contact me.

Thanks,
Bob

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: LBE Advisory Committee's Recommendation on the Charter Amendment (File No. 200510)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:36:00 AM
Attachments: [LBEAC on Charter Amd.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please find the attached letter from Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee regarding File No. 200510.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Chan, Regina (ADM) <regina.chan@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:09 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: LBE Advisory Committee's Recommendation on the Charter Amendment

At the request of the mayoral appointed Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee, attached is a letter regarding the Committee's recommendation on the proposed changes to the Charter.

Thank you,

Regina Chan



LOCAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Members

July 3, 2020

Matthew Ajiake
Juliana Choy-Sommer,
Vice Co-Chair
Darolyn Davis
Elahe Enssani
Miguel Galarza, Chair
Bruce Giron
Virginia Harmon - SFMTA
Dwayne Jones
Nicolas King - DPW
Iris Martin-Lopez - SFPUC
Wayne Perry
Ruben Santana
Stephanie Tang - SF Port
Kimberly Wilson - SFO

Via E-Mail

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682

Dear Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors:

The Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee (“LBEAC”) is composed of representatives of San Francisco LBE Certified firms and City Departments. The LBEAC advises the City Administrator and the Director of the Contract Monitoring Division on implementation of and proposed amendments to the Chapter 14B Local Business Enterprise Utilization and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance.

The LBEAC has discussed the possible impact of the proposed Charter Amendment – Public Works Commission, Sanitation and Streets Commission, and Sanitation and Streets Department. This Advisory Committee respectfully recommends to be stricken in its entirety, SEC. 4.139(c), *Performance of Work for Other Departments* (“provision”). The proposed provision is in direct opposition to the City mandate to strengthen public contracting opportunities for small local businesses.

The “public works or improvements in City streets, sidewalks, or City-owned buildings or facilities” referred to in the provision, are exactly the non-specialized type of work contracted out to the very small and micro local businesses in our diverse community. If implemented, the provision would effectively offer first right of refusal to a department, thereby eliminating numerous opportunities to the small local businesses that compete in the City’s long established low bid procurement processes. To reserve for a City department the aforementioned work contradicts Chapter 14B of the City Ordinance, which contains the mandate to set aside for award to micro LBES no less than 50% of Public Works contracts estimated to cost between \$10,000 and the threshold amount (currently \$706,000).

Moreover, cost accountability is not factored in the provision. With no cost analysis having been done, the major impact of this provision is to divest from the local small businesses that strengthen our local economy and hire our local residents. LBEAC is deeply concerned about potential impacts on minority-, women-, and immigrant-, owned businesses, especially as we face COVID-induced fiscal uncertainty.

Please feel free to contact me directly at mgalarza@yerba-buena.net regarding any questions or concerns you have about the LBEAC's recommendation to the proposed Charter Amendment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Miguel Galarza', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Miguel Galarza
Committee Chair
Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: No Potential Contractors Comply Waiver Requests
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 12:26:00 PM
Attachments: [H30 signed 12B letter and waiver.pdf](#)
[H40 signed 12B letter and waiver.pdf](#)

From: Cruz, Liezel (HRD) <liezel.cruz@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:11 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Winchester, Tamra (ADM) <tamra.winchester@sfgov.org>; Viterbo-Martinez, Domenic (ADM) <domenic.viterbo-martinez@sfgov.org>
Cc: Johnson, Dave (HRD) <dave.johnson@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: No Potential Contractors Comply Waiver Requests

Hello,

I'd love to follow up and receive approval for the 2 attached requests back from March 2020.

Thank you,

Liezel Cruz
Sr. HR Analyst
Public Safety Team
Department of Human Resources
415-551-8947

From: Cruz, Liezel (HRD)
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 11:20 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](#)>; Winchester, Tamra (ADM) <[tamra.winchester@sfgov.org](#)>; Viterbo-Martinez, Domenic (ADM) <[domenic.viterbo-martinez@sfgov.org](#)>
Cc: Johnson, Dave (HRD) <[dave.johnson@sfgov.org](#)>
Subject: No Potential Contractors Comply Waiver Requests

Good morning,

I'd love to receive approval for the 2 attached requests as soon as possible and please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Liesel Cruz, Sr. HR Analyst

Public Safety Team

Department of Human Resources

415-551-8947

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-SF_PACHT001 - A-414893
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:37:00 PM
Attachments: [CPUC_807.pdf](#)

From: CPUC Team <westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:53 AM
To: GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov
Cc: westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com; CPC.Wireless <CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org>; Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; clarence.chavis@verizonwireless.com
Subject: CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-SF_PACHT001 - A-414893

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (“CPUC”) see attachment.
This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.

Jul 07, 2020

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for SF_PACHT001 - A
SF_PACHT022 - A

San Francisco, CA /GTE Mobilnet California LP

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Ann Goldstein
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400
Schaumburg, IL 60173
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com

JURISDICTION	PLANNING MANAGER	CITY MANAGER	CITY CLERK	DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD	COUNTY
City of San Francisco	CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org	city.administrator@sfgov.org	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org		San Francisco

VZW Legal Entity		Site Name		Site Address		Tower Design	Size of Building or NA
GTE Mobilnet California LP		SF_PACHT001 - A		100 5th Ave, San Francisco , CA94118		Utility pole/tower	N/A
Site Latitude	Site Longitude	PS Location Code	Tower Appearance	Tower Height (in feet)	Type of Approval	Approval Issue Date	
37°47'11.962"N	122°27'48.572"W	414893	Antenna Rad 52.833	54.833	Zoning	06/20/2019	

Project Description: Install 1 antenna and RRU's to an existing light pole.

VZW Legal Entity		Site Name		Site Address		Tower Design	Size of Building or NA
GTE Mobilnet California LP		SF_PACHT022 - A		2201 Broderick St, San Francisco , CA94115		Utility pole/tower	N/A
Site Latitude	Site Longitude	PS Location Code	Tower Appearance	Tower Height (in feet)	Type of Approval	Approval Issue Date	
37°47'26.25"N	122°26'33.88"W	414913	Antenna Rad 52.833	54.833	Zoning	05/09/2019	

Project Description: Install 1 antenna and RRU's to an existing light pole.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Turning off cameras during public comment should count as leaving
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 11:16:00 AM

From: Heidi Petersen <heidipetersen@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Turning off cameras during public comment should count as leaving

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

Hi, I'm a constituent in District 5, and I've attended several different meetings over the past few months where the Supervisors or other attendees turned off the cameras. Turning off the camera should be counted as leaving the meeting. Either require cameras on or meet in person.

Thanks,
- Heidi Petersen

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Genocidal "California Volunteers Monument" at the corner of Dolores St and Market St
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:51:00 AM

From: Patricia Keenan <kptalk@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:55 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Genocidal "California Volunteers Monument" at the corner of Dolores St and Market St

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

Dear City Supervisors,

At the corner of Dolores St and Market St. is a disgusting racist statue of a man charging forward in triumph with his horse's foot on the neck of a Native American man!!! Are there plans to remove this daily source of dolor and supremacy over all – including today's colonization of the Mission District?

Thank you,
Dr. Connie Phillips
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: California Volunteers Monument (part 2)
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:55:00 AM

From: Patricia Keenan <kptalk@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:13 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: California Volunteers Monument (part 2)

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

I stand corrected. It still looks incredibly war-like and given the pain that Dolores St is named for, something less violent might be a balm.

Thank you,

Dr. Connie Phillips

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Public Safety Committee Resolution #200141
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:23:00 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Colin Gallagher <colinvgallagher@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:32 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Opposition to Public Safety Committee Resolution #200141

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

Members of the Public Safety Committee-

I am contacting you in advance of the Public Safety Committee meeting to be held this Thursday, July 9, to express my opposition to the proposed ordinance amending the Health Code to permit sex venues in San Francisco to have locked doors within their establishments and prohibiting the Director of Public Health from adopting standards that would require the monitoring of patrons' behavior inside the establishments.

It is irresponsible to make these amendments to the Health Code when we are still experiencing the the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. At the present time it is not possible to obtain a professional haircut in San Francisco. I find it incomprehensible that the Board would consider proposed changes would facilitate the transmission of COVID-19, let alone HIV, through sex venues in the city.

There is an epidemic of crystal meth use in the lgbt community. Facilitating the use of meth and other controlled substances inside sex venues by curtailing the ability of public health authorities to mandate reasonable limits on locked doors within those venues is simply unwise. There has been at least one death through drug overdose at Steamworks in Berkeley in the past year. Is this the record that you want San Francisco's sex venues to emulate?

The Public Safety Committee would better serve the lgbt community, and public safety within the city, by conducting hearings into questions such as why, after nearly two years, there have been no arrests made or charges filed in the murder of Brian Egg, a gay male San Francisco resident? Or why is it that the District Attorney's office is not charging violent crimes occurring in the Castro district, including circumstances where the alleged assailant had admitted to the offense before police officers?

Very truly yours,

Colin Gallagher

240 Lombard Street #939
San Francisco, CA 94111

Email: colinvgallagher@icloud.com

Sent from my iPad

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Please do not cut MUNI
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:14:00 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Drina Kaufmann <kaufmanndrina@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:30 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please do not cut MUNI

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

Hello Supervisors,

My name is Drina Canjura-Kaufmann and I have been a student here in San Francisco my whole life. I live in the Mission District (94110). I have taken MUNI to school everyday for seven years and it has been invaluable for all the activities in my life. Having access to MUNI is crucial. So many families do not have a car and count on MUNI to get to work and everywhere else. Please ensure MUNI gets the funding necessary!

Thank you,
Drina Canjura-Kaufmann
(415)9332953

Enviado desde mi iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Abysmal SF MUNI service
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:52:00 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: tom babcock <tbabcock123@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:40 PM
To: PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Abysmal SF MUNI service

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

Hi Mr. Preston,

I tried using the SF Muni complaint system but it doesn't work. The CAPTCHA system fails and then erases the information. So the bottom line is, I'm now complaining to you about the abysmal service that MUNI is currently delivering. I was passed up by TWO N JUDAH busses today (07/03/20), 12 minutes apart. The first bus passed me while I waited at the Duboce/Church stop. I saw that it stopped at the Duboce/Noe stop so I walked there and waited 10 minutes for the next bus. When the next bus came (at about 5:05pm), it stopped, passengers disembarked and when I approached the door, the driver CLOSED the door and wouldn't let me on. I WAS WEARING A MASK!. The driver allowed a bicyclist to remove his bike from the bus and then drove away. I was astonished. The driver didn't even acknowledge my presence.

I have to say, I'm very disinclined to use MUNI even after the COVID-19 pandemic has passed. I will now prefer to use either my car or take Lyft or Uber.

I sincerely hope SFMUNI goes bankrupt and is then reorganized so that more competent management and drivers can be employed. I've lived in this city since 1988 and MUNI service has degraded steadily since then. It's beyond redeemable. Scrap the mess and start over.

regards,

tom babcock
889 Clayton Street
SF, CA 94117

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: MUNI and Other Budget Issues
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:20:00 AM

From: Shelby Henneberger <shelbyhenneberger@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 10:42 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: MUNI and Other Budget Issues

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

To Whom it May Concern,

Stop running SF into the ground unless you want to cultivate a non diverse city built off of tech giants. I watch the BOS meetings, I watch/read press releases, and I don't understand how through all that work, very important transportation like the majority of Muni lines will now be permanently cut.

Excuse my language, but how the fuck do you fine people constantly for not paying fare, criminalize the homeless, increase the muni fare, use \$100+ parking tickets to pay off some of the muni deficit every year, and the muni STILL has \$110 million backlog of repairs? And that's too much money to find? How the hell do the police get any raise in budget if \$110 million is hard to find? Isn't that almost the amount the police budget was raised between 2016 and now?

The solution to the problems faced from the pandemic is "Defund the MUNI"? You're telling everyone here that there is no other solution than to take away the only "cheap" form of transportation so now essential workers have an even harder time to get to work? What the hell is wrong with you? You are ALL making poor people MORE poor.

Do you now understand why people are asking you to heavily defund the police? You can't house those experiencing homelessness, you can't upkeep the muni, and you aren't taxing tech corporations anything significant to help restructure the city. You WERE ACTIVELY asking for more police while defunding education and defunding the muni. How do you have companies bringing in millions of dollars in profit, bringing in tech buses that slow down traffic and take breaks in muni stops, and creating an even larger wealth gap to the city and do nothing about it?

P.S. The policy that was passed that led to no-evictions based on not being able to pay rent is messed up. What do you want people to do when they have \$6k+ stacked up in debt to their landlord and they can't find a job let alone GO TO IT because now we don't have a goddamn MUNI? CANCEL RENT. DEFUND SFPD. DO YOUR JOBS.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Corruption at SF Board of Appeals (Deforesting SF during health pandemic) Call in tomorrow if you can!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:13:00 AM

From: Zach <zkarnazes@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:47 PM
To: Monge, Paul (BOS) <paul.monge@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Info, HRC (HRC) <hrc.info@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (MYR) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Sheehy, Jeff (HSS) <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <Katy.Tang@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM) <nicole.bohn@sfgov.org>
Subject: Corruption at SF Board of Appeals (Deforesting SF during health pandemic) Call in tomorrow if you can!

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

Dear Tree Caring Community, Local Media, Hilary Ronen's office, and SF Board of Supervisors:

See here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tZX3oe8tn5M>

The July 1st meeting was yet another appeal where [DPW violated the law](#) and cut down trees illegally, preemptively hoping for a rubber stamp from the Board of Appeals (yep, they got it.)

Many [brave people spoke up](#) against this corrupt process and demanded that the Board of Appeals take it seriously.

Thank you to those that showed up and spoke truth!

The Board of Appeals gave a simple slap on the wrist and granted the appeal. Vice president Darryl Honda even went so far as to [brag about his friendship](#) with the opposing department representative (Chris Buck).

How can we expect a fair appeals hearing when the vice president is good friends with the opposing department representative??

This is clearly a **conflict of interest**. To protect it is to support corruption in one of our highest city departments.

Please consider speaking out about this with me by calling in at the [Board of Supervisors meeting tomorrow](#).

(Note, I've been trying to get BOS to publish accessibility information on their meetings webpage, so far they haven't

So I have to type it all out here (with my accessibility software which is not easy and is quite painful.)

<https://sfgovtv.org/> >> Follow along to see what's going on in the meeting here

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN (around 3pm):

1 (408) 418-9388 / Access Code 146 744 5071 # #

If you have trouble with the access code, call

1 (415) - 554-5184 And asked to be patched through

Thank you for all your support and caring for our urban canopy!



– Zach Karnazes

Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCcxiZP4mpnPGgSQGqfLoJyg>

<https://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/>

Please note: *While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all*

chronic pain and disability needs. Using the computer hurts for me, always.

My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free to follow up with me if you don't get a reply.

My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.

To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure.

On Wed, Jul 1, 2020 at 1:27 PM Zach <zkarnazes@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Tree Caring Community, Local Media, Mayors Office on Disability, SF Mayor, and SF Board of Supervisors:

Meeting TONIGHT 5:00 P.M.

<https://sfgov.org/bdappeal/meeting/board-appeals-july-1-2020-agenda>

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85900446212>

Access by Telephone:

Dial (888) 475-4499 (Toll Free)

Webinar ID: 859 0044 6212

[My Appeal](#) with evidence

My [previous hearing Statement](#) (6-3-20)

I am a local disability and community activist and also an appellant in the case to protect the [24th Street Mission trees](#).

The Department of Public Works (DPW) has taken it upon themselves to [illegally cut down healthy public fruit](#) trees during an appeals process. San Francisco Public Works Code [Section 811 has clear penalties for this](#), yet the Board of Appeals has been giving a "kiss on the wrist" and a rubber stamp to this apartment for violating the appeals process on numerous occasions. They do not take the role seriously in protecting the public good.

It is already unconscionable to be destroying our urban canopy and cutting down healthy fruit trees during [a health crisis which is worsened greatly by pollution](#).

That they are doing so illegally, only adds to that abuse of the public trust.

I urge the public to attend tonight's meeting at 5 PM and to write a letter to the board of appeals and your local supervisor.

I kindly request the Mayors Office on Disability to submit a complaint for the ongoing accessibility violations mentioned in my appeals brief and during the hearing and communicate with me about what is necessary to process such a complaint.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to step in and correct this illegal behavior from DPW, to fine this department and use the money collected to plant more trees in our urban environment, which continues to have the smallest urban canopy of any major American city, behind New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and others.

– Zach Karnazes

Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist

<https://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/>

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCcxiZP4mpnPGgSQGqfLoJyg>

Please note: *While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs. Using the computer hurts for me, always.*

My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free to follow up with me if you don't get a reply.

My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.

To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure.

On Mon, May 18, 2020 at 4:40 PM Zach <zkarnazes@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Local Media, Community, SF Mayor, and SF Board of Supervisors:

I am a local disability and community activist and also an appellant in the case

to protect the [24th Street Mission trees](#).

It is unfathomable, that during the time of COVID-19, San Francisco's Department of Public Works and Bureau of Urban Forestry are moving forward to cut down **healthy, safe fruit trees** in the Bayview that pose no risk to anyone. This is in stark contrast to [new evidence](#) that shows that increasing air pollution also [increases the risk of infection and mortality rates from COVID-19](#). Their actions are the opposite of what health officials recommend.

It is unfathomable, that during the time of COVID-19, when a multitude of city functions and democratic public input are shut down and [cancelled](#) at City Hall, that our limited city resources are being used to destroy healthy fruit trees. They should be used help people, including the [greatly at-risk homeless](#) population, weather this crisis.

It is unfathomable, that during the time of COVID-19, DPW / BUF continues to neglect their responsibility to the disability community and continues to violate Title II of the [American with Disabilities Act](#).

There will be a hearing for this matter on **June 03rd, 2020** remotely at the San Francisco [Board of Appeals](#). The public is encouraged to attend however, BOA has not provided accessible info for the meeting yet. I've asked them for this information, feel free to contact me and I will be happy to share as it becomes available.

Please see the [attached filed brief](#) with the SF Board of Appeals for more information.

Please **feel free to share this email and attached documents publicly on any social media or news outlets**. I am also available for comment via this email address.

– Zach Karnazes

Disability Advocate | Journalist | Artist

<https://zkarnazes.wixsite.com/access/>

[Videos of Public Activism](#)

Please note: *While technology has improved a lot, computer accessibility aids are not a magic bullet for all chronic pain and disability needs. Using the computer hurts for me, always.*

My replies can take a while sometimes, depending on my pain levels and functional use of my hands. I appreciate your patience! Feel free to follow up with me if you don't get a reply.

My aids may leave typos in my message(s). Please let me know in your response if any part of my email needs clarifying or is confusing.

To help with confusion and disability, I ask that you please respond including the numbering system provided, if any is used.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: July 4th: Abject Fear.
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:58:00 AM

From: Kyle Johnson <k415johnson@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 4, 2020 9:34 PM
To: moffitt@sfgate.com; Susana.guerrero@sfgate.com
Cc: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Kyle Johnson <k415johnson@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: July 4th: Abject Fear.

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

Ms. Bartlett:

Please forward this letter to whomever may be able to help or is interested in this story. I would love to share my experience, fear, and pain with whomever will listen.

Thank you.

Kyle D. Johnson

On Jul 4, 2020, at 9:25 PM, Kyle Johnson <k415johnson@gmail.com> wrote:

Supervisor Preston and Mayor Breed.

I voted for both of you last year, Mr. Preston in the fall and the Ms. Breed earlier in 2019.

We have been harassed by illegal fireworks for the last month and a half. My apartment is in a Victorian built in 1909 so I have worried about going up in flames every since this harassment began. I called 911 at 8.50 pm, on the evening of July 4th after sheltering in my closet with my two dogs for the last hour, after 5 minutes I spoke to a dispatcher that said they couldn't do anything to help me and transferred me to 311. I'm sure you know 311 did not thing as well.

This is unacceptable. I live one block from the police station on Fillmore and Turk, the parking lot of the station is full of squad cars and I haven't seen one officer on the streets this evening as I have been out walking my two dogs. The fact that both the 911 dispatcher and the 311 dispatcher told me they could not help me unless someone was hurt or property was damaged is not good enough to protect the citizens of this city.

I wanted a change in the way SF was managed and ran which is why I voted for each of you. Tonight I have lost in faith in the elected officials. Any accident that occurs tonight is on your watch and each of you is responsible for the outcome. Your citizens are hiding in their homes. How does that make

you feel. I will be seeking better leadership in the next election as I have lost hope in each of you.

I don't expect to hear from either of you I just wanted to let each of you know you lost my vote and each of you need every vote you received so that isn't something either of you can afford but we cannot afford your type of leadership.

Kyle D. Johnson
415-310-7051
1030 Steiner Street, Apt. D.
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Name Change
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:50:00 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Comcast <jvannucchi@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 12:34 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Name Change

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

As verified through the California State Association of Counties, San Francisco was named as follows:

“Created 1850. The sixth mission in California was established here by Padre Junipero Serra on October 9, 1776, and was named Mission San Francisco de Asis a la Laguna de los Dolores (Saint Francis of Assisi at the Lagoon of Sorrows). The mission is now known as Mission Dolores.”

Yes. Named by Padre Junipero Serra of recent media notoriety whose existence is being expunged in a feeding frenzy. Right or wrong, you got me.

I'm confident that the CCSF, which embraces equity and fairness for all, would never knowingly allow a double standard to exist.

As such, when can we expect San Francisco to be renamed?

James Vannucchi

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Amputating CEQA Legs
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:47:00 AM

From: Steve Ward <seaward94133@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2020 4:30 PM
To: CPC.PlanningNews <planningnews@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Amputating CEQA Legs

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

Ø

Page 1 of 2
 July 8, 2020

San Francisco Planning Commission
 San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Re: OPPOSE 2020-000052PCA, Standard Environmental Requirements, Code Amendments

AND Call for strengthening of the CEQA process in San Francisco

Dear Commissioners,

The undersigned organizations write to voice our strong opposition to Planning staff's proposed Standard

Environmental Requirements and Code Amendments (SER proposals). These proposed changes, in the guise

of 'streamlining' and 'standardizing' development approvals, instead unacceptably and dangerously create

huge legal loopholes that allow the waiving of environmental review under the California Environmental

Quality Act (CEQA). We urge you to strongly oppose these SER proposals, and furthermore, we urge the

City to institute changes to the current CEQA review process in San Francisco, to establish more

transparency and democratic participation for local residents.

It should be noted that we the signers, while representing organizations and views that are highly diverse

and often not in alignment, on this issue of the vital need to maintain and strengthen our community CEQA

protections, we are resolute and unified in this communication to you.

Fifty years ago, California adopted CEQA as a vital tool in reducing impacts to the environment, maintaining

neighborhood integrity, reducing transportation congestion, and safeguarding historic landmarks. We support the City mandating the most environmentally friendly equipment and methods for projects in San Francisco, but this must be done without damaging the people's right to a fair CEQA process. CEQA must never be weakened or waived in order to simply speed up project approvals. During these times when the Trump Administration in Washington DC is so easily and callously sweeping aside environmental review and environmental protections in order to streamline corporate profits, San Francisco should be strengthening its environmental protections, not weakening them. The SER proposals would give City planners sweeping powers over project approvals. Under the guise of establishing 'Standard Requirements' these unacceptable proposals would give City planners sweeping powers to declare projects Categorical Exempt from environmental review, behind closed doors, without any public hearings, based on their own subjective discretion. The prop

Would cut the public and the elected Board of Supervisors out of the environmental appeals process. Because there is now a more quickly triggered and shorter time period for appealing Categorical Exemptions to the Board, and Categorical Exemptions do not require hearings at the Planning Commission (and, as stated above, under the proposed ordinance exemptions for any project could just be made up arbitrarily) planners would be able to fly far more projects quickly under the radar, with the public far less likely to be aware of them. This would decimate the ability of the public to find out about and appeal harmful projects. Ø Are a disrespectful repeat of previous such attempts by Planning staff to weaken San Francisco's environmental protections. In 2006, 2010, and 2012 Planning staff put forward very similar proposals to allow themselves to waive CEQA protections and fly projects under the radar without democratic and environmental scrutiny. Each time, the public and the Board of Supervisors said "No!" and rejected these attempts. Enough is enough. Planning staff should not be allowed to come back over and over again every few years, with the same failed undemocratic proposals,

hoping that a new set of Supervisors will somehow not understand the importance of CEQA to

environmental protection, and to the democratic process for San Franciscans.

CEQA in San Francisco needs to be strengthened, not weakened.

For example, there needs to be a more robust process for informing the public of the numerous Categorical

Exemptions that are issued each year by Planning staff.

Ø Appeal Deadlines: Because Categorical Exemptions require no public hearings, with community

questions answered, many projects lack adequate public information at the time that a Categorical

Exemption is issued. To give the public adequate time to learn about a project, and if desired file an

effective appeal, the length of time for an appeal of a Categorical Exemption should be extended

from the current 30 days to 60 days.

Ø Public Notice: So that they are clearly announced to the public, in addition to other noticing

requirements, Categorical Exemptions, as they are issued, should be publicly and prominently

listed in the agenda for the next public meeting of the Planning Commission, with a sentence

describing for each exemption why it was issued.

We are eager to work with the Department to further explore these and other possibilities toward making

the CEQA process more effective for the environment and for the residents of San Francisco.

Conclusion

Because these SER proposals allow Planning staff to outright gut our precious CEQA environmental and

appeal protections, and are an unwarranted revisiting of previous such proposals that San Franciscans

and public officials have clearly and repeatedly rejected, we strongly urge you to OPPOSE them.

We also urge you to strengthen the CEQA process in San Francisco, so past abuses will be prevented and

the people of San Francisco may enjoy their right to a full and transparent environmental review process.

Sincerely The appropriate strength of voice given to neighborhood developments should remain with the people who live there.

Steve Ward 3rd Gen SF

La Playa Park Village (In the Outer Sunset)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: CEQA Implementation - Standard Environmental Requirements (SER) Program (Planning Department Case No. 2020-000052PCA)
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 12:16:00 PM
Attachments: [SFPC CEQA SER Letter 7-8-20.pdf](#)

From: SF Preservation Consortium <sfpreservationconsortium@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:27 AM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Angela.Calvillo@SFBOS.ORG; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Hyland, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.hyland@sfgov.org>; Matsuda, Diane (CPC) <diane.matsuda@sfgov.org>; Black, Kate (CPC) <kate.black@sfgov.org>; Foley, Chris (CPC) <chris.foley@sfgov.org>; Johns, Richard (CPC) <richard.se.johns@sfgov.org>; Pearlman, Jonathan (CPC) <jonathan.pearlman@sfgov.org>; So, Lydia (CPC) <lydia.so@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; Joslin, Jeff (CPC) <jeff.joslin@sfgov.org>; Boudreaux, Marcelle (CPC) <marcelle.boudreaux@sfgov.org>; Sucre, Richard (CPC) <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>; Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC) <elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@sfgov.org>; Gibson, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>; Vanderslice, Allison (CPC) <allison.vanderslice@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Flores, Veronica (CPC) <Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org>; RUIZ-ESQUIDE, ANDREA (CAT) <Andrea.Ruiz-Esquide@sfcityatty.org>; Mike Buhler <Mbuhler@sfheritage.org>

Cc: Consortium <sfpreservationconsortium@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: CEQA Implementation - Standard Environmental Requirements (SER) Program (Planning Department Case No. 2020-000052PCA)

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

SAN FRANCISCO PRESERVATION CONSORTIUM
P.O. Box 330447
San Francisco, CA 94133-0447
July 8, 2020

President Joel Koppel

San Francisco Planning Commission
and
President Aaron Jon Hyland, AIA, NCARB
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
Attn: Jonas P. Ionin, Commissions Secretary
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Subject: CEQA Implementation - Standard Environmental Requirements (SER)
Program Amendments to the Planning, Administrative, Environment and Police Codes
(Planning Department Case No. 2020-000052PCA)

Dear President Koppel and President Hyland:

Established in 2001, the San Francisco Preservation Consortium (Consortium) works in partnership with individuals, neighborhood groups and other associations to advocate for effective land use legislation and responsible historic, architectural and cultural preservation practices in accordance with accepted professional standards and best practices. The Consortium's advocacy ensures that the City and its neighborhoods sustain their living history and character as they evolve.

On behalf of the Consortium's 160 members, I ask the Planning Commission (Commission) and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to table adoption of the proposed Standard Environmental Requirements (SER) Program Amendments to the Planning, Administrative, Environment and Police Codes until at least two months after the current COVID-19 emergency shelter-in-place requirements have been lifted to afford the public adequate time to review and comment on these proposed sweeping changes to the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) in San Francisco. (*The Commission most recently continued this item to their July 30, 2020 meeting and the HPC continued it to their July 15, 2020 meeting.*) We strongly object to the piecemeal adoption of the SER Program Amendments absent the identification of specific SERs and SER Program implementation procedures for the protection of historical resources.

Approximately 75% of the buildings in San Francisco are 50 years old or greater and may be considered potential historical resources. The use of yet-to-be determined SERs appears to exempt a large class of projects from historical resource evaluation all together because projects that would currently require Mitigated Negative Declarations (MNDs) would, under the SER Program, be categorically exempt. The current system often fails to correctly identify the class of historical resource or potential historical resource at the outset of a project. The SER Program might allow even more historical resources and potential historical resources to slip through the cracks as much of the city remains unsurveyed. The Western Addition and nearly the entire west side of San Francisco still need far more survey work and

designation of historic districts and potential historic districts. With the exception of Fort Funston, there is not a single historic district located on the west side of the city. Even most of the east side remains unprotected. Many demolitions are now taking place in the Sea Cliff and Pacific Heights neighborhoods.

We believe the proposed SER Program will place an undue burden on the public to track a much greater volume exemption determinations and approval actions. It will also impose considerable procedural hurdles to evaluating whether alterations to designated historical resources, especially those contributing to historic districts or potential historic districts, would have adverse cumulative effects under CEQA. The Planning Department (Department) already applies the standards unevenly. In some cases, this has meant that demolition of a contributory resource, or alterations that do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, are deemed significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated under CEQA requiring preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Whereas in other instances, the Department has allowed demolition of contributing resources without an EIR as long as it determines the overall eligibility of the historic district is maintained. Proposals to alter or demolish a potential contributor to a potential historic district are among the most difficult impacts to evaluate under CEQA and it appears these distinctions and evaluations might be completely lost with the adoption of the SER Program.

Further, the SER Program Amendments do not adequately address the roles of the Commission and the HPC in accordance with the provisions of Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code. The City's Historic Preservation Officer/CLG Coordinator position remains unfilled which calls into question our Certified Local Government (CLG) Program status. Said staff member must meet the minimum professional qualifications defined in 36 CFR Part 61. Moreover, the Department has at least three funded vacant positions for preservation planners slated to work on the Citywide Survey. The Consortium urges the Department to prioritize the Citywide Survey over the SER Program Amendments to streamline the environmental review process for historical resources.

These are just a few of our initial comments which are difficult to make given the inadequate level of detail provided in the attached HPC packet. Again, we urge the Commission and the HPC to

hold off on
adopting the SER Program Amendments until the public and policy makers have had adequate
time to
evaluate, comment on and seek appropriate modifications to them.

Sincerely,

Stewart Morton, Chair
San Francisco Preservation Consortium

Individual Signatory Consortium Members Include:

Donald Andreini, District 8

Dennis Antenore, Former Planning Commissioner, Founder of Friends of City Planning,
District 5

Lucia Bogatay, President of the Presidio Historical Association

Robert W. Cherny, Former Member of the SF Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board

Courtney Clarkson, District 2

Merle Easton, AIA , Past President of the Victorian Alliance

Erin Farrell, District 10

Steven Haigh, Past President of the Victorian Alliance

Inge Horton, Former Chair of the Sunset Parkside and Action Committee - Historic Resources
Inventory Committee

Katherine Howard, Friends of the Music Concourse, Golden Gate Park Preservation Alliance
and SF Ocean Edge

Caroline Kleinman, District 1

Stewart Morton, Founding Board Member of SF Heritage, Former Member of the SF
Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board appointed by Mayors Moscone, Feinstein & Jordan,
Chair of the San Francisco Preservation Consortium, and active advocate of historical
architecture for over 50 years

Katherine Petrin, Architectural Historian, District 3

Bradley Wiedmaier, Former Research Assistant to Esther McCoy, Architectural Historian, and
to Robert Judson Clark, Princeton University, Professor Emeritus

Steve Williams, Esq.

Howard Wong, AIA, District 3

cc: Mayor London N. Breed

Board of Supervisors

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Planning Commission

Historic Preservation Commission

Jonas P. Ionin, Commissions Secretary

Rich Hillis, Director of Planning

Jeff Joslin, Director of Current Planning

Marcelle Boudreaux, Principal Preservation Planner

Rich Sucre, Principal Planner

Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer, Principal Planner

Lisa Gibson, Director of Environmental Planning

Allison Vanderslice, Principal Preservation Planner for Environmental Review

Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs

Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs

Andrea Ruiz Esquide, Deputy City Attorney
Mike Buhler, President, SF Heritage

Attachment: Executive Summary - Standard Environmental Requirements Ordinance, 4/15/20
<https://commissions.sfplanning.org/hpcpackets/2020-000052PCA%20HPC.pdf>



SAN FRANCISCO PRESERVATION CONSORTIUM

P.O. Box 330447
San Francisco, CA 94133-0447
July 8, 2020

Stewart Morton
Chair and
Treasurer

Donald Andreini
Secretary

Judith Hoyem
Government Liaison

President Joel Koppel
San Francisco Planning Commission
and

President Aaron Jon Hyland, AIA, NCARB
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
Attn: Jonas P. Ionin, Commissions Secretary
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Subject: CEQA Implementation - Standard Environmental Requirements (SER)
Program Amendments to the Planning, Administrative, Environment
and Police Codes (*Planning Department Case No. 2020-000052PCA*)

Dear President Koppel and President Hyland:

Established in 2001, the San Francisco Preservation Consortium (Consortium) works in partnership with individuals, neighborhood groups and other associations to advocate for effective land use legislation and responsible historic, architectural and cultural preservation practices in accordance with accepted professional standards and best practices. The Consortium's advocacy ensures that the City and its neighborhoods sustain their living history and character as they evolve.

On behalf of the Consortium's 160 members, I ask the Planning Commission (Commission) and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to table adoption of the proposed Standard Environmental Requirements (SER) Program Amendments to the Planning, Administrative, Environment and Police Codes until at least two months after the current COVID-19 emergency shelter-in-place requirements have been lifted to afford the public adequate time to review and comment on these proposed sweeping changes to the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) in San Francisco.¹ We strongly object to the piecemeal adoption of the SER Program Amendments absent the identification of specific SERs and SER Program implementation procedures for the protection of historical resources.

¹ *The Commission most recently continued this item to their July 30, 2020 meeting and the HPC continued it to their July 15, 2020 meeting.*


Approximately 75% of the buildings in San Francisco are 50 years old or greater and may be considered potential historical resources. The use of yet-to-be determined SERs appears to exempt a large class of projects from historical resource evaluation all together because projects that would currently require Mitigated Negative Declarations (MNDs) would, under the SER Program, be categorically exempt. The current system often fails to correctly identify the class of historical resource or potential historical resource at the outset of a project. The SER Program might allow even more historical resources and potential historical resources to slip through the cracks as much of the city remains unsurveyed. The Western Addition and nearly the entire west side of San Francisco still need far more survey work and designation of historic districts and potential historic districts. With the exception of Fort Funston, there is not a single historic district located on the west side of the city. Even most of the east side remains unprotected. Many demolitions are now taking place in the Sea Cliff and Pacific Heights neighborhoods.

We believe the proposed SER Program will place an undue burden on the public to track a much greater volume exemption determinations and approval actions. It will also impose considerable procedural hurdles to evaluating whether alterations to designated historical resources, especially those contributing to historic districts or potential historic districts, would have adverse cumulative effects under CEQA. The Planning Department (Department) already applies the standards unevenly. In some cases, this has meant that demolition of a contributory resource, or alterations that do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, are deemed significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated under CEQA requiring preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Whereas in other instances, the Department has allowed demolition of contributing resources without an EIR as long as it determines the overall eligibility of the historic district is maintained. Proposals to alter or demolish a potential contributor to a potential historic district are among the most difficult impacts to evaluate under CEQA and it appears these distinctions and evaluations might be completely lost with the adoption of the SER Program.

Further, the SER Program Amendments do not adequately address the roles of the Commission and the HPC in accordance with the provisions of Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code. The City's Historic Preservation Officer/CLG Coordinator position remains unfilled which calls into question our Certified Local Government (CLG) Program status. Said staff member must meet the minimum professional qualifications defined in 36 CFR Part 61. Moreover, the Department has at least three funded vacant positions for preservation planners slated to work on the Citywide Survey. The Consortium urges the Department to prioritize the Citywide Survey over the SER Program Amendments to streamline the environmental review process for historical resources.

These are just a few of our initial comments which are difficult to make given the inadequate level of detail provided in the attached HPC packet. Again, we urge the Commission and the HPC to hold off on adopting the SER Program Amendments until the public and policy makers have had adequate time to evaluate, comment on and seek appropriate modifications to them.

Sincerely,



Stewart Morton, Chair
San Francisco Preservation Consortium

Individual Signatory Consortium Members Include:

Donald Andreini, District 8
Dennis Antenore, Former Planning Commissioner, Founder of Friends of City Planning, District 5
Lucia Bogatay, President of the Presidio Historical Association
Robert W. Cherny, Former Member of the SF Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
Courtney Clarkson, District 2
Merle Easton, AIA , Past President of the Victorian Alliance
Erin Farrell, District 10
Steven Haigh, Past President of the Victorian Alliance
Inge Horton, Former Chair of the Sunset Parkside and Action Committee - Historic Resources Inventory Committee
Katherine Howard, Friends of the Music Concourse, Golden Gate Park Preservation Alliance and SF Ocean Edge
Caroline Kleinman, District 1
Stewart Morton, Founding Board Member of SF Heritage, Former Member of the SF Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board appointed by Mayors Moscone, Feinstein & Jordan, Chair of the San Francisco Preservation Consortium, and active advocate of historical architecture for over 50 years
Katherine Petrin, Architectural Historian, District 3
Bradley Wiedmaier, Former Research Assistant to Esther McCoy, Architectural Historian, and to Robert Judson Clark, Princeton University, Professor Emeritus
Steve Williams, Esq.
Howard Wong, AIA, District 3

cc: Mayor London N. Breed
Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Planning Commission
Historic Preservation Commission
Jonas P. Ionin, Commissions Secretary
Rich Hillis, Director of Planning
Jeff Joslin, Director of Current Planning
Marcelle Boudreaux, Principal Preservation Planner
Rich Sucre, Principal Planner
Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer, Principal Planner
Lisa Gibson, Director of Environmental Planning
Allison Vanderslice, Principal Preservation Planner for Environmental Review
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
Andrea Ruiz Esquide, Deputy City Attorney
Mike Buhler, President, SF Heritage

Attachment: Executive Summary - Standard Environmental Requirements Ordinance, 4/15/20

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Oppose Supervisor Preston's Ordinance #200375
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 1:31:00 PM

From: Minna leung <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Saturday, July 4, 2020 12:04 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Oppose Supervisor Preston's Ordinance #200375

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

Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for your work during this pandemic on behalf of your constituents. During this unprecedented crisis, housing providers as well as tenants are facing tremendous economic pressures. Because of these, we strongly oppose Supervisor Preston's Ordinance #200375 "COVID-19 Tenant Protections" on a number of legal and ethical grounds.

First, #200375 is unconstitutional. It forces courts to interfere with existing private contracts in violation of both the California and U.S. Constitutions. Not even a pandemic should undermine these basic fundamentals that govern our state and country.

Across the board rent forgiveness/permanent eviction moratorium due to COVID-19 could cause many property owners, particularly small "mom-and-pops," to go bankrupt, causing a significant reduction in the amount of available housing inventory in San Francisco and worsening an already bad housing crisis. Many owners are retired and/or barely getting by each month: they have expenses that are not magically going away or being reduced, such as mortgages, property tax, insurance, maintenance costs, etc. This ordinance potentially wipes out all COVID-19 related rent for tenants at the expense of San Francisco housing providers, who are experiencing just as much distress as renters, if not more; many property owners have also lost their jobs. With Mayor Breed's and Governor Newsom's moratoriums forcing housing providers to work out forbearance agreements with renters, the combined effect of this and #200375 will push many housing providers deeper underwater, causing many to drown, financially. Many have spent their entire lives working and saving for their property and could now find themselves in financial ruin by not being able to collect rental income for most of 2020. This loss during their golden years will cause many to be unable to sustain basic needs such as food, medical expenses and, ironically, a roof over their heads.

#200375 encourages tenants without financial distress to decide to stop paying rent just to take advantage of the situation. With multiple government orders in place to stop evictions,

nothing can happen to them, even if an unlawful detainer is filed. The devastating combination of reduced rental income combined with steady but most likely increased ownership expenses down the road will cause foreclosures and property owner bankruptcies to skyrocket.

Housing providers are not responsible for this pandemic. Even though we are sympathetic, we are also negatively affected, and, in many cases, barely hanging on as is. We are not all wealthy and many are not strong enough financially to not have any rental income for most of this year; many of us are small “mom and pops” providers who are unable to carry this financial burden. The City should take responsibility for this and follow Los Angeles’ lead with their \$100M renter relief fund for those facing difficulties paying rent due to COVID-19.

I respectfully and very strongly request that you VOTE NO ON #200375. Please consider the effects on us as well. The ordinance mentions that “tenants may find themselves in an ever-deepening financial hole.” What about housing providers?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A hardworking housing provider who has been hit hard by the pandemic while striving to provide quality housing for myself, my family and my renters.

Minna leung

isidoretam@hotmail.com

720 Potrero Ave

San Francisco, Ca 94110

From: [Isidore Tam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose Supervisor Preston's Ordinance #200375
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 7:57:03 PM

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

Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for your work during this pandemic on behalf of your constituents. During this unprecedented crisis, housing providers as well as tenants are facing tremendous economic pressures. Because of these, we strongly oppose Supervisor Preston's Ordinance #200375 "COVID-19 Tenant Protections" on a number of legal and ethical grounds.

First, #200375 is unconstitutional. It forces courts to interfere with existing private contracts in violation of both the California and U.S. Constitutions. Not even a pandemic should undermine these basic fundamentals that govern our state and country.

Across the board rent forgiveness/permanent eviction moratorium due to COVID-19 could cause many property owners, particularly small "mom-and-pops," to go bankrupt, causing a significant reduction in the amount of available housing inventory in San Francisco and worsening an already bad housing crisis. Many owners are retired and/or barely getting by each month: they have expenses that are not magically going away or being reduced, such as mortgages, property tax, insurance, maintenance costs, etc. This ordinance potentially wipes out all COVID-19 related rent for tenants at the expense of San Francisco housing providers, who are experiencing just as much distress as renters, if not more; many property owners have also lost their jobs. With Mayor Breed's and Governor Newsom's moratoriums forcing housing providers to work out forbearance agreements with renters, the combined effect of this and #200375 will push many housing providers deeper underwater, causing many to drown, financially. Many have spent their entire lives working and saving for their property and could now find themselves in financial ruin by not being able to collect rental income for most of 2020. This loss during their golden years will cause many to be unable to sustain basic needs such as food, medical expenses and, ironically, a roof over their heads.

#200375 encourages tenants without financial distress to decide to stop paying rent just to take advantage of the situation. With multiple government orders in place to stop evictions, nothing can happen to them, even if an unlawful detainer is filed. The devastating combination of reduced rental income combined with steady but most likely increased ownership expenses down the road will cause foreclosures and property owner bankruptcies to skyrocket.

Housing providers are not responsible for this pandemic. Even though we are sympathetic, we are also negatively affected, and, in many cases, barely hanging on as is. We are not all wealthy and many are not strong enough financially to not have any rental income for most of this year; many of us are small "mom and pops" providers who are unable to carry this

financial burden. The City should take responsibility for this and follow Los Angeles' lead with their \$100M renter relief fund for those facing difficulties paying rent due to COVID-19.

I respectfully and very strongly request that you VOTE NO ON #200375. Please consider the effects on us as well. The ordinance mentions that "tenants may find themselves in an ever-deepening financial hole." What about housing providers?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A hardworking housing provider who has been hit hard by the pandemic while striving to provide quality housing for myself, my family and my renters.

Isidore Tam

isidoretam@hotmail.com

98 Lois lane

San Francisco, Ca 94134

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Hostage to the Homeless - San Francisco: A City on the Brink of Collapse
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 2:23:00 PM
Attachments: [IMG_1775.MOV](#)

From: Brandon Crain <becrain89@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 12:08 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Jennifer Friedenbach <jfriedenbach@cohsf.org>; oglowacki@cohsf.org; development@cohsf.org; info@nationalhomeless.org; chesa.boudin@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: 7OYS@kgo-tv.com; BreakingNews@kron4.com; newstips@foxtv.com; McCoy, Gary (REC) <gary.mccoy@sfgov.org>; Kanishka.Burns@sfgov.org; Lee, Mason (MYR) <mason.lee@sfgov.org>; Monge, Paul (BOS) <paul.monge@sfgov.org>; Beinart, Amy (BOS) <amy.beinart@sfgov.org>; Temprano, Tom (BOS) <tom.temprano@sfgov.org>

Subject: Hostage to the Homeless - San Francisco: A City on the Brink of Collapse

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

The streets of San Francisco are in a state of despair and destitution and you, those at City Hall and those at the Coalition on Homeless, have an obligation to your constituents to do something about it! As a young Black man born and raised in Richmond, CA, and it's been my life's dream to live in the famed 'City By The Bay'. The city that Tony Bennett sings about; the city that movies are filmed in; the city that tourists flock to from around the world. And for the past two and half years, I've made good on that dream...but that dream has since decayed into a nightmare that I can't seem to escape – regardless of neighborhood.

For decades, San Francisco has served as a bedrock of liberal values and ideals. It's served as a city that allows a certain sense of freedom not found in many other places...it's part of the city's appeal and part of the reason so many of us live here. However, it is those same ideals that have turned the streets of the nation's most expensive rental market, to those akin to a developing country. San Francisco's cavalier and blasé attitude towards the erection of tent cities and street encampments is the single largest issue that we face and will be the thing that brings this world class city to its knees. There is a level of compassion that should be afforded to those less fortunate and to those who obviously need the help of supportive services to lift them out of homelessness. But that compassion erodes when service resistant street inhabitants are allowed to erect tents in an area and terrorize the rent and mortgage paying San Franciscans who reside there.

A week before the Shelter in Place (SIP) went into effect, I moved to the corner of 16th and Dolores to the city's Mission Dolores Neighborhood...a clean, quiet block, with tree lined

streets and churches on all 4 corners. The average rent for a 1 bedroom apartment in this area, based on RentCafe.com, is \$3,684; I pay less for my studio – my rent is \$2800. What was the reason for the move? It was to escape the raucous homeless encampment that was growing unabated outside of my previous apartment at 14th and Market, right across from the Safeway. And where did I move from prior to that? I moved from Geary and Leavenworth as the homeless began moving up from the Tenderloin and into Lower Nob Hill. My apartment at 16th and Dolores was supposed to be my sanctuary and I was grateful to God to be able to sleep at night and to live in a neighborhood that surely wouldn't attract or allow tent cities... but all of that changed with the Shelter in Place. After that, my sanctuary has turned into my own personal inescapable hell. Since then, neighborhoods that have never had tents on their streets are saturated with them. And neighborhoods where they were before, have become completely and utterly overwhelmed by them (the Tenderloin and UC Hasting's lawsuit comes to mind). And with these tent cities and the homeless that live in them, comes an unprecedented level of disruption and anarchy...disruption ranging from fights; thefts (we've had a break in at my Casa Dolores apartment building); littering; open air drug use; open air drug dealing; discarding of needles; public defecation; screaming and blasting of music at all hours of the night; threatening and challenging those of us who actually pay to live here... among other criminal activity (On Friday, June 26, I watched SFPD arrest someone from the encampment who had an outstanding warrant). I've placed countless phone calls to SFPD, to City Hall and to 311...all to no avail. I'm told by police that their hands are tied and I'm told by 311 and City Hall that "due to the Shelter in Place and CDC guidelines, we're not moving any tents", which is untrue; I watched the cops move this group from in front of the church they were in front of – from there, they relocated to the grassy area outside of my apartment. There is a safe sleeping site 4 blocks from here at Sanchez Elementary School, but they refuse to go! Why should we, the people paying some of the most expensive rents in the country, have to suffer due to their homelessness...especially when there are services provided and refused? I'm told that things will "change" once the SIP is lifted, but the virus is continuing to rage and reopening has been delayed...which means there is no end in sight to the SIP. Are those of us who are being victimized by the aforementioned behavior expected to passively endure this for the unforeseeable future?! How much lawlessness is to be expected before you all step up and protect your residents? People are trying to work from home; parents are trying to teach their children from home; children are trying to learn from home... "trying" being the keyword as those are all herculean feats considering the level of disorder and chaos right outside our windows.

As stated in my opening, you have an obligation to protect the quality of life for those of us who live here...those who pay to live here. You have an obligation to prevent one of the greatest cities in the world from being lost to those who are resistant to services and who would rather live "free" on the streets. Companies and conventions are pulling out of San Francisco and residents are moving away with the homeless and poor street conditions being the main reasons cited. San Francisco is grabbing national and international headlines...and not for anything enviable...it's making headlines due to the blight on our streets where residents are paying the highest rents in the nation. I urge you to please mandate that homeless individuals are in the places dedicated to them (shelters, hotels, safe sleeping sites, navigation centers, etc.) and that an all-out ban on street camping/living be enacted. Continuing to wish this problem away isn't going to fix it and continuing to throw more and more money at the issue isn't helping either (In the most recent 2019-2020 budget proposal, \$364 million is going towards homeless initiatives, yet our streets are the worse they've ever been and our homeless numbers the highest). More compassion is not the solution; if compassion were the answer, we'd have fixed this issue 10 times over. There needs to be a cultural shift in the city, and at the forefront of that shift should be... "Street camping/living will not be tolerated and more will be done to preserve the quality of life of San Franciscans". Our streets have become derelict and despondent under your watch and you are beholden to us to fix it; continuing to allow our streets to slip further and further into madness is negligent at best and borderline criminal at worst. Mayor Breed, your website says the following..."We are the City of St. Francis — none of our residents should be forced, relegated, or allowed to sleep on our streets

or endure illness without the services they need. I will ensure that our City has the resources and effective policies in place to keep our residents housed, help those currently struggling with homelessness into housing, and provide the supportive services all of our residents need."...it's about time you made good on that promise.

I implore you all to treat this issue with the urgency it deserves and requires; the window to address this glaring crisis continues to close each and every day that you do nothing. It would not surprise me if San Franciscans began taking to the streets in protest at you all's inaction and inability to remedy what ails this city – we are watching.

Signed,

Brandon Crain – A fed up and frustrated San Franciscan

Note: The views expressed in this email are those of a private citizen of San Francisco; my views are not reflective of the entity in which I am employed

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS:Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Urban Blight
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:00:00 PM

From: Stewart Wilber <s.wilber@mindspring.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:21 PM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Urban Blight

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

Your Honor and District Supervisors Haney and Mandelbaum:

Dolores Street used to be one of the most beautiful boulevards in the world, part of the famous 49-mile scenic drive, a source of urban pride, and a joy to drive.

It is now a nightmare to behold (see pictures). This is due to crowded, unsanitary tent encampments.

These are a source of noise at all hours, suffer from a complete lack of sanitary facilities, are a total violation of social distancing, a hotbed for covid 19, dangerous to the health of the neighborhood, have (as always) become a nexus of drug and alcohol abuse, and are illegal due to Proposition Q passed by voters in November 2016.

Reaching out to sf311.org just results in being told "we no longer remove tents."

Please, Ma'am and Sirs, give us back our beautiful boulevard!

Respectfully,

Stewart Wilber
1923A 15th St.
SF, CA 94114
415-660-8268

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Clean Streets!!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:50:00 PM

From: amesia doles <amesia@labodegaflora.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:58 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Clean Streets!!

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

Hello,

We are longtime residents of the Mission District and are begging you to help us with the quality of our streets. I was walking down my alley yesterday and felt overwhelmed by the garbage, the feces, the urine that soaks the tree outside our apartment building. There has to be a better way. Our alley (Lilac) is filled with beautiful art on the walls, the pavement is such a disgusting mess that it's impossible to enjoy walking through it. Why do we let our city look like this? A city with so much money and so much potential beauty? Clearly there are so many people living outside that also need better, more long term help and care, but the least we can do is work on keeping the streets clean for everyone who lives here whether we are lucky enough to have walls or not. Please do what you can to help us and our streets. Thanks to Hilary Ronen for all she does for our neighborhood, we are proud that you represent us!!

Amesia Doles and Sean Thomas

11 Lilac Street

San Francisco 94110

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: BASF Letter to City Attorney re: Norman Yee Amendment (File No. 200515)
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:55:00 PM
Attachments: [FINAL 7.8.20 BASF Letter re Yee Amendment.pdf](#)
Importance: High

From: Mikele Lewis-Nelson <mlewis@sfbar.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:56 PM
To: Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; FEITELBERG, BRITTANY (CAT) <Brittany.Feitelberg@sfcityatty.org>; Callahan, Micki (HRD) <micki.callahan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; SFPD, Commission (POL) <SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yolanda Jackson <yjackson@sfbar.org>; Stuart Plunkett <stuart.plunkett@alston.com>
Subject: BASF Letter to City Attorney re: Norman Yee Amendment
Importance: High

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

Mr. Herrera and Ms. Callahan,

Please see attached letter *sent on behalf of Stuart Plunkett, President of the Bar Association of San Francisco.*

Thank you,
Mikele Lewis-Nelson

Mikele Lewis-Nelson | Executive Assistant
The Bar Association of San Francisco | 301 Battery Street, Third Floor | San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: 415-782-8998 | Fax: 415-477-2388
mlewis@sfbar.org | www.sfbar.org
(First name pronounced – Mih-KELL)

Confidentiality Notice:

The information in this e-mail (including attachments, if any) is considered privileged and/or confidential and is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. Any review, use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited except by or on behalf of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by reply email, delete this email, and do not disclose its contents to anyone.



THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO

2020 OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Stuart C. Plunkett
President

Marvin K. Anderson
President-Elect

Mary McNamara
Treasurer

Vidhya Prabhakaran
Secretary

Alexis A. Amezcua
Cristine Soto DeBerry

Jamie L. Dupree

Terrance J. Evans

Holly Gaudreau

Steven A. Hirsch

Erick C. Howard

Charles H. Jung

Sebastian Kaplan

David Kelly

Miriam Kim

Lisa P. Mak

Phyra McCandless

David Otsuka

Peggy Otum

Karen Scarr

Ragesh Tangri

Erica Villanueva

BARRISTERS CLUB OFFICERS

Kelly Matayoshi
President

Jessica Ryland
President-Elect

Anjali Kulkarni
Treasurer

Lindsey Mignano
Secretary

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND GENERAL COUNSEL

Yolanda M. Jackson

July 8, 2020

Mr. Dennis Herrera
City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Ms. Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director
Department of Human Resources
One South Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Herrera and Ms. Callahan:

The Bar Association of San Francisco's Criminal Justice Task Force ("BASF-CJTF"¹) writes to you concerning recent reports that the City Attorney's Office has advised Board of Supervisors President Norman Yee that the decision to place on the ballot for public vote his proposed amendment to the City Charter ("Yee Amendment") concerning staffing levels at the San Francisco Police Department ("SFPD") must—even before being submitted to the voters—be negotiated with the San Francisco Police Officers' Association ("SFPOA").

The Yee Amendment is simple, straightforward, and democracy in action. It would require the Police Department every two years to submit to the Police Commission a report and recommendation regarding police staffing levels, require the Police Commission to consider the report and recommendation when approving the department's proposed budget, and remove any minimum police staffing level that arguably is required by the current City Charter.

As you know, the Yee Amendment must be placed on the ballot by July 21, 2020, in order to be considered by voters in the November election; otherwise, a City Charter amendment will have to be delayed until 2022.

¹ The Bar Association of San Francisco represents 7,500 members and is the largest legal organization in Northern California dedicated to criminal justice reform. In 2015, BASF established the Criminal Justice Task Force, consisting of judges, prosecutors, public defenders, law enforcement, private defense counsel, civil liberties advocates, and others, to advance systemic reforms in San Francisco.

We are very concerned that an interpretation that requires bargaining right now over the Yee Amendment with SFPOA will prevent voters from considering it in the November election. Following the death of George Floyd and national and local protests, there is currently extraordinary public demand for a reexamination of SFPD's staffing and fundamental responsibilities. Permitting SFPOA to delay passage of the Yee Amendment will tie the City's hands in regards to staffing for another two years, and virtually guarantee that the Mayor, the Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the Chief cannot deliver the reforms San Francisco expects.

Moreover, and as set forth below in detail, we respectfully disagree that bargaining with SFPOA is legally required or appropriate under the circumstances. To the contrary, the Yee Amendment is a classic managerial matter that should not be the subject of bargaining as a matter of law and policy.

I. The Yee Amendment does not at this time change police staffing levels; it directs the Chief to submit a report re: staffing levels and the Police Commission to consider that report, without an artificial minimum staffing level.

The Yee Amendment does *not* cut police staffing levels at this time. Instead, it puts in place a process to evaluate staffing levels. It requires the Chief to analyze staffing levels and submit a report to the Police Commission, and requires the Police Commission to consider the Chief's report. It eliminates the artificial "minimum" staffing level of 1,971 officers, and instead simply allows that Chief's report on staffing, and the Police Commission's consideration of that report, to proceed.

The Yee Amendment will not necessarily result in any reduction in police forces. At present, there is no live controversy over which to meet and confer with SFPOA, as there are at least three conditions that have to materialize before there is any potential reduction in staffing. First, in order for there to be a potential reduction in staffing, the voters would have to approve the Yee Amendment in the November 3, 2020 election; if they do not approve it, there is no change via the Yee Amendment and no impact on SFPOA nor the staffing levels. Second, even if the voters approve the Yee Amendment in the election, the Chief would have to submit a report that recommends cuts in staffing, or else there is no impact on staffing traceable to the Yee Amendment. Third, the Police Commission would have to accept such a recommendation to reduce staffing², and then exercise its independent discretion to approve a budget that includes staffing reductions, in order for there to be an adverse impact on staffing.

² The Yee Amendment expressly states that the Police Commission need *not* accept or adopt any recommendation made by the Chief.

Thus, the Yee Amendment itself does not result in any reduction in staffing, and there is no live controversy with SFPOA that could conceivably be subject to meet and confer and/or arbitration, at least unless and until the Police Commission moves to implement staffing reductions through the budget process.

II. Even if the Yee Amendment were to be interpreted as putting forth a live controversy by potentially reducing staffing levels, a decision to reduce staffing levels, which is not driven by labor costs, is a classic managerial decision not subject to meet and confer bargaining.

The Meyers-Milias-Brown Act (Gov. Code Section 3500, *et seq.*; “MMBA”) sets forth California’s public sector labor law provisions. It requires that under certain circumstances a public sector employer must meet and confer and bargain with the Union-representative of a recognized bargaining unit of employees. Section 3504, requires management to bargain over matters within the “scope of [union] representation,” which includes “all matters relating to employment conditions and employer-employee relations, including, but not limited to, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, except, however, the scope of representation shall not include consideration of the merits, necessity, or organization of any service or activity provided by law or executive order.”

The “however” qualifier of Section 3504 (i.e., the principle that any “consideration of the merits, necessity, or organization of any service or activity provided by law or executive order” is not included in “the scope of representation”) was added by the California legislature to “forestall any expansion of the language of ‘wages, hours and working conditions’ to include more general managerial policy decisions.” *Santa Clara Cnty. Corr. Peace Officers’ Ass’n v. Cnty of Santa Clara*, 224 Cal. App. 4th 1016 (2014) (“*Santa Clara*”), quoting *Building Material & Construction Teamsters’ Union v. Farrell*, 41 Cal. 3d 651, 657 (1986) (“*Building Materials*”).

Importantly, the MMBA recognizes “the right of employers to make unconstrained decisions when fundamental management or policy choices are made.” *Claremont Police Officers Ass’n v. City of Claremont*, 39 Cal. 4th 623, 632 (2006) (“*Claremont*”), quoting *Building Materials*, at 663. Management decisions are not subject to bargaining. “To require public officials to meet and confer with their employees regarding fundamental policy decisions . . . would place an intolerable burden upon fair and efficient administration of state and local government.” *Berkeley Police Ass’n v. City of Berkeley*, 76 Cal. App. 3d 931, 937 (1977) (“*Berkeley Police*”). Notably, the case law teaches that management’s prerogative is particularly strong in cases involving police department policy matters that implicate public trust in law enforcement. *San Francisco Police Officers’ Ass’n v. San Francisco Police Comm’n*, 27 Cal.App.5th 676, 690(2018) (“*San Francisco Police*”) quoting *Building Materials*, at 664 (matters involving “the avoidance of unnecessary deadly force are of obvious importance, and directly affect the quality and

nature of public services,” are not within the scope of representation); *Berkeley Police*, at 937 (creation of a citizen review panel to make disciplinary recommendations was considered “a matter of police-community relations,” such that the city’s challenged policies “constitute[d] management level decisions which are not properly within the scope of union representation and collective bargaining”); *Claremont*, at 632-33 (racial profiling study designed to “improve relations between the police and the community” is not subject to bargaining).

Where fundamental management decisions have a significant adverse effect on wages, hours, or working conditions, the California Supreme Court has adopted a balancing test to determine whether those effects must be subject to the meet and confer requirement under the MMBA. *Claremont*, at 638; *Building Materials*, at 660. The test asks whether “the employer’s need for unencumbered decision making in managing its operations is outweighed by the benefit to employer-employee relations of bargaining about the action in question.” *Building Materials*, at 660; *Claremont*, at 630. In performing this balancing, “a court may also consider whether the ‘transactional cost of the bargaining process outweighs its value.’” See *Building Materials*; *Claremont*; *Santa Clara*, at 1030. Delays instituted by extended bargaining and legal process should be considered a cognizable “transactional cost” to management under this analysis. *San Francisco Police*, at 764.

As an initial matter, the Yee Amendment itself has no adverse impact on wages, hours, or working conditions. As noted above, any such claim by SFPOA is premature at best. Instead, the Yee Amendment merely establishes a process by which staffing is evaluated.

Second, the Yee Amendment is a classic managerial decision about staffing, not driven by labor costs, which the courts consistently find to be *outside* of the meet and confer requirement. It replaces a minimum staffing requirement—that arguably impinges on appropriate management decision-making—with a management-driven process by which the Chief provides an executive-level assessment of staffing, operations, and the department’s public safety and legal duties, as well as a staffing recommendation for the Police Commission’s consideration in connection with the budget. Reinforcing the conclusion that it falls within management’s prerogative, the Yee Amendment is also responsive to the recent, widespread, and urgent calls from the San Francisco community for police reforms, including specifically changes to staffing levels. See *Claremont*, at 632-33; *Berkeley Police*, at 937; *San Francisco Police*, at 764.

Leading cases have explained that the decision by management to reduce staffing of public safety employees is not subject to bargaining; only the effect of that decision, *i.e.*, the manner in which those reductions occur, must be negotiated. Thus, where a City decided to layoff firefighter employees, and the Union demanded to meet and confer over the layoff decision, the court concluded that the City did *not* need to meet and confer

before making that decision to lay off employees; instead, the City only was required to bargain over the way in which layoffs were to be implemented. *Int'l Ass'n of Fire Fighters v. Public Employment Relations Board I*, 51 Cal.4th 259, 264-65 (2011). Similarly, in *Santa Clara*, the County wanted to cut the Department of Corrections budget and reduce the work schedules of corrections officers; the court found that the county was *not* required to meet and confer about the need to reduce the budget of the Department of Corrections, nor about the policy decisions to avoid layoffs by undertaking hours reductions.³ *Santa Clara*, at 1041.

Third and finally, even if the *Claremont* balancing test were to apply, any reasonable analysis under it comes down strongly on the side of allowing the Yee Amendment to be submitted to the voters. Time is of the essence, and unencumbered managerial decision-making is critical to preserving public trust in the City's reform efforts and in SFPD. The Yee Amendment must be submitted within days in order to be timely placed on the November 3, 2020 ballot to the voters. Any requirement that the parties complete a meet and confer right now would be a death sentence for the Yee Amendment. Yet allowing the Amendment to be placed on the ballot still gives SFPOA plenty of time and opportunity to meet and confer—if that were to be found, down the road, to be necessary. The voters should have an opportunity to speak on the issue, and the Yee Amendment provides that opportunity.

III. The City should stop voluntary bargaining with SFPOA over managerial matters because doing so is contrary to the law, and has delayed and undermined reforms; instead, the City must prioritize transparency, timeliness, public input, and real and meaningful change in negotiating with SFPOA.

We appreciate that the City has long adopted an approach toward labor relations that favors voluntary, and often exhaustive, discussion of any matters that are of concern to unionized employees, regardless of whether they are within the scope of representation. We do not question the wisdom of this approach in other domains, where the considerations are very different from those presented by policing.

³ By contrast, in *Building Materials*, the City, in order to reduce labor costs, wanted to lay off bargaining unit workers and reassign the work to workers outside of the bargaining unit. That clearly was considered a management decision that had a significant effect on hours, and given that management's motivation in making a staffing change was to save labor costs by taking work away from unionized workers, the Supreme Court found on balance that the employer should meet and confer with the Union. Here, there is nothing to indicate that the Yee Amendment was motivated by labor costs.



However, we do not believe this approach to labor negotiations with SFPOA has served SFPD, the City, or the San Francisco community, well. BASF-CJTF has been involved in police reform efforts for a number of years and has observed the meet and confer process with SFPOA delay—*by many months to years*—urgent reforms that promote public safety and reinforce public trust in SFPD. Indeed, the extensive delays instanced by negotiations with SFPOA have been a serious concern ever since the U.S. Department of Justice publicly cautioned that negotiations over SFPD’s revised use of force policy must not unreasonably delay adoption and implementation of the changes at issue. The meet and confer process with SFPOA has recently and unacceptably delayed many other key reforms, such as changes to the body camera policy, and the Department General Order on bias, just to name a few.

A new approach to negotiating police department matters with SFPOA is overdue. Full communication with the union *to the extent required by law*, and the improvement of labor-management relations, should remain important objectives of the meet and confer process. However, these cannot be the only principles guiding the City’s strategy. The City’s approach must also prioritize transparency, timeliness, and the advancement of substantive police reforms. The law supports these principles. It recognizes that formulating policies that promote public safety and trust between police agencies and the communities they serve is a fundamental duty of local government that must not be encumbered with undue delays, or worse, bargained away behind closed doors.

There is no legal requirement that the City meet and confer, at this time, with SFPOA regarding the Yee Amendment. It is time for the City to prioritize transparency and reform, and allow the Yee Amendment to proceed to the next step—review by the voters.

Sincerely,

Stuart Plunkett
President, Bar Association of San Francisco

Cc: Mayor Breed, Supervisors, Commissioners, Chief Scott

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Keep SF parking affordable during Pandemic
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:18:00 PM

From: Tamu Boylen <tamuboylen@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:19 AM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Marstaff (BOS) <marstaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Chu, Carmen (ASR) <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>; SFSO Complaints (SHF) <sfsocomplaints@sfgov.org>; Cisneros, Jose (TTX) <jose.cisneros@sfgov.org>; Raju, Manohar (PDR) <manohar.raju@sfgov.org>

Subject: Keep SF parking affordable during Pandemic

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

To Mayor London Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and San Francisco Elected Officials,

We the people of San Francisco kindly request that you keep San Francisco metered parking affordable during the Covid-19 pandemic.

On Monday July, 6th 2020 metered parking was raised from \$.50 cents an hour to \$1.25 an hour. That is a 125% increase in the middle of a pandemic.

According to the United States Department of Labor the unemployment rate for June was 17.8 million Americans. The State of California Employment Development Division reported the unemployment rate of San Francisco county at 11.9% in May 2020 (June statistics are yet to be released). In May 2019 the unemployment rate was under 3%. That is 1,011,600 San Francisco county residents without jobs. The average rent prices in San Francisco are \$3629 a month. San Francisco has some of the highest rent prices in the world. San Francisco residents are struggling financially please minimize our suffering by lowering the egregious metered parking increase.

Covid-19 has been catastrophic in many ways. Americans are struggling

financially with little hope. Lead by example, Mayor London Breed, San Francisco is a beacon of exalting public safety during the pandemic. Please continue to handle San Francisco residents with the same care. We will hold you accountable.

We understand the necessity for metered parking as a source of funding for public works and the city, yet request your continued empathy for San Francisco residents financial insecurity during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Best,

Tamu Boylen

1115 Post St
San Francisco, CA 94109

415-630-0751

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Personal Care Establishments
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:01:00 PM

From: Conor Capelli <capelli1@mail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:50 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Personal Care Establishments

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

Board of Supervisors:

With Santa Clara County reopening hair salons, only San Francisco and the two counties that do not have permission to open, are not providing personal care services such as hair care. As San Francisco has already received permission, it is time for a partial phase 3 that would allow hair care establishments to reopen. Independent personal service providers can no longer pay rent for stations with no customers. How many salons are going to close? It makes no sense that salons are functioning in 55 California counties, even those on the watch lists, but are unable to open in San Francisco under the Covid guidelines established by the State Cosmetology board.

In frustratrion -

C. Capelli

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: SAFEWAY
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:48:00 PM

From: Lee Sochia <lsochia@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 4, 2020 8:06 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SAFEWAY

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

Has changed their bag fee from 10c to 25c... THIS IS PRICE GOUGING IN A HEALTH CRISIS!!

Lee @Home
ITS Admin

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Nextdoor is censoring conversation
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:49:00 PM

From: sfrobink@aol.com <sfrobink@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 1:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Nextdoor is censoring conversation

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

Just a word to the wise here - The neighborhood chat site, Nextdoor, is censoring conversation. I wanted to post about how to boost our immune systems to keep us healthy, also discuss how vaccines may or may not be effective or safe (so many viral strains, all kinds of stuff in vaccines that can sicken people) and they wouldn't let me. Don't we have first amendment freedom of speech rights?

Anyway, we can all learn to boost our immune systems to stay strong - I take several kinds of immune boost supplements every day.

Thanks - Robin Krop

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Prioritize Education in COVID-19 Response
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:49:00 PM

From: Maya Kttn <mkstuff81@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 1:14 PM
To: mkstuff81 <mkstuff81@gmail.com>
Subject: Prioritize Education in COVID-19 Response

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

I am writing as your constituent to ask you to take action to prioritize education in the COVID-19 response. Based on statements made within the past few weeks, it seems that most school districts have decided not to return to full-time instruction. I understand why, and do not blame school districts for taking the measures necessary to protect the health of students, staff, and their families.

These risks, however, exist because of other policy choices we have made. The state has permitted bars, gyms, restaurants, and other indoor venues to open. All of these are, by their nature, vastly more likely to spread COVID-19 than an elementary school. And, while they are valuable parts of our economy and society, they are not as important as schools. If it is not safe for schools to reopen for full-time, in-person instruction, then we have a moral obligation to close non-essential businesses or take other policy steps until transmission rates are low enough for schools to safely reopen.

Additionally, while billions in cuts to K-12 education in CA were put off this year, schools need additional funding to make the necessary changes to operate safely. It boggles my mind that the 5th largest economy in the world has almost the lowest in per student spending. At every level of government there has been money provided to help businesses weather the impacts of COVID, where is the same consideration for education and the families that rely on the multitude of services that public schools provide?

As a parent of two elementary-age children, I am certain that virtual learning will not come close to replicating the learning that takes place when our children attend school in person. And the harm caused by keeping school online will fall disproportionately on those children who are already disadvantaged, magnifying inequalities in a state where the gap between wealthy and poor districts is already far too large. By prioritizing non-essential businesses over our children's education, we are risking lasting damage to our children as well as to our economy. I urge you to do everything within your power to prioritize education in COVID-19 response.

Thank you.

Maya Kuttan
SF, CA 94131

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Finding the Way Out in this Turmoil
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:50:00 PM

From: Speech Organizers <loudonsf@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2020 1:57 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Budget, MYR (MYR) <budget@sfgov.org>; SFhousingInfo <sfhousinginfo@sfgov.org>; MONS (MYR) <MONS@sfgov.org>; MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org>; Cassiol, Jimmer (DPW) <Jimmer.Cassiol@sfdpw.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MTABoard@sfmta.com; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>; Norris, Jennifer (WAR) <jennifer.norris@sfgov.org>; Caldon, John (WAR) <john.caldon@sfgov.org>; War Memorial Board <WarMemorialBoard@sfgov.org>; SFPDCommunityRelations, (POL) <SFPDcommunityrelations@sfgov.org>; SFPDMediaRelations, (POL) <sfpdmediarelations@sfgov.org>; SFPD Bayview Station, (POL) <SFPDBayviewStation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Central Station, (POL) <sfpdcentralstation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Ingleside Station, (POL) <SFPDInglesideStation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Mission Station, (POL) <SFPDMissionStation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Northern Station, (POL) <sfpdnorthernstation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Park Station, (POL) <SFPDParkStation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Richmond Station, (POL) <sfpdrichmondstation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Southern Station, (POL) <SFPDSouthernStation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Taraval Station, (POL) <SFPDTaravalStation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Tenderloin Station, (POL) <SFPDTenderloinStation@sfgov.org>

Subject: Finding the Way Out in this Turmoil

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

Dear Mayor Breed, SF Supervisors, police officers and other officials,

Greetings. The current turbulence perhaps accounts for one of the most dangerous times in human history. Many are anxiously seeking a way out.

Sweden and Taiwan are two nations that never implemented shelter-in-place, yet both have low rates of Covid-19 infection. Taiwan, in particular, is almost clean.

What could be the cause? Sweden is the first Western country that severed over 100 sister-cities with the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in the last 3 months. Sweden also shut down all the Confucius Institutes and classrooms. In Taiwan's case, Taiwan never built sister-city or Confucius Institutes with CCP.

To learn more, please watch this newly released documentary(33 min long):

Manipulating America: The Chinese Communist Playbook

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nRW4pWg0d00>

No one shall be deceived. The American cities, states hit hard by the pandemic are those that built many sister-cities or Confucius Institutes with communist China. The strong ties with the wicked CCP bring bad luck to them. (In China, different surveys show that 60-90% of those who died from the pandemic are CCP members although CCP only accounts for 6% of total population).

Here is an overview, you may find the correlation between the CCP ties and the Covid-19 status.

New York: 7 sister cities; 12 Confucius Institutes; 1 sister-state with Jiangsu Province in China; total 20 counts

New Jersey: 6 sister cities; 2 Confucius Institutes; 1 sister-state with Zhejiang Province in China; total 9 counts

Florida: 12 sister cities; 1 Confucius Institute; total 13 counts

Texas: 12 sister cities, 2 Confucius Institute; total 14 counts

Arizona: 6 sister cities; 1 Confucius Institute; total 7 counts

Minnesota: 5 sister cities; 1 Confucius Institute; 1 sister-state with Shanxi Province in China, total 8 counts

Illinois: 7 sister cities, many Confucius classrooms; total 7 counts

California: 53 sister cities; 5 Confucius Institutes; 1 sister-state with Jiangsu Province in China, total 59 counts

May you watch the film, seriously consider severing the sister-city tie with Shanghai. This is for you, for the city, the people in the city. More importantly, for America- the most beautiful country on earth and the beautiful values it stands for.

In fact, what is happening today was predicted hundreds of years ago in many

Chinese prophecies. About 2 years ago, an insightful book was published, foretelling what will happen and what the precious solution is. Now available in 20 languages, please find the language you are most comfortable with to read:

How the Specter of Communism Is Ruling Our World

<https://www.thespecterofcommunism.com/en/>

Many Americans still have quite some fantasies about communist China, thinking as long as we work with the CCP, then eventually communist China will change and become one of the free world. This pandemic already shows there is no way the CCP could change. Poison is poisonous, there is no way for poison to become nutrient.

"When Humans Don't Set it Straight, Heaven Will", says a Chinese proverb. Now China is facing the second wave of pandemic in Beijing and northern provinces. In South, over 26 provinces are flooded with the worst flood in 80 years. Heaven is angry. When pandemic comes to eradicate this evil party, the wise ones are quickly breaking away from the evil. Why would anyone like to be wiped out with evil as an accomplice unless that person is determined to go with evil.

The wicked CCP after killing over 80-million innocent Chinese is about to be eliminated by heaven. Please consider signing the petition below to denounce the wicked CCP in order to earn blessings from heaven at this crucial time.

Please help pass on this important information to your friends and loved ones if you see fit.

Kind regards,

Don

EndCCP.com

ELIMINATE THE

DEMON CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

This pandemic could have been prevented if the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) did not lie. Yet, ever since it took over China, hundreds of millions of people have been suffering from its endless deceptions and brutality. The demon CCP has plundered the ancient land of China, and now its terror has spread globally, affecting everyone. It is time for all of us to reject its evil work and put an end to the Chinese Communist Party!

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SUPPORTING Rules Committee (Special) Agenda Item #2 Hearing - Initiative Ordinance - Business and Tax Regulations Code - Real Property Transfer Tax Rate Increase on Transfers of Properties for at Least \$10,000,000. File #200654
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 4:53:45 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly supporting an increase in the real property transfer tax rates for high end properties.

Eileen Boken
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SUPPORTING Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee Agenda Item #3. Police and Public Works Codes - Administrative Penalties and Fines for Illegal Dumping File #191283
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 5:03:12 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly supporting this legislation as illegal dumping is not only blight it's also a public health issue.

Eileen Boken
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: OPPOSING Budget and Finance Committee Agenda Item #3 Amended Ten-Year Capital Expenditure Plan File #200487
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 5:17:06 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly opposed to the proposed Ten-Year Capital Expenditure Plan for FYs 2020-2029 for the following reasons:

SFPUC CAPITAL PLAN

- Does not include funds to seismically retrofit the south basin of Sunset Reservoir.
- Describes the Emergency Firefighting Water System aka AWSS as potable water even though the BOS has passed legislation to explore other options.

SFMTA CAPITAL PLAN

- Reflects pre-COVID19 spending priorities even though COVID-19 could radically change mobility.

Eileen Boken
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: OPPOSING Budget and Finance Committee Agenda Item #4 Appropriation - Proceeds from General Obligation Bonds Transportation and Road Improvements, 2014 - Series 2020B - Municipal Transportation Agency - Street and Transit Projects - \$140,000,000. - FY ...
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 5:28:20 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly opposed to appropriating these funds now.

COVID-19 could radically change the nature of mobility. Appropriating these funds now is premature.

Eileen Boken
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 18 letters for File No. 200531
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 3:15:00 PM
Attachments: [18 letters for File No. 200531.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached 18 letters for File No. 200531.

File No. 200531 - Hearing on the budget for the Police Department, including an analysis of changes over the last decade, structure for the department, and COVID-19-related impacts on services, revenues and expenditures; and requesting the Police Department and the Budget and Legislative Analyst to report.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Beth Gold](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Divest from the SFPD
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 7:17:06 PM

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

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, specifically the Budget & Finance Committee of Supervisors Sandra Fewer, Shamann Walton, and Rafael Mandelman,

My name is Beth Gold. I am a resident of Chambersburg , and I am emailing today to demand a divestation of funds from San Francisco's police department and redistribution towards social services focused on community safety and health. These include: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Adult Protective Services, SF Dept of Emergency Preparedness and Assistance, Medi-Cal, CalWORKS, County Adult Assistance Programs, JobsNOW!, Families Rising, Family and Children's Services, and SF Dept of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, to name a few.

As you are reviewing Mayor London Breed's proposed city budget for the next two years, I know SF's financial outlook has changed drastically as a result of COVID-19 and many social services are up for budget cuts. I also know that the SFPD has a history of fatal police shootings (the murders of Alex Nieto, Amilcar Perez-Lopez, Mario Woods, Luis Gongora Pat, Jessica Williams, the list goes on), and countless reports of officer misconduct and brutality that continue to persist despite efforts by the District Attorney and public defenders to press charges, and despite implementation of additional bias trainings and other reforms from both a local and federal level. These harmful issues persist and something needs to change. (With funds that are directed to the police department I ask that additional efforts towards ending police violence be made, outlined in Campaign Zero (<https://www.joincampaignzero.org/solutions#solutionsoverview>).)

I am demanding that you remove funds from this institution that violently responds to community concerns and move these vital funds to services that work to de-escalate crime before it has the chance to emerge. These services, initiatives such as affordable housing, youth programs, social worker support, mental health support, and crisis intervention and hotlines, are better equipped to protect our communities both now and long-term than police departments that have a consistent and inexcusable history of violence and excessive force, specifically against communities of color, as we are seeing at a local and national level from police departments around the country. Social services also play a vital role in providing support and resources for marginalized communities during a global pandemic. This divestation is crucial and urgent to ensure the flourishing of all communities and an end to systemic racism and oppression.

Respectfully,
Beth Gold

From: [Deb Porter](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: SFPD 2020 Budget
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:10:47 AM

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

Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Deborah Porter, and I am a resident of San Francisco. Recently our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. It has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided.

Last year, the SFPD budget was over \$611,000,000, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have NOT seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to reduce SFPD budget substantially and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

As the City that knows how, we have a unique opportunity to be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Deb Porter
19A Mirabel Ave
porter.deb@gmail.com

From: [Helen Tseng](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: redistribute funds to solve homelessness
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 12:32:39 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers:

My name is Helen, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Helen Tseng
841 San Jose Avenue, San Francisco
helen@shewolfe.co
(404) 969-6539

From: [Sarah Brown](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Please help our homeless, not the SFPD
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 1:15:47 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Sarah Brown, and I am a resident of San Francisco. These past weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, I think San Francisco elected officials should redirect funds to where the populous is asking for them to go.

Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Sarah Brown
3620 19th St, SF, CA

From: [Jordan Beaston](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Budget Meeting
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:19:29 PM

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

Good afternoon,

I am unable to call in to the budget hearing this afternoon so I am hoping to make my voice heard via email.

My name is Jordan Beaston and I am a resident and employee of the City of San Francisco. I have worked for the city for four years, first with the Recreation and Parks Department and now with the Real Estate Division.

I strongly encourage the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Office of the Treasurer **NOT TO INCREASE SFPD'S BUDGET**. Working in the City firsthand, I know that each Department has been asked to cut their budget by up to 10%. It is my understanding that SFPD has only been asked to slash their budget by 4%.

How is this right at all? Among many cries of San Francisco residents and Citizens of the US nationwide for defunding the Police, how is it possible that an already **OVERFUNDED** department has to cut their budget the least?

Don't you think that the funding that SFPD is saving could be better used to supplement the budgets of SFUSD, the Department of Public Health, and SFMTA?

The last thing that the people of San Francisco need is more police officers and less buses. Please do the right thing and put that money into **IMPROVING** people's lives instead of into a department that **MURDERS AND IMPRISONS PEOPLE**.

Thank you,
Jordan

From: [André Arko](#)
To: [André Arko](#)
Subject: Defund the SFPD. Seriously.
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:32:49 PM

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

My name is Andre Arko, and I am a resident of San Francisco.

As protests against police brutality, racism, and anti-Blackness continue for week after week across America, the SFPD has repeatedly demonstrated that "reform" is useless to stop police brutality and murder.

Despite having already implemented every single "reform" from the #8cantwait campaign, SFPD spends over half a billion dollars a year only to regularly murder suspects of color while failing to improve safety, lack of housing, or mental and physical health care.

Defund the SFPD. Reclaim their yearly budget of \$611,701,869, and use it to house the houseless, fund public health programs, and provide for the other needs of our residents, instead of locking them up or murdering them.

San Francisco claims to be progressive. It's well past time we started to actually be progressive.

Sincerely,
André Arko
35 Brosnan St. Apt. 8
San Francisco, CA 94103
andre@arko.net
(415) 504-2134

From: [Jimmy Foti](#)
To: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment for July 8th Meeting on SFPD Budget
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:47:19 PM

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

Good afternoon, Supervisors, my name is James Foti, and I live and work in San Francisco.

All over the city, the people have spoken. The time is NOW to DEFUND, DISARM, and DISBAND SFPD.

We DEMAND the defunding of SFPD in THIS YEAR's budget and we ask that it be redirected towards public health, housing, and reparations for communities that have been most targeted by policing and imprisonment, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and the unhoused. We've identified specific, concrete cuts you can make right now, collected at [DefundSfpdNow.com](#)

We must reimagine what Public Safety For All looks like.

Black people make up just 5% of San Francisco's population, but account for 35% of our homeless population, 54% of our jail population — and 40% of people who are killed by police. If Black Lives Matter, let's house Black families, not murder them.

We spend \$6.6 million dollars a year on a District Housing Unit that specifically patrols public housing communities, perpetuating the over-policing and surveillance of Black and Brown families.

SFPD's budget of about \$736 million dollars comes at the expense of housing and social services — resources that create real public safety for all.

Why should SFPD get a \$43 million dollar increase while schools are facing \$26 million dollars in cuts? What does this budget say about our values? Which do you think is more important to a healthy city, educating children or harassing poor people?

Narcotics, homeless, gang, plainclothes, and other such units exist specifically to target Black people, indigenous people and other people of color, as well as the LGBTQ+ community, and the poor. Criminalizing people simply for being too poor to be able to afford a place to live is disgusting.

For less than half of the SFPD budget, \$320 million dollars, we can house every unhoused person in San Francisco, while still having money leftover to invest in healthcare, free public transit, education, universal childcare, and alternative safety programs that actually keep us all safe.

Thank you for your time
James Foti

From: [Mariko Reed](#)
Subject: Pease Fund Schools and Social Services
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:53:08 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Mariko Reed, I am a parent and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Mariko Reed

323 Guerrero St

MarikoReed@gmail.com

808-226-7676

From: [Maggie Gierard](#)
To: [Maggie Gierard](#)
Subject: SFPD Budget
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:21:32 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Maggie, and I live in San Francisco.

The time is now to defund the SFPD and redirect funds towards public health, housing, and reparations for communities that have been most targeted by policing and imprisonment, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, trans communities, and the unhoused. If you go to [DefundSfpdNow.com](https://defundsfpdnow.com) there is a list of specific, concrete cuts you can make right now.

We need to reimagine what Public Safety For All looks like.

The American police system was designed to protect wealthy white people, and rarely upholds the dignity and rights of marginalized communities. The SFPD budget has exploded in the last two years, growing by more than \$100 million dollars. We could house every unhoused person in the city with the SFPD budget. We could provide top-level community assistance and mental health resources for those in need with that money.

The facts show that the SFPD disproportionately targets the Black community.

- Black people make up just 5% of San Francisco's population, but account for 35% of our homeless population, 54% of our jail population — and 40% of people who are killed by police. If Black Lives Matter, let's house Black families, not murder them.
- Black and latinx residents together make up 20% of the city's population, but they accounted for 78% of all individuals booked or cited for drug sales in 2017. Meanwhile Salesforce is celebrated for boosting the profits of white-owned pharmaceutical companies.
- In 2019, Black students made up 43% of all SF school district youth that were arrested, cited, or detained at school, despite being only 7% of the student body.

This Board is considering making racially motivated 911 calls illegal, which I think is a fantastic idea. But we need to go beyond that and change how the city interacts with the Black community.

We are not asking for chaos, but public safety for all. I think that would be the true reflection of the San Francisco spirit. We must defund SFPD and refund our communities.

Thank you,
Maggie

From: [Catherine Muehleib Madden](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: We need real change. Now.
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:27:01 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Catherine Madden, and I am a resident of Noe Valley. I am writing to add my voice to the chorus of others demanding that you take steps to defund the SFPD immediately.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police who are not trained to help address these issues.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and any other services and treatment they need.

This is a step towards addressing the unbelievable inequality that plagues our city and making it a livable place for all who find themselves here.

Sincerely,

Catherine Madden
807B Alvarado Street 94114
catherine.muehleib@gmail.com
202-695-5300

From: [Nathan Perretta](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: 2021 San Francisco Budgeting Concerns - SFPD
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:57:31 PM

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

Good afternoon,

My name is Nathan Perretta, and I am a resident of San Francisco. In this past handful of weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how our Black citizens are treated in our country. SF and the Bay Area as a whole have been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a massive source of misused resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in SF. It's time to redirect money to other areas of need now that the SFPD has failed to deliver on these targeted improvements.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and use those resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Thank you for your time,
Nathan Perretta
504 Haight St
San Francisco, CA 94117
nathanaperretta@gmail.com
814-937-3934

From: [Amy Lin](#)
Subject: Defund SFPD - Reinvest in the Community
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:07:12 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Amy, and I am a resident of San Francisco. As you all know, protests and calls to defund SFPD have been ongoing for the past couple months. The racial violence committed against our Black community in this country at the hands of police has gone on for far too long. As citizens and residents of San Francisco, we're demanding tangible change to make our city a better place.

In recent events, we've called for an estimated 4% budget cut in the SFPD budget. Today, we'll be discussing the city budget in a town hall. The proposed budget adds \$23.2 million to the SFPD budget—the very opposite of what the city's constituents are asking for. Funding SFPD is a waste of resources. The police disproportionately police and target Black and Latinx San Franciscans, and routinely engage in violent and predatory behavior. We should be putting our monetary resources towards housing the unhoused, especially during a worldwide pandemic. The streets, sidewalks, and alleys of our city are overrun with vulnerable people who need the most care at this critical time. Promises to move the homeless into hotels and protected sites have largely not seen any action. Though this is especially important in the context of COVID-19, there needs to be longer term investment and solutions for SF's unhoused people.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change. Invest in our communities, and DO NOT haphazardly throw more funding towards the SFPD.

Sincerely,

Amy Lin

1525 Larkin St. , San Francisco

amyhclin14@gmail.com

From: [kaylena.katz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public comment to DEFUND THE POLICE
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:15:22 PM

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

Hi my name is Kaylena and I live in SF district 1 and I work in district 6. I am writing to tell you to DEFUND, DISARM, and DISBAND THE POLICE in a meaningful way. The SFPD budget receives more funding than parks and rec, homeless services, libraries, and workforce development put together. We could house every homeless person in SF if we defund the police and put that money into rental subsidies and social services. As a social worker I have to tell homeless people every day that there are simply no options to house them. THAT IS UNACCEPTABLE. Black San Franciscans make up only 5% of the city population but 35% of our homeless population and 54% of our jail population. THAT IS PROOF OF SYSTEMIC RACISM.

The starting salary of a police officer is \$90K, while the starting salary of a teacher is only \$63K. We have to invest in our youth instead of investing in the policing of them. GET POLICE OUT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

In 2019, Black students made up 43% of all SFUSD youth that were arrested, cited, or detained at school, despite being only 7% of the student body. STOP POLICING OUR CHILDREN OF COLOR. COLOR IS NOT A CRIME.

Why should SFPD get a \$23 million dollar increase while schools are facing \$26 million dollars in cuts? ABSURD. DISGUSTING. You have a responsibility and moral obligation to end policing in this city as we know it. Don't be cowards. STAND UP TO THE POLICE.

DEFUND all their dirt bikes and cars and boats. We do not need them.

Thank you,
Kaylena Katz
Concern citizen

Sent from my iPad

From: [Maxwell Ho](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Uplifting SF Communities by Defunding the Police
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:41:08 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers,

My name is Maxwell Ho, and I am a resident of San Francisco. These past weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change. I thank you for your previous efforts and advocacy for change, and hope you will continue to fight for justice.

Sincerely,
Maxwell Ho
235 De Montfort Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112
(415) 802-9984

From: [Willoughby Smith](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the SFPD Budget, Defund SFPD
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 8:23:01 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers,

I am a resident of San Francisco. Our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and an immediate reform in how Black, POC, Indigenous, Trans people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. San Francisco is a radical and beautiful place to live and as such it sets an example for the rest of the country to follow.

Accordingly, I would like to ask that the city listen to the hundreds of people who are speaking up today, during the SFPD Budget Review, to NOT approve the SFPD budget, to DEFUND SFPD, and to SUPPORT Our City and Our People.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources and a force of terror on Our City. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. We've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing and we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Enough is enough, we need to reject the new SFPD proposed budget and defund SFPD.

On behalf of my city and my community I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. Give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and use those extraordinary resources towards funding public transportation which has suffered greatly as a result of the pandemic and without which many cities and communities will suffer.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and use those extraordinary resources towards citywide funding for mental health resources. This beautiful city has been plagued by racism, white supremacy, inequality, homophobia, transphobia, police terror and ICE raids. Defund the police and support your community by putting funding into rebuilding your system from the mental standing up.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and use those extraordinary resources towards creating and offering affordable housing for all residents. This city was and is home to a community that has faced displacement due to rising costs of living. Take responsibility for your City and fund housing, the most basic of personal securities, for your people.

On behalf of my community and my city, I implore you to listen and act rightly.

Willoughby

Resident, District 4; Worker, District 9

From: [Nirav Sanghani](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Put the SFPD police budget elsewhere where it can make a difference!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 8:24:15 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

Hello, my name is Nirav Sanghani, and I am a ten-year resident of San Francisco. In the last few weeks, our nation has been swept by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action; thankfully, often in a good way. I've also realized that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

From my research, SFPD has been a waste of this money. Last year, its budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending all of this on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability. Instead, we just see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to aggressively slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need. We have the money for this and we can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,
Nirav Sanghani

35 Dolores St, Apt 201
San Francisco, CA 94103

nirav.sanghani@gmail.com
832-567-5753

From: [Maura Mana](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Item 2 regarding SFPD funding Wednesday 7/8/2020
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 8:32:32 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I was one of the callers in line for comment for hours and simply gave up but not before I heard the rants of the majority of callers. They clearly all seemed to be regurgitating from the same script: defund, disband, fund education, health etc... ..one even had the audacity to suggest the sfpd did not care about the murder of the 6 year old boy over 4th of July. That is so far from the truth.

I would like to voice my complete support for the SFPD. None of those callers spoke for me. I am asking that the BOS set aside any personal bias that they have towards the SFPD (e.g..Sandra Fewer) and make sound decisions for the safety of every citizen of San Francisco. Defunding will become a colossal failure. Police moral is at a low time low and that is a disaster for us all. They are being vilified and used as scapegoats. Crime is rising all over this nation and 6 year olds are being shot and killed. Ask yourselves who will suffer the most with a reduced police force? I can tell you it ain't Sea Cliff.

Funneling more money towards the homeless is laughable. The last budget round included \$364 MILLION for homeless services. Where exactly does that money go??? Where are the heads of that agency showing us a graph of budget allocations??? At least Chief Scott can provide that.

The callers today were living in another universe. I guarantee not ONE of them has ever been a victim of crime nor do they have any law enforcement loved ones in their family.

The only caller I agreed with was the one that called out Sandra Fewer for suggesting that the public only have one minute! Shame on her. So typical.

Maura Healy
SF Resident and native born

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Amber Doherty](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Reallocate Money Towards Homelessness and Mental Health
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 12:02:27 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Amber Doherty, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Amber M. Doherty

1562 Noe St.
SF, CA 94131

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 71 letters regarding the SFPD Budget
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:15:00 AM
Attachments: [71 letters for File No. 200531.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached 71 letters regarding File No. 200531.

File No. 200531 -Hearing on the budget for the Police Department, including an analysis of changes over the last decade, structure for the department, and COVID-19-related impacts on services, revenues and expenditures; and requesting the Police Department and the Budget and Legislative Analyst to report.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [kate hoyle](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: This is the Moment
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:45:34 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Kate Hoyle, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Kate Hoyle

1970 Fell St
San Francisco, Ca
97019

From: [Tyler Ly](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; Gabrielalopez@sfusd.edu; AlisonMCollins; StevonCook; JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu; RachelNorton@sfusd.edu
Subject: Reallocate Police Funds
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:29:08 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers:

My name is Tyler Ly, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Best,
Tyler Ly
683 Brannan St, San Francisco, CA 94107
tylerly96@gmail.com
(858) 229 - 7954

From: [Hannah Long](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Urgent need for change to policing
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 3:19:05 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Hannah Long, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Hannah Long

Potrero Hill

long.hannahk@gmail.com

From: [Agatha Kielczewski](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Please reallocate the police budget
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 3:25:47 PM

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

My name is Agatha Kielczewski, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Agatha Kielczewski

546 Mississippi St., San Francisco, CA 94107

agatha@u.northwestern.edu

630-873-0304

Agatha J. Kielczewski

agatha@u.northwestern.edu | 630.873.0304

From: [Michael Sova](#)
Subject: Reduce SFPD funding; invest \$\$ in alleviating homelessness
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 3:54:57 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Michael Sova, and I am a resident of San Francisco (Crocker Amazon). During this past month or so, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to reduce the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Michael Sova
15 Naylor Street
SF, CA 94112

Be here, now!

From: [Evan Wardell](#)
Subject: Reinvest in our community
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:35:53 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Evan Wardell, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Evan Wardell
725 Ellis
San Francisco CA
94109

7745630573

From: [Karina](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: DEFUND THE POLICE
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:56:02 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Karina, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Karina

[YOUR ADDRESS]

[YOUR EMAIL]

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Agnes Lenzen](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Defund nonessential police services, stop unnecessary police "force"
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 10:14:07 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Agnes Lenzen, and I am a business owner and resident of San Rafael with clients living and working in San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Agnes Lenzen

714 C Street, Suite 214

San Rafael CA 94901

agnesmassagetherapy@gmail.com

From: [Kari Clark](#)
Subject: Our city deserves better
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 11:53:46 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Kari Clark, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Kari Clark
1764 Mission St.
San Francisco, CA 94103
kariclark.design@gmail.com
(707)486-8988

From: [Nikou Kangarloo-Foroutan](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: DEFUND THE POLICE
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 12:59:26 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Nikou Kangarloo-Foroutan, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Nikou Kangarloo-Foroutan

From: [Kelly To](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHE\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#)
Subject: Defund the SFPD
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 1:31:02 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers,

My name is Kelly To, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-blackness, and immediate reform in how black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

We're counting on you to stand up for Black communities and marginalized communities and defund the SFPD. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kelly To

From: [Hillary Johannsen](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff. \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney. \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Request to reallocate egregious police budgets towards education, social services, and dismantling racial injustice
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 1:37:38 PM

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

My name is Hillary Johannsen, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Hillary Johannsen

2554 Greenwich Street, Apt 1, San Francisco, CA 94123

hillaryjohannsen@gmail.com

209-712-9672

From: [Jarod Backens](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Please Hear Us
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 3:46:12 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers,

My name is Jarod Backens, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Jarod Backens
237 Cumberland St, Apt 6, San Francisco, CA 94114
jarodbackens@gmail.com
518-424-9262

From: [Callie Cesewski](#)
Subject: DEFUND THE POLICE
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 4:05:29 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Callie Cesewski, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Callie Cesewski

1140 Silver Ave

callieann189@gmail.com
415-830-1621

From: [Gordon, Daniel](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Save the people of SF
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 4:50:52 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers,

My name is Daniel Gordon, and I am a nurse and a resident of San Francisco. These past weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police. And we have seen an increase in homeless; an increase in the dehumanizing of vulnerable people.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Daniel Gordon
174 Cook St
San Francisco, CA 94118

Daniel Gordon, RN, BSN, PCCN
Clinical Nurse II
14 Moffitt - Medical Surgical High Acuity Telemetry
Unit: 415.353.1368
Voalte: 79456
[email: Daniel.Gordon@ucsf.edu](mailto:Daniel.Gordon@ucsf.edu)
he/his

From: [Brad Cruz](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SAVE ME, SAVE US
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 8:42:48 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Bradley Cruz a California businessman. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Bradley Cruz
928 4th St. #2
Santa Monica, Ca 90403
Bcruzin22@icloud.com
424.259.3696

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jacki Rust](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 8:56:06 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Jacki and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need. And schools!

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

[Jacki Rust]

[1 Edward st]

[jackirust@gmail.com]

[415-425-0197]

From: [hk](#)
To: epimoz@yahoo.com
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 11:23:57 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR ADDRESS]

[YOUR EMAIL]

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

From: [Plknudson](#)
To: [Rachelnorton](#); [Faaugamoliga](#); [Jennylam](#); [StevonCook](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [Gabrielalopez](#); [Marksanchez](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: My plea to leadership
Date: Saturday, June 27, 2020 8:22:50 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Peter Knudson, and I am a resident of San Francisco's Duboce Triangle. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Peter Knudson

2172 15th St, San Francisco, Ca 94114

4159105455

From: [Miloni Shah](#)
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Saturday, June 27, 2020 11:19:35 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Miloni Malhotra and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,
Miloni Malhotra

1950 Clay Street

San Francisco
shahmiloni@gmail.com
6469430922

Miloni Malhotra | Director - Revenue Strategy | 646.943.0922

From: [Andrew Faggella](#)
Subject: Help spread funding
Date: Saturday, June 27, 2020 1:59:29 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Andrew Faggella, and I am a resident of San Francisco. These past weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Best,
Andrew Faggella

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Christian Baba](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Sunday, June 28, 2020 1:06:46 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR ADDRESS]

[YOUR EMAIL]

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

From: [Jamie Yukimoto](#)
To: ayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu; AlisonMCollins; [StevonCook](#); JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu; RachelNorton@sfusd.edu
Subject: Please defund the police
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 12:17:26 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Jamie Yukimoto, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Jamie Yukimoto

2300 29th Ave. SF, CA 94116

yukimotoj@gmail.com

From: [Zoe](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#)
Subject: Defund the police
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 2:04:34 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Zoe Skigen, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-blackness, and immediate reform in how black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Zoe Skigen

132 Bartlett St.

zskigen04@gmail.com

415-290-9292

From: [Emma Fitzgerald](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Elected Officers
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 3:16:36 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Emma Fitzgerald, and I am a former resident of the Bay Area. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Emma Fitzgerald
Los Angeles, CA
emfitzgerald17@yahoo.com
818-854-1788

From: [Alvaro Avenda?o](#)
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 3:40:12 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR ADDRESS]

[YOUR EMAIL]

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

Enviado desde mi iPhone

From: [Earthlink](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Citizen's Message
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 3:47:25 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers:

My name is Calista Henson, and I am a resident of San Francisco. These past few weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Calista Henson

1181 Oak Street, San Francisco CA 94117

calihenson@earthlink.net

949.491.2803

From: [Erin Harrington](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; [Gabriela Lopez](mailto:GabrielaLopez); AlisonMCollins; StevonCook; JennyLam@sfusd.edu; FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu; RachelNorton@sfusd.edu
Subject: Defund SFPD
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 4:03:48 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Erin Harrington, and I am a resident of San Francisco. The past few weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,
Erin Harrington
94109

From: [Jeannie Yang](#)
Subject: DEFUND THE POLICE - ADOPT PEOPLE'S BUDGET
Date: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 12:19:13 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Jeannie and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Jeannie

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Allison Woo](#)
Subject: We want justice and defunding!!
Date: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 10:52:36 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Allison Woo, and I am a resident of San Francisco. Our country has been protesting and calling for rapid and meaningful change to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Also it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. With these huge budgets and spending, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a great example for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,
Allison Woo

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Sophia Vu](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: INVEST IN OUR COMMUNITY
Date: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 5:34:52 PM

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

Hello City Leaders,

My name is Sophia Vu, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards education, mental health, and solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Sophia Vu
sophiapv14@yahoo.com
(415) 794 - 7092

From: [Marianna Kowalczyk](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#)
Subject: Requesting budget cuts for SFPD
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 10:59:31 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Marianna Kowalczyk, and I am a resident of San Francisco. Recently, protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-blackness, and immediate reform in how black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to decrease the SFPD budget and instead use those resources towards solving homelessness and mental health programs, which is felt most by our black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Marianna Kowalczyk

From: [Andrea Hernandez](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: WE DEMAND CHANGE
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 11:00:02 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR ADDRESS]

[YOUR EMAIL]

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Monica Nolte](#)
Subject: Do the Right Thing - Support Your Residents
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 12:50:59 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Monica, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action and this is admirable. However, there is still much to be done such as defunding police and decreasing policing within San Francisco. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue. This is a very important time to reconsider what this city and its officials value within our residents. Education, healthcare, mental health resources, and resources for the homeless should be at the top of your priority list. As city officials, your aspiration should be to improve the quality of lives within San Francisco and these measures will assist in that, increasing funding to SFPD will not and will do the exact opposite.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police and this needs to change. This is not a want, this is a need.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need. San Francisco houses some of the most incredible resources of healthcare and has residents that have the determination to meet the needs of the city, but this cannot be done without the approval of city officials. That is why your decisions are so important, and so I ask of you to look at the faces of your residents, the color of their skin, the words they say, and the resources that they need and make the right decisions for your community.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Monica Nolte

590 Minnesota St.
San Francisco, CA 94107

monicamnolte@gmail.com

From: [Renee Maquindang](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Review
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:13:18 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Renée, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Renée Kyomi Maquindang

1475 Holloway Ave, SF, Ca 94132

reneekyomi@gmail.com

702-334-6964

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Eli Cohen](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: MUST DIVERT FUNDS FROM PD TO SOCIAL SERVICES
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 3:01:50 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Eli Cohen

664 27th Ave

selicohen2@gmail.com

4154978514

From: [Justina Green](#)
Subject: RETHINK SFPD FUNDING!!!!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:11:28 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Ayannah Green, and I am a resident of the Bay Area. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Ayannah Green

ayannah.green11@gmail.com

(415)-261-4813

Sent from my iPhone

From: [J West](#)
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 7:49:35 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR ADDRESS]

[YOUR EMAIL]

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Rachel Fields](#)
To: [Rachel Fields](#)
Subject: Choose the right side of history!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:03:21 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Rachel Fields and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Rachel Fields
14 Gorham Street
San Francisco, CA 94112
rachelfields77@gmail.com
415.596.0060

From: [Anne Vollen](#)
To: [anne Vollen](#)
Subject: Defund the Police; Invest in Health, Housing and Education
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:27:27 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Anne Vollen, and I have been a resident of San Francisco for more than 25 years. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Anne Vollen

3740 Divisadero Street
San Francisco, CA 94123

annevollen@gmail.com
415.819.8493

From: [Deborah Garfinkle](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff. \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney. \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: invest in health, housing and education - defund police
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:27:44 PM

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

My name is Deborah Garfinkle, and I am a resident of San Francisco. Since the end of May, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Respectfully,

Deborah Garfinkle

400 Beale St Apt 613

dhgarf@yahoo.com

415-706-8463

From: [Kerri McDermott](#)
To: [Kerri McDermott](#)
Subject: Defund Police! Invest in Health, Housing and Education!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:28:32 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers:

My name is Kerri, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Kerri McDermott
2368 Fulton St.
SF, CA 94118

From: [Claire Callahan](#)
To: [Claire Callahan](#)
Subject: Reallocate SFPD Funding to Food Security in SF
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:37:42 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Claire Callahan, and I am a resident of San Francisco. Over the past month, communities across our country have called for rapid and meaningful change in police protocols and use of force, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. SF and the Bay Area have been at the forefront of much of this action, and I am proud that so many of you, especially Mayor Breed and Supervisor Walton, have advocated for meaningful reforms for our homeless population and stopping police responses to noncriminal calls. And there is more action we must take to fundamentally change policing and use of force in our city.

SFPD is excessively used with too few results and far too many harms. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. Meanwhile, [1 in 4 San Franciscans were food insecure](#). In our city with so much wealth and opportunity, we should not be perpetuating income inequality through our city budget. I urge you to reallocate portions of the SFPD budget to food security initiatives in our city for working families and individuals struggling to make ends meet.

Supervisor Fewer and others, I call on you to reallocate the SFPD budget towards solving food insecurity, which is felt most acutely by our Black, Brown, and AAPI communities in Western Addition, the Tenderloin, Bayview, Chinatown, and even in my district in the Richmond.

San Francisco is making promising strides in keeping COVID-19 levels low and in advocating for reforms that will further racial justice and appropriate use of police in our city. If we further cut the police budget we can be a beacon for other cities to follow.

Sincerely,

Claire Callahan

391 17th Avenue, San Francisco, CA
Claire.m.callahan@gmail.com
425-244-6049

From: [Kathleen Walker](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Defund Police
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:37:56 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Kathleen Walker, and I am a public school teacher in San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Walker

SFUSD

walkerk@sfusd.edu

415 686 3397

From: [Elaine Wang](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Change for Our City
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 2:31:36 PM

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

To Mayor Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

My name is Elaine Wang, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has not effectively used our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,
Elaine Wang
elaineywang@yahoo.com

From: [Hannah Gemrich](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: 2021 Budget
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 6:14:21 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers,

My name is Hannah, and I am a resident of San Francisco. The budget for 2021 is beginning to be discussed.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

Sincerely,

Hannah Gemrich

2702A 24th Street

From: [Brad Cruz](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SAVE US, SAVE AMERICA
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:36:51 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Bradley Cruz, and I am a California businessman. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Bradley Cruz
928 4th St. #2
Santa Monica, Ca 90403
Bcruzin22@icloud.com
424.259.3696

Sent from my iPad

From: [Sophia Krivoruchko](#)
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 10:43:57 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR ADDRESS]

[YOUR EMAIL]

[YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Malindi Walker](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: defund the san francisco police department
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:57:34 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Malindi, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Malindi Walker

3119 Noriega St, San Francisco, CA 94122

malindiwalker1164@gmail.com

805-628-6351

From: [Kirsten Lim](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Invest in the city by significantly reducing the budget for SFPD
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:26:58 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Kirsten Lim, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I was encouraged to see Mayor Breed's promise to reduce the SFPD budget and to increase the usage of social workers to respond to police calls. I am sending this email as a reminder of the promise the city has made to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Kirsten Lim
45 Bartlett Street San Francisco, CA 94110
kirstenblim@gmail.com

From: [Mylene](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Divest from the SFPD
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 4:21:05 PM

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

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors - specifically the Budget & Finance Committee, Supervisors Sandra Fewer, Shamann Walton, and Rafael Mandelman:

My name is Mylene de Guzman and I am a resident of Lower Haight. I am emailing today to **demand a DIVESTMENT OF FUNDS from San Francisco's police department and REDISTRIBUTION TOWARDS SERVICES focused on community safety and health.**

These services include: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Adult Protective Services, SF Dept of Emergency Preparedness and Assistance, Medi-Cal, CalWORKS, County Adult Assistance Programs, JobsNOW!, Families Rising, Family and Children's Services, and SF Dept of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, to name a few.

As you are reviewing Mayor London Breed's proposed city budget for the next two years, I know SF's financial outlook has changed drastically as a result of COVID-19 and many social services are up for budget cuts. I also know that the SFPD has a history of fatal police shootings (the murders of Alex Nieto, Amilcar Perez-Lopez, Mario Woods, Luis Gongora Pat, Jessica Williams, the list goes on), and countless reports of officer misconduct and brutality that continue to persist despite efforts by the District Attorney and public defenders to press charges, and despite implementation of additional bias trainings and other reforms from both a local and federal level. These harmful issues persist. Something needs to change.

I am demanding that you remove funds from this institution that violently responds to community concerns and move these vital funds to services that work to de-escalate crime before it has the chance to emerge. These services, initiatives such as affordable housing, youth programs, social worker support, mental health support, and crisis intervention and hotlines, are better equipped to protect our communities both now and in the long-term than police departments that have a consistent and inexcusable history of violence and excessive force, specifically against the poor and communities of color, as we are seeing at a local and national level from police departments around the country. Social services also play a vital role in providing support and resources for marginalized communities during a global pandemic.

More, using the police department's remaining funds, I urge that SFPD adopt measures outlined in [Campaign Zero](#), to further curb police violence.

If San Francisco is truly committed to ensuring the flourishing of all communities and an end to systemic racism and exploitation, it must adopt these measures.

DIVESTMENT AND REDISTRIBUTION ARE CRUCIAL AND URGENT.

Sincerely,
Mylene de Guzman
401 Steiner St. SF 94117

From: [Grace Lu](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#)
Subject: Defund the Police & Save Our City!
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 7:48:07 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Grace and I am a registered voter in San Francisco, CA. I am writing to you today to ask what you are doing to ensure that your officers are not abusing their power and are held accountable for their actions.

After witnessing the death of George Floyd at the hands of the Minneapolis Police Department, I am left feeling outraged, frustrated, and hurt. The system has failed yet another black man and we are anxiously waiting to see if the officers responsible for his death will face consequences.

As a resident of San Francisco, I want to make sure that my local police department is taking the necessary preventative measures to ensure that incidents like this will not occur in the future. So I ask:

- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department being trained to de-escalate altercations by using peaceful conflict resolution strategies?
- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department forbidden from using carotid restraints (chokeholds, strangleholds, etc.) and hog-tying methods? Furthermore, are they forbidden from transporting civilians in uncomfortable positions, such as face down in a vehicle?
- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department required to intervene if they witness another officer using excessive force? Will officers be reprimanded if they fail to intervene?
- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department forbidden from shooting at moving vehicles?
- Is there a clear and enforced use-of-force continuum that details what weapons and force are acceptable in a wide variety of civilian-police interactions?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department required to exhaust every other possible option before using excessive force?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department required to give a verbal warning to civilians before drawing their weapon or using excessive force?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department required to report each time they threaten to or use force on civilians?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department thoroughly vetted to ensure that they do not have a history with abuse, racism, xenophobia, homophobia / transphobia, or discrimination?

- Are the officers in the SF Police Department trained to perform and seek necessary medical action after using excessive force?
- Is there an early intervention system enforced to correct officers who use excessive force? Additionally, how many complaints does an officer have to receive before they are reprimanded? Before they are terminated? More than three complaints are unacceptable.

Statistics have indicated that by enforcing these policies, there is a significant decrease in civilian complaints and injury due to excessive force. If any of the policies are not currently in place, then what is being done to ensure that they are going to be enforced in the near future? What can I do, as a concerned citizen, to set these policies in motion?

I also want to increase the level of trust between the police department and the community. To establish trust, there has to be transparency. I would like to see the SF Police Department collect and report data on civilian deaths that occurred in custody and as a result of an officer's use of excessive force. The data should be broken down by demographics and should showcase the race, gender, sexuality, and religion of the civilians. Allowing the public access to this information will show us where we, as a community, fall short.

Thank you for your time and I hope that we can work together to protect the SF community. I refuse to let the next hashtag come from here.

Sincerely,

Grace Lu

550 Ashbury Street, San Francisco, CA 94117
510-918-5354
gzlu@ucdavis.edu

From: [Byron Atashian](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#)
Subject: Redistribute police funding to community services
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 7:57:29 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers,

My name is Byron and I am a registered voter in San Francisco, CA. I am writing to you today to ask what you are doing to ensure that your officers are not abusing their power and are held accountable for their actions.

After witnessing the death of George Floyd at the hands of the Minneapolis Police Department, I am left feeling outraged, frustrated, and hurt. The system has failed yet another black man and we are anxiously waiting to see if the officers responsible for his death will face consequences.

As a resident of San Francisco, I want to make sure that my local police department is taking the necessary preventative measures to ensure that incidents like this will not occur in the future. So I ask:

- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department being trained to de-escalate altercations by using peaceful conflict resolution strategies?
- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department forbidden from using carotid restraints (chokeholds, strangleholds, etc.) and hog-tying methods? Furthermore, are they forbidden from transporting civilians in uncomfortable positions, such as face down in a vehicle?
- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department required to intervene if they witness another officer using excessive force? Will officers be reprimanded if they fail to intervene?
- Are the police officers in the SF Police Department forbidden from shooting at moving vehicles?
- Is there a clear and enforced use-of-force continuum that details what weapons and force are acceptable in a wide variety of civilian-police interactions?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department required to exhaust every other possible option before using excessive force?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department required to give a verbal warning to civilians before drawing their weapon or using excessive force?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department required to report each time they threaten to or use force on civilians?
- Are the officers in the SF Police Department thoroughly vetted to ensure that they do not have a history with abuse, racism, xenophobia, homophobia /

transphobia, or discrimination?

- Are the officers in the SF Police Department trained to perform and seek necessary medical action after using excessive force?
- Is there an early intervention system enforced to correct officers who use excessive force? Additionally, how many complaints does an officer have to receive before they are reprimanded? Before they are terminated? More than three complaints are unacceptable.

Statistics have indicated that by enforcing these policies, there is a significant decrease in civilian complaints and injury due to excessive force. If any of the policies are not currently in place, then what is being done to ensure that they are going to be enforced in the near future? What can I do, as a concerned citizen, to set these policies in motion?

I also want to increase the level of trust between the police department and the community. To establish trust, there has to be transparency. I would like to see the SF Police Department collect and report data on civilian deaths that occurred in custody and as a result of an officer's use of excessive force. The data should be broken down by demographics and should showcase the race, gender, sexuality, and religion of the civilians. Allowing the public access to this information will show us where we, as a community, fall short.

Thank you for your time and I hope that we can work together to protect the SF community. I refuse to let the next hashtag come from here.

Regards,

[Byron Atashian](#) | (818) 239-2280

UC Berkeley, Haas School of Business | B.S. Business Administration
5301 Mission St, San Francisco, CA 94112

From: [Lucy Hunter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Divest from the SFPD
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 10:49:10 PM

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

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, specifically the Budget & Finance Committee of Supervisors Sandra Fewer, Shamann Walton, and Rafael Mandelman,

My name is Lucy Hunter. I am a resident of San Francisco, and I am emailing today to demand a divestation of funds from San Francisco's police department and redistribution towards social services focused on community safety and health. These include: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Adult Protective Services, SF Dept of Emergency Preparedness and Assistance, Medi-Cal, CalWORKS, County Adult Assistance Programs, JobsNOW!, Families Rising, Family and Children's Services, and SF Dept of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, to name a few.

As you are reviewing Mayor London Breed's proposed city budget for the next two years, I know SF's financial outlook has changed drastically as a result of COVID-19 and many social services are up for budget cuts. I also know that the SFPD has a history of fatal police shootings (the murders of Alex Nieto, Amilcar Perez-Lopez, Mario Woods, Luis Gongora Pat, Jessica Williams, the list goes on), and countless reports of officer misconduct and brutality that continue to persist despite efforts by the District Attorney and public defenders to press charges, and despite implementation of additional bias trainings and other reforms from both a local and federal level. These harmful issues persist and something needs to change.

(With funds that are directed to the police department I ask that additional efforts towards ending police violence be made, outlined in Campaign Zero (<https://www.joincampaignzero.org/solutions#solutionsoverview>).)

I am demanding that you remove funds from this institution that violently responds to community concerns and move these vital funds to services that work to de-escalate crime before it has the chance to emerge. These services, initiatives such as affordable housing, youth programs, social worker support, mental health support, and crisis intervention and hotlines, are better equipped to protect our communities both now and long-term than police departments that have a consistent and inexcusable history of violence and excessive force, specifically against communities of color, as we are seeing at a local and national level from police departments around the country. Social services also play a vital role in providing support and resources for marginalized communities during a global pandemic. This divestation is crucial and urgent to ensure the flourishing of all communities and an end to systemic racism and oppression.

Sincerely,
Lucy Hunter

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Miranda Huson](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Disgusting Actions of SFPD
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 10:10:17 AM

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

My name is Miranda Huson, and I am a native resident of San Francisco. Last night, I witnessed cops congregate on the corner of Treat and 23rd to brag about how they had just beat a group of people with their batons. While I do appreciate that it was a holiday where people tend to be rowdy, this type of glorification of violence from SFPD is appalling. Furthermore, I witnessed many of the officers drinking beer while driving on the job. I even saw one officer then throw his empty cans out of his car window while driving away. Unfortunately, I did not feel safe enough to record the incident or catch any information about the officers involved. These actions are appalling, and the fact that the officers did this in front of bystanders shows that they have no fear of repercussions.

I am sure that you receive many such emails from concerned residents, and I hope that you are taking them very seriously. I also know that SF has committed to cutting police funding, but I have not seen action beyond publicity stunts. I hope that you are able to make real change to protect our city, and that this story encourages you to keep up the good fight.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, MUNI budget problems, and City College funding.

Sincerely,

Miranda Huson

From: [Abby Klinkenberg](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Budget Concerns
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 10:55:17 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Abby Klinkenberg. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Abby Klinkenberg

From: [Jamie Reeves](#)
To: [Jamie.](#)
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 11:04:53 PM

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

Racism is a public health crisis, and racial inequalities are being exposed nationwide to those who have never had to experience them firsthand.

First step we must take of MANY: defund the heavily funded police, and reallocate funds into community services.

The safest communities do not have the most police, but have the most resources.

From: [Hrayr Khanjian](#)
Subject: Redistribution of pd funds needed and cancel rent!
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 11:32:25 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Hrayr, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

Also please consider canceling rent. Many residents whose income was coming from: nightlight and professions that require touch, have been struggling, please balance our socioeconomic divide.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Hrayr Khanjian
mission sf 94110

From: [Hull Munda](#)
To: majorlondonbreed@sfgov.org
Subject: SFPD Budget Reallocation
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:41:29 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Ansumana Hull, and I am a German citizen but resident of San Francisco. These past weeks, the US has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Germany sure is not perfect but has leas by example in fully committing to dealing with its racist and bigoted past to ensure history does not repeat itself. As citizens of any country we need to be able to trust in our elected officials and law enforcement to protect us. San Francisco has been at the forefront of much of reformative action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of the communities resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need. The issue of homelessness cannot be addressed or solved with police work. That money and their time is needed Elsewhere.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Ansumana Hull
1535 Green At #207
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Elisa Orellana Huhn](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Defund the SF Police Department, reinvest in our communities
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:58:19 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Elisa Orellana, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Elisa Orellana

1251 20th AVENUE
San Francisco, CA 94122

Translator, reviewer, linguistic consultant (EN<>ES)

Member of ASETRAD and NTCA

Skype: +1 619 550 2885

WhatsApp: +1 415 650 8174

<https://es.linkedin.com/in/elisaorellana>

<http://www.elisaorellanahuhn.com>

Current time zone: PDT

Where am I? San Francisco, CA

Estaré fuera de mi oficina habitual en las fechas arriba indicadas. Por favor, ten paciencia si tardo en contestar a tu correo.

I'll be out of my usual office on all the abovementioned dates. Please be patient if my response time is delayed.

Este mensaje se dirige exclusivamente a su destinatario y puede contener información privilegiada o confidencial. Si no es usted el destinatario indicado, queda notificado de que la utilización, divulgación y/o copia sin autorización está prohibida en virtud de la legislación vigente. Si ha recibido este mensaje por error, le ruego que me lo comunique inmediatamente por esta misma vía y proceda a su destrucción.

From: [Susan Witka](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: EMERGENCY: DEFUND BLOATED SFPD NOW! and FUND SF Peoples" RIGHT to first class EDUCATION, HEALTHCARE,HOMES, PUBLIC TRANSIT, LIVING WAGE JOBS
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:10:29 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is SUSAN WITKA], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

SUSAN WITKA

824 43rd Ave 94121

witkasf@gmail.com

From: [Michelle Huang](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliqa@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Allocation of SFPD Defunded Money
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:14:42 AM

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

Hello all,

I hope you are safe and healthy during this pandemic!!

I am Michelle Huang, a San Francisco resident, and I am writing to you to express my insight onto where the defunded SFPD money should go.

Growing up in this city, I have seen many racial inequalities despite the inclusive and diverse image San Francisco presents. From the lasting effects of redlining to the intense gentrification of BIPOC neighborhoods, San Francisco has oppressed the BIPOC community while tokenizing their culture. It's not right, especially since they are the backbone of San Francisco's history and identity. Now, as money is available from defunding SFPD, I urge you to use this opportunity to support those communities by funding schools in BIPOC neighborhoods.

Schools seem to be first for budget cuts even though they play a critical role in our society. They foster healthy and educated students and prepare them to tackle issues in our world. If we want to do and be better as a collective nation, we must recognize this and do our part to better our local San Francisco society. From supporting underfunded schools (usually in BIPOC neighborhoods) and bettering the quality of SFUSD education (STARTING FROM ELEMENTARY), we are ensuring those communities are healthy and educated, lowering the crime rates in our city.

The money should be allocated to fund art, music, and physical education/activity classes and electives. No one is born wanting to harm another. It is in the oppressive environment where one experiences and bottles up feelings of frustration, sadness, and anger in which is released into violent acts. So instead of policing and militarizing, furthering the oppression, there should be art, music, and physical activity. All ways to take our emotions and express them in an insightful and positive manner. SO MANY public schools lack these classes. I barely had art and music classes from my public school experience and most of my peers relate. Without having an emotional outlet as apart of the education system, so many youths are left angsty and are more prone to partaking in crimes.

Along with this, the money should be allocated to incentivizing teachers to underfunded schools along with increasing the entire pay of teachers as a whole. For the majority of the week, students spend 6-8 hours for 12 years with teachers,

making them their role models. Teachers have the power to change someone's life for the better and that should be recognized by paying them (AT THE VERY LEAST) a living wage. With a higher wage, it also ensures better-quality teaching and thus better-quality learning. From this, students are more inclined to go to school-- bettering themselves and their communities and thus lowering crime rates.

Dedicating money to ensure healthier students would increase safety in our city FROM THE ROOT. Currently, eradicating police officers is too radical as our city has grown reliant on it, however, IT SHOULD BE THE GOAL.

In conclusion, this is a great opportunity to better our city. You all are in a position to make incredible change so please, do right by it.

Thank you for reading this and I hope you all have a wonderful day!

Sincerely,
Michelle Huang

From: [karen kirschling](#)
Subject: Reallocate egregious police budget toward solving homelessness and racial injustice
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:08:37 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

Greetings. I am writing as a concerned resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead reallocate those extraordinary resources towards education, social services, dismantling racial injustice, and - especially - toward solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Karen Kirschling
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [Jeanne Crawford](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: 2021 police budget
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:16:38 PM

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

Dear Mayor London Breed, SF Board of Supervisors, and SF Elected Officers:

My name is Jeanne Crawford, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This last month has brought into much sharper focus the unjust deaths of people of color at the hands of the police. I feel this is bound to happen because the police are asked to respond to so many situations that do not require a police response. The police should not be having to deal with homelessness issues, mental health issues, rape issues, bad drug reactions and overdoses, etc., etc.. It is unfair to ask all this of our police. We need to spend some money creating flexible teams of professionals to respond to these calls to 911. It has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests for racial justice and defunding the police continue.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards two things:

1. Money to create a blueprint for an alternative "squad" (could be made up of social workers, psychologists, de-escalation specialists, addiction specialists, rape specialists, etc) who could respond to 911 calls not requiring the response of an armed policeman/woman. (I think there are some models this City could look at for doing this). A deadline would be set for getting this new rapid response "squad" up and running.
2. Solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action.

Sincerely,
Jeanne Crawford

331 Gambier Street, SF 94134

415 334-2530

jeannecrawford@gmail.com

From: [Justin Reyes](#)
Subject: Defund SFPD
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:46:01 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Justin

From: [Carson Baum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Marcy Ellis](#)
Subject: Divest from the SFPD
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:16:42 PM

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

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, specifically the Budget & Finance Committee of Supervisors Sandra Fewer, Shamann Walton, and Rafael Mandelman,

My name is Carson Baum I am a resident of Pac Heights, and I am emailing today to demand a divestation of funds from San Francisco's police department and redistribution towards social services focused on community safety and health. These include: San Francisco Human Services Agency, Adult Protective Services, SF Dept of Emergency Preparedness and Assistance, Medi-Cal, CalWORKS, County Adult Assistance Programs, JobsNOW!, Families Rising, Family and Children's Services, and SF Dept of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, to name a few.

As you are reviewing Mayor London Breed's proposed city budget for the next two years, I know SF's financial outlook has changed drastically as a result of COVID-19 and many social services are up for budget cuts. I also know that the SFPD has a history of fatal police shootings (the murders of Alex Nieto, Amilcar Perez-Lopez, Mario Woods, Luis Gongora Pat, Jessica Williams, the list goes on), and countless reports of officer misconduct and brutality that continue to persist despite efforts by the District Attorney and public defenders to press charges, and despite implementation of additional bias trainings and other reforms from both a local and federal level. These harmful issues persist and something needs to change.

(With funds that are directed to the police department I ask that additional efforts towards ending police violence be made, outlined in Campaign Zero (<https://www.joincampaignzero.org/solutions#solutionsoverview>).)

I am demanding that you remove funds from this institution that violently responds to community concerns and move these vital funds to services that work to de-escalate crime before it has the chance to emerge. These services, initiatives such as affordable housing, youth programs, social worker support, mental health support, and crisis intervention and hotlines, are better equipped to protect our communities both now and long-term than police departments that have a consistent and inexcusable history of violence and excessive force, specifically against communities of color, as we are seeing at a local and national level from police departments around the country. Social services also play a vital role in providing support and resources for marginalized communities during a global pandemic. This divestation is crucial and urgent to ensure the flourishing of all communities and an end to systemic racism and oppression.

Sincerely,
Carson
520-271-7021
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Erica Morales](#)
To: [Erica Morales](#)
Subject: [*** INSERT UNIQUE SUBJECT LINE ***]
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:50:24 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers
My name is [YOUR NAME], and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue. SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police. I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need. We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change. Sincerely, [YOUR NAME] [YOUR ADDRESS] [YOUR EMAIL] [YOUR PHONE NUMBER]

From: [Eliza McGowen](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: A solution to violence in our city, among other things
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 6:53:00 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Eliza, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past month, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,
Eliza McGowen
30 Fair Oaks St
SF, CA 94110
508 560 3180
elizamcgowen@gmail.com

From: [Casey McLewin](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: DEFUND SFPD
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 7:42:44 PM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Casey McLewin, and I am a resident of Menlo Park, California. This past week, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-Blackness, and immediate reform in how Black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our Black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,
Casey McLewin

From: [Isabel Ullmann](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff. \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cityattorney; District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [GabrielaLopez@sfusd.edu](#); [AlisonMCollins](#); [StevonCook](#); [JennyLam@sfusd.edu](#); [FaaauugaMoliga@sfusd.edu](#); [RachelNorton@sfusd.edu](#)
Subject: Defund SFPD and Invest in black and brown communities
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 12:04:08 AM

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

Good afternoon,

My name is Izzy Ullmann and I am an SF Resident.

I am writing to you to demand that you vote to defund and abolish SFPD during the budget process.

Police create and perpetuate harm. They target the most marginalized community members- folks who are BIPOC, trans and gender queer, unhoused folks, folks with disabilities and mental illness. Police destroy communities. They are rooted in slave catching and suppression of labor uprisings. Police instigate, escalate, harm, violate, destruct, decimate and murder. There is no purpose for them in our communities and we must divest from policing and invest in community support and liberation.

Across the city, we have been demanding that y'all defund, disarm, disband and abolish the police. The time is now.

It is an illusion that police respond to crime-- that is less than 5% of SFPD calls. They spend their time being called to harass unhoused people, and deal with traffic issues and noise complaints. Their existence is unnecessary.

The police criminalize San Francisco's black and brown communities, many of whom have called SF home for much longer than many of the gentrifiers the police pretend to protect. Policing harms individuals and it tears communities apart.

As someone supporting undocumented folks through their immigration proceedings, I see how the police destroy our communities. They charge students and youth with racist crimes that have penalties that could get them deported. They terrorize our trans black and latinx communities and imprison survivors of domestic violence for defending themselves.

It is abhorrent to watch as the SFPD budget is INCREASED while we are seeing budget cuts taken to the mental health services in SF schools, cuts taken to the rapid response network which responds to community members' calls to report ICE detentions, a deep lack of support for our unhoused, black, Latinx, and indigenous community members through the COVID pandemic, leading to drastically higher infection and death rates in these communities. This is all interconnected.

Rather than investing in health, housing, legal services, mental health support, education and liberation in black and latinx communities in SF, we are investing in their incarceration. Black folk make up 5% of SF's population but 54% of the jail population. Black and Latinx folks together make up 20% of SF residents but 78% of folks booked or cited for drug sales in 2017. We spend \$4 million dollars on a gang unit that explicitly does NOT police white people but rather exists to track, control and incarcerate black and brown youth.

Why should SFPD get a \$23 million dollar increase AFTER budget cuts when schools are facing 26 million dollars in cuts? For less than half of the SFPD budget (\$320 million), we can house every unhoused person in SF and still have so much money left for healthcare, mental health services, free public transit, education, universal childcare, anti-violence and programs dedicated to serving and uplifting BIPOC, trans and gender queer folks, and immigrants in the city.

Some initial cuts could include:

- police in schools and housing (\$10 M)
- units that target BIPOC (\$28.9 M)
- unnecessary specialized units (\$25.3 M)
- traffic and airport units (\$56.4 M)
- publicly funded PR, Community engagement units (\$1.5 M)
- patrol and investigative units (\$79.3 M)
- personnel, training and capital increases (\$76.1 M)
- make police oversight independent of SFPD (\$8.4 M)

Please see <https://defundsfpdnow.com/> for details and explanations of the scope and reasoning for each cut.

We are demanding public safety for all. We are demanding you defund SFPD and refund our communities.

**With gratitude,
Izzy Ullmann
SF Resident
No New Jail SF
Free SF Coalition**

From: [Dee Michel](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Defund SFPD
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 12:45:42 AM

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

To Mayor Breed, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and San Francisco Elected Officers

My name is Dee Michel, and I am a resident of San Francisco. This past several weeks, our nation has been gripped by protests calling for rapid and meaningful change with regard to police behavior, an end to racism and anti-blackness, and immediate reform in how black people are treated in America. Our city has been at the forefront of much of this action. Accordingly, it has come to my attention that the budget for 2021 is being decided as these protests continue.

SFPD has been a waste of our resources. Last year, the SFPD budget was \$611,701,869, the majority of which comes from the San Francisco general fund. While we've been spending extraordinary amounts on policing, we have not seen improvements to safety, homelessness, mental health, or affordability in our city. Instead, we see wasteful and harmful actions of our police.

I call on you to slash the SFPD budget and instead use those extraordinary resources towards solving homelessness, which is felt most by our black neighbors and veterans. We implore you to give every member of our community experiencing homelessness a place to call home and the treatment they need.

We can be a beacon for other cities to follow if only we have the courage to change.

Sincerely,

Dee Michel

771 San Jose Ave

San Francisco

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 87 letters for File No. 200510
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:40:00 PM
Attachments: [87 letters for File No. 200510.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached 87 letters for File No. 200510.

File No. 200510 - Charter Amendment (Third Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to create the Department of Sanitation and Streets to succeed to specific duties currently performed by the Department of Public Works; to create a Sanitation and Streets Commission to oversee the Department of Sanitation and Streets; to create a Public Works Commission to oversee the Department of Public Works; and to require an annual performance audit and cost and waste analysis for both departments; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; at an election to be held on November 3, 2020.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Soha Abdou](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 11:37:47 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Soha Abdou - سها عبده
Arab Families Program Coordinator
Tenderloin Family Housing - 201 Turk St.
Chinatown Community Development Center
Email : soha.agina@chinatowncdc.org
Direct # : 1-415-745-4576

From: [CHRISTINE CORDARO](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Clean Streets
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:13:37 AM

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

Dear BOS,

I tried dialing in to today's meeting but for an "invalid/not started yet" response. Not surprising.

In reference to this item, Clean Streets/Sanitation Department: this is long overdue. I have lived in a number of cities in the US and California (Wausau & Madison, WI ; Chicago, Raleigh NC, Sacramento, Fresno, San Mateo, and 30 years in SF). NEVER in my life have I seen such filth CITYWIDE! Honestly, the streets of Cairo with 20 million people are cleaner than SF.

And it is not just the homeless who create this mess. It is the residents themselves who seem to have a mindset that it is just fine to throw candy wrappers, pizza boxes and just about anything on the sidewalks and streets. Compounding the problem is the fact that unlike Chicago, there are few receptacles and when they are there they are overflowing with junk. Some of it comes from residents who refuse to pay for garbage service but the rest is from a haphazard collection routine by DPW.

We need a real sanitation service, oversight and a mechanism to ensure public cooperation.

Christine Cordaro

Sent from my iPad to this ite

From: [Jiwoo Song](#)
To: [Breed](#), [Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:40:46 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Jiwoo Song

From: [CHRISTINE CORDARO](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Clean streets
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:05:33 AM

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

San Francisco is by far the filthiest city in the country-bar none! Not only is it a failure of the city and lack of oversight, it is the the mindset of the people-plain and simple!

Sent from my iPad

From: [Simon Luu](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:52:07 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Sincerely,
Simon Luu
Cell: (415) 519-5177
Email: simonluu@usc.edu
Double Concentration in Political Science and Psychology

Related image



From: [Simon Luu](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:52:07 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Sincerely,
Simon Luu
Cell: (415) 519-5177
Email: simonluu@usc.edu
Double Concentration in Political Science and Psychology

Related image



From: [Nikita Saini](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Supervisor Peskin and Mayor Breed We need Clean Streets! San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:55:44 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisor Peskin,

I am a D11 Constituent and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

As your constituent Supervisor Peskin, I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

Best,
Nikita

From: [Cindy Changar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Yes to a Dept of Streets and Sanitation
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:31:19 AM

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

Vote to put a Department of Streets and Sanitation on the ballot! We deserve to live in clean neighborhoods. The Bayview is a dumping ground and it's residents deserve a healthy and safe place to live.

Thank you, Cindy Changar

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Saad, Nabil](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:48:55 AM

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

Hello!

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to become dirtier, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Best Wishes,

Nabil Saad

Davidson '21, Poli-Sci Major

Presidential Scholar

Sp '18 AFA

From: [Strang, Carlyn](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:57:44 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Agree, Ava](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:19:31 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Ava Agree
JD Candidate, May 2021
UC Hastings, College of the Law
ava.agree@uchastings.edu
(973) 479-5819

From: [Krea Gomez](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:28:39 PM

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

Greetings Mayor Breed and Board of Supervisors

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the conditions of our streets and to create a much needed oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. A fact that both astounds me and that makes so much sense considering the condition our city has been in.

With us on the beginning of a statewide second wave of COVID-19 and increasing concerns about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is necessary now more than ever and is just plain good old common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

--

In Community,

Krea Gomez, Education Director
Pronouns: she/her/they/them
Cell: 510-953-8358



The Young Women's Freedom Center
832 Folsom Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94107
Office: 415-703-8800

From: [Lucero Herrera](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:33:52 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Lucero Herrera

--

In Community Salute,

Lucero Herrera

[She/Her/Hers](#)

Self - Determination Coordinator, for Youth Detention & Reentry

Young Women Freedom Center

832 Folsom Street Suite 700, San Francisco 94107

(510) 755-9321 Work Phone

**"THERE WILL BE MANY CHAPTERS IN YOUR LIFE, DON'T GET LOST
IN THE ONE YOU'RE IN NOW"**

From: [Janice Madriaga](#)
To: [Breed](#), [Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:40:02 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Janice Madriaga

From: [Maverick Ruiz](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:44:28 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

From: [Maverick Ruiz](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:46:41 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

From: [Anne De Ocampo](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:48:48 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Anne De Ocampo

From: [Vivvy Forevermore](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Department of Sanitation and Streets
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:49:35 PM

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

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

From: **Vivvy Forevermore** <dragalivestud@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 7, 2020 at 3:19 PM
Subject: Department of Sanitation and Streets
To: <Board.of.supervsiors@sfgov.org>

Hello,

I'm a resident of SF and have lived in the Tenderloin area for 8 years. It is **CRUCIAL** that a Department of Sanitation and Streets is created. I am a working artist who has managed to somehow stay in the city I love, despite the housing crisis. Yet everyday I am stepping over or in Human Feces, Animal Feces, used needles, and gutters full of trash and biowaste.

Please address this by creating a Department of Sanitation and Streets to address what is actually a public health issue.

Thank you,

Mica Sigourney

From: [Eri Oura](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:49:35 PM

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

Hello Mayor Breed and SF Board of Supervisors,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
eri

--

eri oura

pronouns: they/them

Executive Assistant to Jessica Nowlan
[Young Women's Freedom Center](#)
c. 510.650.8189
o. 510.808.5340

*"Injustice anywhere is a threat
to justice everywhere."
- Martin Luther King Jr.*



From: [Lordgin Savella](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:53:20 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Lordgin Savella

From: [Lordgin Savella](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:53:35 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Lordgin Savella

From: [sabrina b](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: SF Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 4:53:18 PM

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

Hello,

As a SOMA resident and SFUSD teacher I've been extremely concerned about the safety and sanitation of our city for many years now. COVID-19 has exacerbated the need for our tax dollars to be spent in ways that are visible and beneficial to the everyday people who have to navigate the city streets with their head down to avoid stepping on human feces, urine and/or needles. My concern is not only for the people who have to walk through this grime daily, I am also concerned for those who have no choice but to defecate in public spaces. We need real solutions and tangible change now!

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

In Community,

Sabrina Belara

From: [Jasmine Johnson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Cleaner Streets
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 4:56:56 PM

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

Hello-

I am writing today to ask that one more supervisor vote in favor of getting a ballot measure on the November ballots in regards to a Street and Sanitation Dept. The amount of money being asked for is very small compared to the size of the total budget but will make an enormous difference in the cleanliness of our streets. I live and work in several neighborhoods that would benefit from a dedicated department to keep the streets cleaner.

I hope 6 supervisors will step up and vote in favor of putting it on the ballot so the residents of this city can vote on it in November.

Thank you

Jasmine Johnson

From: [hadi razzaq](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 5:10:20 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Hadi Razzaq

From: [Julia Arroyo](#)
To: [krea](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 6:18:04 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

In Community,

Julia Arroyo
pronouns: she/ her

San Francisco Site Director
Program Director
Young Women's Freedom Center
o:415-703-8800 ext.203
c:415-618-9124
youngwomenfree.org

From: [Angelica Mendez](#)
To: [krea](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 6:18:54 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you, Angelica Mendez

From: [Marshal Lawler](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 7:34:54 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Marshal Lawler and I am a resident of San Francisco.

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Marshal Lawler

From: [Brady Penn](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Clean Streets
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 7:38:28 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a Constituent in North Beach and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Liam McLaughlin](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 7:52:31 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Outer Sunset (District 4) and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Liam

--

Liam McLaughlin
(703) 623-2673

From: [Max Friend](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:04:34 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am an SF born and raised constituent of the Inner Sunset and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

Max Friend

From: [Matt Friend](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Department of Sanitation Amendment Support
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:10:05 PM

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

Mayor Breed and Board of Supervisors,

I presently live in the Nopa neighborhood, and have lived in the Bay Area for most of my life. I am writing because I have been informed there is discussion to form a Department of Sanitation and Streets in San Francisco, and was surprised to hear that this department did not exist.

I support the exploration of and potential creation of this department, as I believe the state of our streets is currently not only negatively affecting the lives of residents such as myself, but the economic future of our city (such as certain conferences pulling out of San Francisco due to the look and smell of our city).

I hope that your offices commit the time and resources to both performing due diligence, and if appropriate, forming this new department, so that our city can reflect on the outside the beauty I know our residents hold on the inside.

Matt Friend

From: [Sarah O'Connell](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Board of Supervisors & Mayor Breed - We Need Clean Streets!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:16:11 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I live in St. Francis Wood with my family and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially right now, during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get dirtier, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. Why are unpaid, often homeless, volunteers doing more to clean up our streets than city employees? We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Herman Holland](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides; Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors; Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisor Fewer and Mayor Breed we need Clean Streets! San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 8:47:25 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisor Fewer,

I am a D1 Constituent and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

As your constituent Supervisor Fewer, I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Herman Holland

From: [Rosa Serpas](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisor Fewer and Mayor Breed we need Clean Streets! San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:01:20 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisor Fewer,

I am a D1 Constituent and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

As your constituent Supervisor Fewer, I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Rosa Serpas

From: [Kimberly Lutes-Koths](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SUPERVISOR MANDELMAN AND MAYOR BREED: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:46:12 PM

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

Supervisor Mandelman,

My name is Kimberly Lutes Koths and my family and I have resided in D8 for nearly 8 years. My husband and I voted for you because at the time we believed that you shared our same progressive values, We have been disappointed by the way you have voted on key issues, and hope that you will not let us down yet again on something as important as clean streets for our neighborhood and oversight to prevent corruption in city departments.

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Kimberly Lutes-Koths
D8 Resident

From: [Joy Zhan](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:58:58 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of Visitacion Valley and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

Joy Zhan 詹綽盈
415-200-6536
joyzhan@gmail.com

From: [Corey Farris](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisor Safai and Mayor Breed We need Clean Streets!San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:06:27 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisor Safai,

I am a D11 Constituent and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

I have made no less than 20 separate submissions on the 311 app related to trash on the streets and sidewalks in my neighborhood, all within the past two months. Because of the trash I see on a daily basis, I believe that the Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

As your constituent Supervisor Safai, I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Corey Farris

--

"Everybody is a genius. But if you judge a fish by its ability to climb a tree, it will live its whole life believing that it is stupid."

From: [Julia Lubar](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We Need Clean Streets!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:18:40 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of **Presidio Heights** and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get dirtier, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Julia

From: [Julia Lubar](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We Need Clean Streets!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:18:40 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of **Presidio Heights** and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get dirtier, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Julia

From: [Anne Yamamoto](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:04:35 AM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the excelsior and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you

Anne Yamamoto

From: [Daniel Weiner](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments in SF
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:18:58 AM

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

Hello Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

Having worked in District 6 and lived around for a number of years, I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that addresses the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the few major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans as well as those who travel in and out of the city.

It makes absolutely no sense all districts receive equal resources if D6 has the most daily traffic by foot and car in the city.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment or you will lose my vote come next election

Thank you,

Dan Weiner

From: [katri](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:21:20 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

From: [Cindy Kreeck](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:25:01 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

--

Cindy Kreeck (pronouns: she/her)
University of California, Berkeley | Class of 2020
B.A. Psychology
B.A. Spanish: Hispanic Languages, Linguistics, and Bilingualism
cindykreeck@berkeley.edu | (626) 384-1011



From: [Celine Bellegarda](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:35:01 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Celine Bellegarda

From: [Katherine Kirk](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:47:22 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Katherine Kirk

From: [Mandera Silvestro](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:49:03 AM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of Visitation Valley and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Mandera Silvestro](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:50:44 AM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of Visitation Valley and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [britney.pirr](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: We Need These Changes to DPW
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 11:51:47 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors & Mayor Breed,

I am an SF resident and concerned constituent writing in support of Supervisor Matt Haney's charter amendment to establish a Department of Sanitation & Streets, along with an oversight commission for DPW.

I strongly urge all the Supervisors to jump on board with this charter amendment as it works in the best interest of SF residents. Right now we are concerned-- more than ever-- with our dirty streets (due to COVID-19) and the DPW scandal. This proposal will bring accountability to DPW and aim to make our streets safe and clean! I was stunned to find out that San Francisco is one of the only major cities without a Department of Sanitation, yet I guess I should have known that considering how dirty our streets are. We need this charter amendment now & if it is not passed, a lot of your constituents will be disappointed.

Thank you,

Britney

From: [Paloma Concordia](#)
To: ayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org; [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 12:18:35 PM

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

Hello Mayor Breed and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you, Paloma Concordia

--

Paloma B. Concordia, Founder
paloma@papalodown.com
[415-992-1428](tel:415-992-1428)

PapaLoDown Agency
#PRforthePeople
Arts | Culture | Community

www.papalodown.com

Want to know what we're up to these days?! check out the [Lo Down](#).

From: [jordan amann](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SF Needs a Department of Sanitation & Streets - and Oversight Over Departments Now!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 1:21:56 PM

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

Dear all,

Thank you so much for your tireless effort during this pandemic. Your leadership is inspiring and I am so proud to be a resident of San Francisco! I am writing today about a different matter, in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

I was really surprised to learn that San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during this scary time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. I believe that it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. I fully support the work the new department would be doing - making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use. I am consistently disappointed at the state of our streets and the hazardous waste and materials often strewn onto the sidewalks for days. It concerns me that these unsanitary conditions create greater risk for our most vulnerable communities to contract and spread diseases.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. I am a proud constituent of his, and I believe his work is truly leading the way for the changes our city desperately needs.

Kindest regards,

Jordan Amann
San Francisco Resident, District 6

From: [Nick Tong](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MVR\)](#); [BOS Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 1:28:47 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Nicholas Tong

From: [Emily Wang](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 1:31:11 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Emily Wang

From: [Jesse Ante](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Support the need for San Francisco Department of Sanitation & Streets and Oversight Departments
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 1:51:07 PM

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

Hello Mayor London Breed,

My name is Jesse Ante I am a Cal Alumni engineer and worked in San Francisco for 40 years 27 with PG&E and 13 with California Public Utilities Commission. I love this city and enjoyed all the time I have spent my professional career, however over the years I have seen the income inequality of the tech boom fuel the rise of homelessness and moral corruption has also leaked onto our dirty streets. When I travel the world, I tell people where I work in the city and the first thing they say is "San Francisco it's is on my Bucket list of favorite cities to visit". Right now it's still a beautiful and desired city but relatives who recently visited are affected by the homelessness and dirty streets.

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight.

The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use. The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change **now!**

Thank you,

Jesse Ante
Retired Engineer
jesse.ante@gmail.com
510 409-9115

Sent from my iPad

From: [Keren Park](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:37:11 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Keren Park

--

Class of 2021

From: [Desi Danganan](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:39:43 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Desi Danganan
Executive Director

415-215-4689
desi@kultivatelabs.org

Book an appointment:
<https://desi.as.me/>

From: [Jackie Prager](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:05:27 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of Noe Valley and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Jackie Prager

From: [Talia J Panadero](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:22:59 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Talia

Talia Panadero
University of California, Berkeley | Class of 2021
Public Health B.A., Anthropology Minor
talia.panadero@berkeley.edu | [bcal](#)

From: [Mei Zhong](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:24:22 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of Sunset District and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Shayan Shirkhodai](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:31:39 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Best,

Shayan Shirkhodai
UC Berkeley Class of 2021
B.A. Political Science

From: [Delali Dzikunu](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:31:55 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Bayview-Hunterspoint neighborhood of San Francisco and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Delali Dzikunu

From: [Liza Reyes](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:36:19 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of **Mission District** and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Micah Mangot](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:42:18 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Mission District and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Caitlin McCoy](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Department of Sanitation
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:46:49 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Sunset and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now! Our people need us.

Thank you.

From: [Jessica Montes](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:50:31 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Jessica Montes

From: [Lola Cleaveland](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); bos-legislative_aids@sfgov.org
Subject: Tomorrow's Vote Regarding the DPW
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:52:32 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

I would like to voice my support for the amendment proposed by Supervisors haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar which would create oversight commissions for the DPW and create a Department of Sanitation and Streets. I am a constituent of District 9, and I believe it is imperative that splitting the Department of Public works will help fight corruption in our city and finally put our resources towards creating a clean and livable city for all residents. I urge anyone reading this email to vote in favor of this measure tomorrow.

Best,
Lola Cleaveland
District 9 Resident

From: [Stephanie Lee](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SF Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:33:19 PM

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

Hello,

Today I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Best,
Stephanie

From: [Stephanie Lee](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: SF Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:33:57 PM

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

Good afternoon,

Today I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Best,
Stephanie

From: [Vanessa Hon Chin](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MTR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SF Needs a Department of Sanitation, don't let tourists be disappointed by our amazing city because our streets are a mess!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 4:53:30 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get dirtier, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Vanessa, a born and raised San Franciscan that is tired of seeing our streets covered in filth.

From: [Gabriella Allaf](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:15:57 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Gabriella Allaf

--

Gabriella Allaf
Undergraduate Fellow | Berkeley Law

From: [Angie Chu](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 6:35:20 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Crocker-Amazon neighborhood and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Emilia Lubet](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 6:36:37 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of **Potrero Hill** and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.
Emi Lubet

Sent from my iPhone

From: ate.shari
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 6:50:08 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Shari

From: [Samantha Arrizon](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 6:57:11 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Samantha Arrizon

From: [Frida C](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 7:06:23 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of SOMA and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Henry S](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 7:36:09 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

--

Henry Stiepleman

From: [LL JILLY](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 7:51:32 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Excelsior and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

This message was sent from a high school student using a Gmail account at San Francisco Unified School District. The content of the email should be related to education in support of 21st Century learning. If you have any questions regarding this message, please email

gafe@t.sfusd.edu and include "Student email" in the subject line.

From: [Alexandra Nobida](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 8:10:14 PM

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

Hello,

I, Alexandra Nobida, am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the current state of our streets and would create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

I believe that the Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Alexandra Nobida

From: [Anders Gotcher](#)
To: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org; [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 8:45:29 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Tenderloin and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

Anders Gotcher

From: [Zoe Kapsack](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:19:51 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of **Parkmerced** and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

Zoë Kapsack

From: [John Foster Cartwright](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: PLEASE !! San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:38:55 PM

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

Hello,

At the wonderful information sharing I received from my dear colleague, Honey Mahogany, I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

John Foster Cartwright

From: [Andrea Aruino](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:54:16 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of Bayview District and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

From: [Olivia Onek](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Supervisors and Mayor Breed - We need Clean Streets!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 10:13:14 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

My name is Olivia and I am a constituent of Bernal Heights. I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you.

Olivia

From: [marie berry](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: We need CLEAN STREETS!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 10:13:30 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I am a constituent of the Castro and I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation.

Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense. It is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

I am hoping that you will take the bold action that is needed now to make a change for our neighborhood. Please add yourself as a co-sponsor to truly make a change and to show your constituents that you care.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Marie Berry

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Suzanne Scelzi](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 10:37:48 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Suzi Scelzi

From: [Jonas Logan](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Sanitation Department
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 5:30:36 AM

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

To whom it may concern,

The idea of a Department of Sanitation, providing oversight as to our efforts to keep our neighborhoods clean and safe is something I can support. The current state of San Francisco's streets is poor at best. This is not due to the lack of effort by any of the cities various departments or agencies but instead reliant upon a cross department / agency coordination they may not exist. Why not make one point person / persons responsible?

This used to be called the greatest city in the world? We need a tune-up.

Pete De Martini

SF Resident 63 years

From: [Jonas, Logan](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 5:32:25 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets. San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Logan Jonas
Resident of the Tenderloin

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 11:56:00 AM

From: Mahogany, Honey (BOS) <honey.mahogany@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!

For the record.

Honey Mahogany, MSW

Pronouns: she/her or they/them

Legislative Aide

Supervisor Matt Haney

From: Maria Davis <saintmaryspub@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2020 8:56 AM
To: BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Maria Davis

Owner- St. Marys Pub

Co- Owner- The Stud

Co- Owner- Three Sisters Products

From: [Lola Lewdovico](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:36:04 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Corey Fusco
Noe Valley Resident

From: [Eric Garcia](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:41:19 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Eric Garcia, a long-time SF resident and Bay Area native.

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,
Eric

--

Eric Garcia

Co-Director, **detour dance** | **Tiny Dance Film Festival**
detourdance.com

From: [Alyssa Daulat](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 3:12:42 PM

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

Greetings to you and the following,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America without a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get dirtier, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you and hoping for your support!

Best,

Alyssa Daulat
Concerned San Francisco Resident

From: [Fernando Serrano](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 3:18:51 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment, which would finally address the current state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Given the context of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making, reinforced by real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Fernando Serrano

From: [Maryam R](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Department of Sanitation and Streets and Oversight Over Departments!
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 3:32:01 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed, Supervisors and Aides,

Recently I visited the Tenderloin to march with many activists for the Courthouse to Compton's rally for Black Trans Lives. As you know, many trans people of color still live in the Tenderloin. I witnessed first hand how our city is failing the people who live downtown and in the 'loin- the garbage on the streets was heartbreaking.

I am writing in support of Supervisors Haney, Ronen, Walton, Preston, and Mar's Charter Amendment that would finally address the state of our streets and to create oversight commissions for the Department of Public Works and the new Department of Sanitation and Streets.

San Francisco is one of the only major cities in America *without* a Department of Sanitation. Especially during the time of COVID-19 and heightened fears about the spread of infectious disease, creating a new Department of Sanitation and Streets is common sense: it is a solution to keep our city clean with data-driven decision making and real accountability and oversight. The new department will be dedicated to making sure our streets and sidewalks are cleaned, that we have trash cans for litter, and that we have public bathrooms available for people to use.

The Department of Sanitation and Streets will make a huge impact on our streets and the quality of life for all San Franciscans. While our streets continue to get more dirty, the current department tasked with street cleaning has been full of fraud and corruption. We need oversight and we need it now.

Please support Supervisor Haney's charter amendment. Our city needs this change now!

Thank you,

Maryam Rostami
817-980-9577

From: [Lucas Chin](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); Alow@perkinscoie.com
Subject: Portsmouth Square 2020 Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:07:44 PM

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

June 25, 2020

San Francisco Board of a Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisor to include Portsmouth Square as part of the 2020 Health and Recovery Bond. Portsmouth Square is a valuable asset to the community and provides a place for seniors to hang out and interact with others. There hasnt been lots of development regarding portsmouth square so I think it would benefit from the 2020 health and Recovery Bond.

Thank you for your time
Lucas Chin

From: [Kelly Ma](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); Alow@perkinscoie.com
Subject: Portsmouth Square 2020 Health and Recovery Bond.
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:11:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisor to include Portsmouth Square as part of the 2020 Health and Recovery Bond. As a recent immigrant and a Chinatown resident, Portsmouth Square is definitely a significant place for all the residents here since it's an amazing open space for people to interact with each other especially when lots of seniors are living in SROs. Renovating the park can encourage more residents to use and enjoy their time at the park, while giving the community more space and a safer platform for socializing. I strongly encourage you to include Portsmouth in the bond and bring a better space for the Chinatown residents.

Best,
Kelly Ma

From: [Lillian Tang](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); alow@perkinscoie.com
Subject: Portsmouth Square 2020 Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:14:17 PM

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

June 25, 2020

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

Dear Supervisors, I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisors to include Portsmouth Square as part of the 2020 Health and Recovery Bond.

Portsmouth Square is a space for many of the SRO residents to stretch, interact, and socialize. A lot of seniors go there everyday to get fresh air and talk with other people. Portsmouth Square is an essential space in San Francisco's Chinatown. A renovation for this park is long overdue. It deserves to be included in the list of renovations.

From: [Roy Yu](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); Alow@perkinscoie.com
Subject: Portsmouth Square 2020 Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:18:52 PM

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

San Francisco Board of a Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisor to include Portsmouth Square as part of the 2020 Health and Recovery Bond.

Portsmouth Square is a huge part of San Francisco Chinatown. I really enjoy going to this park and it has a huge impact on others living in Chinatown as well. Portsmouth Square has been known to have issues and I feel like it's important to include the park since it's essential to Chinatown.

-Roy Yu

From: [Brandon Stites](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); Alow@perkinscoie.com
Subject: Portsmouth Square Board 2020 Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:22:25 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Brandon Stites. I am a rising senior at Lowell High School and I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisor to include Portsmouth Square as part of the 2020 Health and Recovery Bond.

It is imperative that Portsmouth Square is added because it needs to actively be maintained for the hundreds of Chinatown residents that go there everyday.

Chinatown is a neighborhood that lacks open space. Because of this, I expect all the open space available in Chinatown to have adequate funding so it can be properly utilized by the people you built it for. There are so many simple things you can do to improve the park for the demographic that uses it most, senior citizens and children. You can easily renovate the play structure or add exercise machines for the seniors.

Like the Japantown Peace Plaza is the center of that community, Portsmouth is the center of Chinatown. I urge you to rethink your decision. You can even contact me if you need any help or ideas.

Sincerely,
Brandon Stites

From: [Shirley Tsang](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); Alow@perkinscoie.com
Subject: 2020 Health and Recovery Bond re: Portsmouth Square
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 3:18:30 PM

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

June 26, 2020

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of Chinatown Alleyway Tours (CATs) to urge the Board of Supervisor to include Portsmouth Square as part of the 2020 Health and Recovery Bond.

Portsmouth Square is an essential open space area for its users who are mainly Chinatown residents. Many of the elderly residents live in Single Room Occupancies (SROs), which are 8 by 10 feet sized rooms that act as their bedrooms, and therefore Portsmouth Square becomes their living room where they spend time with their friends and family.

Portsmouth Square is also very important to us, Chinatown Alleyway Tours (CATs), since this is our meeting point for our tour groups and also the starting location of our tours. Besides CATs, other tour groups also bring large groups of tourists into this park, and therefore Portsmouth Square is always filled with people.

Portsmouth Square, being the largest open area in Chinatown, serves as a community hub for the residents. Frequently, this park is utilized for big community events and large gatherings, making it vital for its users. Portsmouth Square is a significant landmark of Chinatown that should not be overlooked.

Sincerely,
Chinatown Alleyway Tours

From: [Peter Ross](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Item # 10 - Declaring Support for the Restoration of the Aquatic Park Pier
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:26:22 PM

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 – My name is Peter Ross and I reside at 1919 Baker Street. As I am not able to phone in for today’s meeting, I would like to provide my strong written support for this item and urge the Board to adopt it. I have been a resident of San Francisco for 39 years, am a lifetime member of the South End Rowing Club as well as its Past President, and am a Director of the citizen’s coalition known as Aquatic Park & Pier Project (formerly known as “Save Aquatic Park”). While Aquatic Park has enriched my life and the lives of my fellow Bay swimmers over the past many years, never has its importance been so great as since the advent of Covid-19. The Park has drawn users from all over the City and has provided an amazing opportunity to build community in a socially responsible way at a time when it has been most needed. The Pier’s state of dilapidation threatens the historical, cultural and recreational benefits it provides to all San Franciscans. Without direct intervention, the Pier will not survive the next generation – and, without the Pier, the entire Aquatic Park area will be jeopardized. I commend and thank Supervisors Stefani and Peskin for championing Aquatic Park Pier Project and urge the entire Board to join them. We have a great opportunity not only to preserve this precious resource but to invigorate the entire area.

Sincerely,

Peter Ross

Peter J. Ross
Principal
Ross Financial
1736 Stockton Street, Suite One
San Francisco, CA 94133
(T) 415-912-5612
(F) 415-912-5611
(C) 415-505-4331
rossfinancial@smkc.com

This email communication (including any attachments) may contain legally privileged and confidential information intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you should immediately stop reading this message and delete it from your system. Any unauthorized reading, distribution, copying or other use of this communication (or its attachments) is strictly prohibited.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 300 letters for File No. 200638
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:56:00 PM
Attachments: [300 letters for File No. 200638.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached 300 letters for File No. 200638.

File No. 200638 - Emergency ordinance to establish cleaning and disease prevention standards in tourist hotels and large commercial office buildings to help contain COVID-19; to require training related to these standards for employees on paid time and to provide certain protections to employees as they perform cleaning duties; to prohibit retaliation against employees for refusing to perform work under conditions they believe may be unsafe or for reporting such conditions or exercising rights protected by the ordinance; and providing for administrative enforcement by the Department of Public Health and financial penalties as authorized by state law.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Fuentes, Gerry](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:40:50 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

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

Hello. My name is Gerry Fuentes and I worked as the General Manager at Courtyard San Francisco Union Square. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently open. We operate at a loss but open nonetheless. I want to feel safe in my work environment and our associates also want to feel safe. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards and the increase in costs will only make it more difficult to stay open and keep our associates employed. Most of my co-workers are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of our jobs in hospitality but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping other associates unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly make it impossible for our doors to remain open for much longer. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Yours in hospitality,

GERRY FUENTES
GENERAL MANAGER
O 415.346.3800

COURTYARD San Francisco/Union Square

761 Post St
San Francisco, CA 94109
courtyard.com



   courtyard.com

From: [Vandesteeg, Janice](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:42:19 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, affecting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Janice Vande Steeg
Vice President of Operations
Aimbridge Hospitality



From: [Xiao Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:51:15 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Xiao Wong
dencow85@gmail.com
3731 Irving Street
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Zhilian Huang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:55:58 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Zhilian Huang
elainehuangch@gmail.com
333 Harrison st #442
San Francisco , California 94105

From: [Perdomo, Santiago](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please help
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:06:55 PM

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

Hello. My name is Santiago Perdomo and I worked as Assistant Director of Welcome Office at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Hunter, Wendy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SF Emergency Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:14:09 PM

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

Hello. My name is Wendy Hunter and I worked as Director, HR at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

WENDY HUNTER


DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES / W SAN FRANCISCO

181 Third Street / San Francisco, CA 94103

T 415-817-7861 E / wendy.hunter@whotelsworldwide.com

EXPLORE WHAT'S NEW / NEXT AT W HOTELS WORLDWIDE

WHOTELS.COM / facebook.com/wsanfrancisco / twitter.com/wsanfrancisco / Instagram [@wsanfrancisco](#) & [@tracewsf](#)



From: [william Leiva](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:02:19 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

william Leiva
williamleiva@yahoo.com
2121 whitman way #8
San Bruno, California 94066

From: [Stephen Krespel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:02:27 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,
Steve Krespel

Stephen Krespel
stevemoth@yahoo.com
2382 Post St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Gustavo Hernandez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:02:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Gustavo Hernandez
gustavo.dark677@gmail.com
97 , Morton Dr
Daly City, California 94015

From: [Sanjuana Rodriguez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:02:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Sanjuana Rodriguez
rsanjuana844@gmail.com
2565 Clinton ave
Richmond, California Ca

From: [Omar Bahena](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:10:40 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Omar Bahena

Omar Bahena
osirisde7958@gmail.com
107 Lexington Ct
Vacaville , California 95687

From: [Morena Beltrán](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:34:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Morena Beltrán
morenabeltran99@yahoo.com
1637 51st ave
Oakland , California 94601

From: [Morena Beltrán](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:35:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Morena Beltrán
morenabeltran99@yahoo.com
1637 51st ave
Oakland , California 94601

From: [Marnie Lopez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 2:02:18 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Marnie Lopez
marnzlopez@yahoo.com
109 Woy CT
Pinole california, California 94564

From: [Fisch, Jonathan \(HGS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Initiative
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 2:43:31 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image008.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

All the best,

Jonathan Fisch

Owner Relations & Revenue Manager

Fairmont Heritage Place, Ghirardelli Square

900 N. Point, Suite D100

San Francisco, California 94109

jonathan.fisch@fairmont.com

Tel 415-268-5707

Fax 415-268-9903

www.fairmont.com/ghirardelli

Fairmont

HERITAGE PLACE



This communication is the property of AccorHotels and contains confidential information intended only for the persons to whom it is addressed. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify us by return e-mail and destroy the original message and all copies.

From: [Rhys O'Connell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 3:31:49 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Rhys O'Connell
Director of Operations
Hotel Zephyr

From: [Amy Cacho](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 3:33:48 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors, As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Warm Regards –

Amy Cacho
Area Director of Sales & Marketing


FISHERMAN'S WHARF


A NOBLE HOUSE HOTEL

495 Jefferson St, San Francisco, CA 94109

415-846-6373

acacho@noblehousehotels.com

From: [E.S. Zuercher](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 3:53:49 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Erica S. Zuercher

840 Post St. Apt 404
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: [Mendi Gunadi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 3:58:18 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Mendi



Mendi Gunadi
Director of Finance
250 Beach Street, San Francisco, CA 94133
D: 415-617-6512
Mendi.Gunadi@HotelZephyrSF.com
www.hotelzephyrsf.com



From: calijakelevy@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:16:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

calijakelevy@gmail.com
1214 Polk street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Mark Wood](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:33:20 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mark Wood
markzo1229@yahoo.com
833 Jones st
San Francisco , California 94109

From: [Sylvia Gardner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:38:54 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Gardner
sylgardner@aol.com
5497 mountain ridge way
Antioch, California 94531

From: [Somchai Pramprasert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:49:05 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Somchai Pramprasert
pramprasert@gmail.com
535 taylor street apt 406
Sf, California 94102

From: [Mark Manis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:55:41 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely

Mark Manis | Director of Sales & Marketing

HILTON SAN DIEGO GASLAMP QUARTER

t: 1+ 619 231 4040 | o: 1+ 619 702 8263
401 K Street | San Diego CA 92101 | USA

hilton.com | facebook.com/hiltongaslampquarter   



Hilton CleanStay with Lysol protection is setting a new standard for hotel cleanliness and disinfection.

Learn more by visiting: <http://www.hilton.com/cleanstay>

From: [Jim Kaye](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fisch, Jonathan \(HGS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy building ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:57:37 PM

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

We are owners of a deeded fractional share apartment at Fairmont Ghirardelli. As such our visits usually span several days for which we do not normally have daily cleaning and bed linen changes. When there we are the only ones using the apartment. To require daily cleaning and linen changes during our stays is, I believe, unnecessary and expensive. Cleaning and linen replacement prior to and at the end of a stay should suffice. We as owners, not the operators, would have to carry this added cost with little or no benefit. Please amend this provision.

Sincerely,

Jim Kaye
916-765-3446

From: [Maria A Flores](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 6:12:30 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Maria A Flores
marflores16@gmail.com
18634 Times Ave
San Lorenzo, California 94580

From: [Miao Juan liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 6:56:42 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Miao Juan liu
emilymiao896@gmail.com
325 capistrano avenue
San francisco, California 94112

From: [Gil Murillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 8:30:26 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Gil Murillo

Gil Murillo

Executive Vice President and Chief Investment Officer | Watermark Lodging Trust, Inc.
150 North Riverside Plaza, Suite 4200, Chicago, IL 60606
p: (847) 482-8600 | d: (847) 810-1951 | murillo@watermarklodging.com
www.watermarklodging.com



Effective April 13, 2020 Carey Watermark Investors 1 Inc. and Carey Watermark Investors 2 Inc. merged to

create Watermark Lodging Trust, Inc. Please use the new contact information and email address noted above. Thank you.

From: [Kenta](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: **URGENT** Healthy Building Ordinance!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 8:48:38 PM
Attachments: [Healthy Bulding Ordinance Letter.pdf](#)

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

Greetings,

Please see my attached letter in regards to the upcoming Healthy Building Ordinance.
VOTE NO!

Kenta Kamohara
Holiday Inn Express & Suites – Napa Valley
5001 Main Street American Canyon, CA 94503
P: (707) 552-8100 F: (707) 552-3107 D: (707) 552-8100 x4

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.


With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,



Kenta Kamohara | General Manager
Holiday Inn Express & Suites Napa Valley
5001 Main Street
American Canyon, CA94503

From: [Yanling Chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 9:04:51 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Yanling Chen
dish_ish_isabel@yahoo.com
1374 39th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Yann Taylor](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy buildings ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 9:06:43 PM

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

The Healthy Building Ordinance seems like overreach - covid unlikely to be spread through surface contact. I believe the board should focus resources on making sure folks wear masks and wash their hands regularly.

Thank you

Yann Taylor, San Francisco Resident.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Aida Rodriguez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 9:20:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Aida Rodriguez
cmartinez94608@gmail.com
1024 47th St Apt 3
Emeryville , California 94608

From: [Olson, Aaron](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 5:42:15 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier managing several hotels in California including a large hotel in San Francisco, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. **I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!**

Sincerely,

Aaron Olson
Senior Vice President, Hotel Operations
Crestline Hotels & Resorts
3950 University Drive Suite 301
Fairfax, VA 22030
P: 571-529-6364

This communication and any attachment to this communication may contain proprietary or confidential information or information that is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from

disclosure. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From: [Don Dennis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 6:14:50 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier with two hotels in San Francisco, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Don Dennis
President, Operations



600 6th Street S, Kirkland, WA 98033

(O) 425-636-5675

(C) 206-793-7999

ddennis@noblehousehotels.com



From: [Nita Bernardo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 8:38:08 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely, Nita Bernardo

Nita Bernardo
nitaber@tahoo.com
455 Eastmoor avenue #115
Daly City Ca , California 94025

From: [Oscar Vergara](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 8:46:25 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Oscar Vergara
segga76@yahoo.com
402 Palisade Drive
Oakland, California 94607

From: [Rahul prabhakar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 9:03:11 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Rahul prabhakar
rahul.prabh1@gmail.com
888 Ofarrell street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: [Miruts Kassa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 9:20:56 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Miruts Kassa
jk3007@yahoo.com
1795 O'Farrell Street Apartment number 305
San Francisco, San Francisco Apartment number 305 94115

From: [Chris Manley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:04:13 AM
Attachments: [image794001.png](#)
[image809002.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force more hotels to close or remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Closed hotels also deprive millions of visitors the opportunity to come see and experience the great city of San Francisco.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I plead that you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!



Chris Manley
Chief Operating Officer

www.sbcos.com

cmanley@sbcos.com

direct 303-785-3121
cell 720-841-6200

From: [Shane Thompson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:06:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Shane Thompson

Shane Thompson
shane.thompson746@gmail.com
55 poncetta drive apt 210
Daly city, California 94015

From: [Resty Eusantos](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:14:19 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Resty Eusantos
ytser1780@yahoo.com
178 Santa Barbara Avenue
Daly City, California 94014

From: [Jose Perez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:14:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Jose Perez
perez7191@gmail.com
461 commercial ave
South San Francisco, California 94080

From: [Joseph Bojanowski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:16:24 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Regards,

JOSEPH BOJANOWSKI

President

PM HOTEL GROUP

5425 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 700, Chevy Chase, MD 20815

T: 202.787.3308

pmhotelgroup.com

FOLLOW US!



From: [Ruihui Chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:29:21 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Ruihui Chen
Chenruihui88@gmail.com
2690 22nd Avenue
San Francisco , California 94116

From: [Zunker, Steve](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:41:32 AM

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

This message was sent securely using Zix®

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotel owner in California, I need to express my opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. This is not hyperbole, it is the plain and simple truth. The ripple effect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

Having worked in nearly every position in the hotel business, I've seen the steady creep of government fees and regulation stifle, and in some cases, completely strangle the business I've grown up in. If there is simply an assumption at the government level that businesses will adjust, I can assure you that the ability to adjust any further is greatly diminished, if not gone. Hotels, restaurants and other hospitality businesses survive on extremely thin margins and are on the verge of financial ruin across the country. Lenders who take back lodging properties will face the same headwinds the previous owners have and may elect to remain closed, never reopening in some cases. These ordinances are not simply one thing these businesses have to absorb, they are one MORE thing in a long list of headwinds. This will be the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Steve Zunker

ASHFORD

Steve Zunker
Senior Vice President of Asset Management
14185 Dallas Parkway, Suite 1100
Dallas, TX 75254
Cell: 571-527-6479
Fax: 972-499-0041

Direct Line: [972-778-9523](tel:972-778-9523)

Email Address: szunker@ashfordinc.com

NOTICE: This email contains confidential information solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not said recipient your use, disclosure or other distribution of any information included herewith is STRICTLY PROHIBITED, and you are instructed to notify the sender immediately and delete this email, all copies and attachments.

This message was secured by [Zix](#)[®].

From: [Paul Finstad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Vote No - Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:46:33 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Paul

Paul V. Finstad

Vice President, Investments | Watermark Lodging Trust, Inc.
150 North Riverside Plaza, Suite 4200, Chicago, IL 60606
p: (847) 482-8600 | d: (847) 810-1955 | finstad@watermarklodging.com
www.watermarklodging.com



Effective April 13, 2020 Carey Watermark Investors 1 Inc. and Carey Watermark Investors 2 Inc. merged to create Watermark Lodging Trust, Inc. Please use the new contact information and email address noted above. Thank you.

From: [José Martinez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:55:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

José Martinez
jlmartinez8284@gmail.com
149 school st #3
Daly City , California 94014

From: [Carlos Urcina](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 12:40:01 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Carlos Urcina
carlosurcina@hotmail.com
640 Turk st
San Francisco , California 94102

From: [Ran Tian](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 8:26:56 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Ran Tian
tianran7022@gmail.com
82 delta st
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Rosa Rauda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:40:49 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Rosa Rauda
Rrauda68@gmail.com
11 15th ST
Richmond, California 94801

From: [beatriz itusaca](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:48:18 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

beatriz itusaca
beacure@hotmail.com
574 3rd
San francisco, California 94107

From: [Patricia ORourke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 12:07:02 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Patricia ORourke
ssgtorourke@gmail.com
4755 Mesquite Springs Road
Twentynine Palms, California 92277

From: [Brad Busby](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Emblem Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 9:23:41 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Hotel Emblem's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

If Health and Safety is truly the goal of the council, the ordinance simply defies logic.

Let's assume the room is COVID-19 free prior to a Guests arrival. The proponents of this ordinance claim that this will make Guests safer from COVID-19 while staying at a hotel. If the room is clean prior to arrival, and only the Guests enters the room, then the only way COVID can be introduced to the room is through the Guests themselves. If the Guest is the one introducing the virus, then they already have been exposed to it, and no amount of cleaning after the fact can change this. It is pretty straightforward, the Guest is not safer by cleaning rooms while they are occupying them.

Let's say the ordinance does pass, and we start cleaning occupied rooms. We have already established that the Guest does not become safer by having our teams enter the room. However, if a Guest already has COVID-19, we are now potentially exposing our Colleagues to the virus by making them enter the rooms. From a safety perspective, all this ordinance does is put my team in greater danger. Those are the simple facts.

Please tell me how this council will respond when one of my team contracts COVID-19 because, in order to have a job, and earn a living, they were forced to clean an infected persons room? Because if you pass this ordinance, you will be responsible for those consequences.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Regards

Brad Busby | General Manager
HOTEL EMBLEM SAN FRANCISCO
T 310 908 8535
E brad.busby@viceroymotelgroup.com
562 Sutter Street

San Francisco, CA 94102

#RememberToLive | Follow us [@HotelEmblem](#)



[Vote for Viceroy](#) in the 2020 Travel + Leisure World's Best Awards for a chance to win one of five international travel prizes!

From: [Lilian Calderón](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 10:23:10 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Lilian Calderón
chelita.calderon07@gmail.com
2621 Ritchie st
Oakland, California 94605

From: [Steven Kirkish](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance up for vote
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 11:01:34 AM

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

Hello Board of Supervisors. My name is Steven Kirkish and I worked as Front Desk Supervisor at Hotel Vitale on 8th and Mission Street. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. With the extra \$600 unemployment stimulus payments ending in July, I certainly wont be able to afford expensive San Francisco rent come September and need to work. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Steven Kirkish

From: [Volkart, Jacqueline](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Kevin Carroll](#); [Kelly Powers](#); [Kimball, Jon](#); [Chen, Gena](#); [Chou, Spencer](#); [Gordon, James](#); [Hofilena, Henry](#); [O'Neill, Kevin \(SFOXR\)](#); [Taccioli, Lesley](#); [Volkart, Jacqueline](#); [Weber, Stephen](#); [Wells, Felicity](#)
Subject: The St. Regis San Francisco - Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 11:15:43 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express **The St. Regis San Francisco's** strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines. Our company, Marriott International has followed strict cleaning guidelines for over 93 years, and has strengthened them even further to ensure our employees and guests experience a safe environment.

Personally, I have worked for over three decades with Marriott International. I am very proud of what we do to apply our fundamental philosophy of **“putting people first”**. *As Mr. Marriot says, if we take care of our people, they will take care of our guests and they will then return over and over again.*

Supervisors, what you are trying to do is putting our industry at risk, my hosts (employees) love to come to work, are proud to work at The St. Regis San Francisco and know that their environment will be safe when they return. One of the most beautiful industries is hospitality, moving forward with the Ordinance you are proposing will destroy the livelihood of so many dedicated hospitality professional.

Please reconsider seriously, the future is bright, we need you to trust our companies that we are doing the right thing to protect our most valuable asset, our employees.



Warm regards & [Live Exquisite](#)
Jackie

Jacqueline Volkart, MBA, CMA, CMP
General Manager

The St. Regis San Francisco
125 Third Street San Francisco, California 94103
t. +1 415 284 4050 | m. +1-415-748-7014
stregissanfrancisco.com



MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL
LUXURY BRANDS

We will travel again.

From: [Mark Beevor](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Zetta Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 11:48:54 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Hotel Zetta's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

Sup Peskin, this is **not** about money, this is about getting real people back to work. Each day I come to work, I am laser focused on doing what I need to do to create business that will drive jobs. In the last few months we have brought back four room attendants and this week a houseman. We just increased the number of days our Dir of IT is working and we are talking about bringing back a sales manager. This is all really meaningful and your legislating will be ruin this progress . It is soul destroying.

It has taken a lot for my team, especially housekeepers to come back to work despite what they hear on the news but they came because we are following and are trained in CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines such as **not** going into stayover rooms and leaving rooms vacant for 24-72hr after checkout. If this ordinance passes we will need to tell our team that we are obligated to go against these guidelines because the Board of Supervisors are defying logic and science. How is this going to inspire our employees to come back to work? It is clearly illogical that hotels and offices need to follow these rules but government owned buildings do not. Why the risk of infection is less in the government buildings than hotels I don't know.

I am grappling to understand what I am missing here and how through this ordinance you are selflessly looking after your constituents. Hoteliers are in the business of maintaining the highest standards and have done so for years. We have protocol already in place that is based in objective science. You need to take this issue **off your plate** and **refocus on cleaning issues that you are responsible for, the streets.**

Again, I ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Sincerely,

Mark.

Mark Beevor | General Manager

HOTEL ZETTA SAN FRANCISCO

D 415 321 5132 **M** 307 690 5666 **F** 415 543 5885

E mark.beevor@viceroyhotelgroup.com

55 5th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103



#RememberToLive | Follow us [@HotelZetta](#)

<p>HOTEL zetta SAN FRANCISCO</p>	A photograph of a man and a woman embracing in a hotel room. The man is wearing a light blue shirt and has his arm around the woman's shoulder. The woman is leaning her head on his shoulder.	<p>BEST RATE ANYWHERE HERE ONLINE</p> <p>BOOK NOW</p>
---	--	--

From: [Annette Alvarado](#)
To: mayorlondonbreed@sf.org; [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Health Business Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 12:55:11 PM

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

Hello.

My name is Annette Alvarado and I worked as a Front Office Manager at The Mark Hopkins. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you!

Annette Alvarado

From: [Annette Alvarado](#)
To: mayorlondonbreed@sf.org; [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 12:55:24 PM

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

Hello.

My name is Annette Alvarado and I worked as a Housekeeping Manager at The Sir Francis Drake. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you!

Annette Alvarado

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Wade Sooy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 1:22:15 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Wade Sooy
sooyboy@gmail.com
398 Euclid ave
Oakland, California 94610

From: [Tyre Walston](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy building ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 1:24:38 PM

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

please do not pass this bill!

From: [Simon, Carol](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Fisherman's Wharf Marriott Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 1:37:48 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express San Francisco Fisherman's Wharf Marriott strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

If this ordinance passes, the hotels in the City and Wharf area may very well not reopen. The area will continue to look desolate and very unappealing to visitors and locals as well. There is no way financially some hotels will be able to regroup and afford this.

It is bad enough that many hotels, just with the threat of this are now not planning on opening at the earliest in the fall. How devastating to the labor market as well as the San Francisco economy. Thousands of people will lose their job.....this is the reality!

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Carol Simon
Task Force General Manager
San Francisco Fisherman's Wharf Marriott
<http://www.crestlinehotels.com/>

This communication and any attachment to this communication may contain proprietary or confidential information or information that is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From: [Marie J Nazaire](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 1:53:07 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Marie J Nazaire
mariejnazaire509@gmail.com
3365 Cesar Chavez #34
San Francisco CA, California 94110

From: [Celia Ghanem](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:15:04 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

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

Hello. My name is Celia Ghanem and I worked as Area Director of Finance at Argonaut Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Celia Ghanem
Area Director of Finance

Hotel Zoe
FISHERMAN'S WHARF

ARGONAUT
A NOBLE HOUSE HOTEL

495 Jefferson St, San Francisco, CA 94109

(O)415-345-5501 (F)415-345-5535

cghanem@noblehousehotels.com



From: [Amal Abbara](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco hotel Reopening Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:24:50 PM

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

Hello. My name is Amal Abbara- Tannous and I worked as [Job Title] Spa Supervisor at [Hotel Name] Vitale. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Paula Gruendl](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Cleaning and Prevention Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:35:40 PM
Attachments: [Hotel Council.docx](#)

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

Please see my email attached!

I feel very safe with the standards that my hotel company has put forth in order for myself and my colleagues to return to work.

It is vitally important for us to return to work as soon as possible! We are facing more financial ruin with the elimination of the CARE Act at the end of July and this will put more hotel employees in financial distress and even some will be without homes and food.

Please reconsider this decision!

Many thanks,
Paula Gruendl

July 3, 2020

Hello. My name is Paula Gruendl and I worked as an Area Sales Manager at the Argonaut Hotel and Hotel Zoe in Fisherman's Wharf. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,

Paula Gruendl

July 3, 2020

Hello. My name is Paula Gruendl and I worked as an Area Sales Manager at the Argonaut Hotel and Hotel Zoe in Fisherman's Wharf. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,

Paula Gruendl

From: [Anna Li](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:37:34 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Anna Li
annalfy804@gmail.com
229 Haight street
San Francisco , California 94102

From: [Teri Serrano](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance.
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:57:14 PM
Attachments: [image005.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

TERI SERRANO

Area Director of People Services and Culture
Hotel Spero | 405 Taylor Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Direct: 415-351-7640 | Fax: 415-351-7654
Cell: 310-384-6283 | Email: TSerrano@HotelSpero.com

The Marker | 501 Geary Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Direct: 415-351-7640 | Fax: 415-351-7654
Cell: 310-384-6283 | Email: TSerrano@TheMarkerSF.com



From: [Todd Metzger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Tourism - Healthy Building Ordinance Opposition
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 3:08:50 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Todd Metzger and I'm the Area General Manager for OLS Hotels and oversee the Harbor Court specifically in San Francisco. As a hotelier of 22 years and constituent in San Francisco, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. I had 148 employees in February of 2020, I'm now have 17 left and my out of work teams are still struggling to make ends meet.

The ripple affect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. The shortsightedness of this ordinance to also only target the hotel industry is absurd and irresponsible. It takes a village to run a hotel. Including vendors in all areas of expertise that will be badly damaged by the continue closures of hotels. Landscapers and florist, linen companies, food suppliers, contract maintenance, advertising and marketing companies, restaurant teams, insurance companies...etc.

Further, at the root of this poorly drafted ordinance, this legislation contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. Social distancing is the only real piece of science we've understand globally works to slow the spread.

We must recognize reality, and the reality is travel (Especially to major metropolitan areas) will be a slow road to recovery as visitors become more comfortable and feel safe. Convention business will be nonexistent in the near future, business travel has already announce they will not travel in 2020, and our industry is left with leisure travel and local drive markets. This inevitably affects average daily rates and occupancy. Our industry depends on occupancy to have employees service rooms. This ordinance will not attract more travel as it could be viewed as dangerous to the guest and will only add expenses, causing hotels to stay closed. We need to do right by our teams and visitors by keeping them social distanced, as the protocols so many hoteliers have implemented already.

My company has spent thousands of dollars, creating barriers, adding enhanced cleaning tools that eliminate touch points (ie. electrostatic sprayers) and creating plans to keep guest and employee safe. We are dedicated to making travel safe and spacing/ time between guest and staff interactions is a proven method to deterring the spread of the Covid-19 virus according to the CDC, WHO, AHLA, and CHLA.

This pandemic has hurt us all. The solution moving forward can best be accomplished by working together and building trust between our teams, business owners, operators, customers/ patrons and elected officials. Our elected officials can best help us by highlighting the hotels strategies and dedication to running clean, safe operations. Help us promote travel to SF, don't deter it; so we can put our people back to work safely.

I strongly oppose the Healthy Buildings Ordinance and hope you will too.

Sincerely,

Todd Metzger, Area General Manager
Harbor Court Hotel * Hideaway & Getaway Hotels * Hotel Winters
Phone: 305-304-6978 | Direct Line: 415-537-7573
tmetzger@olshotels.com



www.harborcourthotel.com hideawaycarmel.com thegetawaycarmel.com
www.hotelwinters.com



Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail & any documents

From: [Vicente Ponce](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Tourism
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 3:09:37 PM

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

Hello.

My name is Vicente Ponce and I worked as Hotel Engineer at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Vicente Ponce

From: [Jodi Lopez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Viceroy Hotel Group - Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 3:16:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Viceroy Hotel Group's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

If this ordinance were to pass it would put our employees at further risk of exposure to coronavirus by forcing them to enter and clean guest rooms every day, going against CDC guidelines. In addition, the standards proposed would force two of our existing hotels in San Francisco to remain closed for the foreseeable future, while forcing our third to shut down. This would cause an additional loss of jobs that have recently been reinstated and delay further the return to work of dozens of employees. Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Kind regards,

Jodi Lopez | Area Director Human Resources

HOTEL ZELOS | HOTEL ZEPPELIN | HOTEL ZETTA

M 415 850 4403 **F** [866 873 2673](tel:8668732673)

E jodi.lopez@viceroyhotelgroup.com



From: [Jaygo g](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please hear us.
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 3:51:04 PM

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

Hello. My name is Jossie Go and I worked as a reservations coordinator at Hotel Zoe and Argonaut Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as Federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel are people of color.

Federal and state officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strips beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,
Jossie Go

--

Best Regards,
Jossie

From: [Cui Juan Zheng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 3:55:48 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Cui Juan Zheng
tinajh98@yahoo.com
9 scotia ave
San Francisco, California 94124

From: [Jeff Guy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SF Cleaning Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 4:20:15 PM

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

Hello. My name is Jeff Guy and I work as the Director of Sales at Kimpton Sir Francis Drake. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Orlando Rodriguez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 4:24:01 PM

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

Hello!

My name is Orlando Rodriguez and I worked as a Houseman at Hotel Zoe. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance.

My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Orlando Rodriguez

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Khaled Uckahun](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Ordinance opposition
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 4:29:24 PM

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

Hello.

My name is Khaled Uckahun and I worked as In room dining server at the Francis Drake hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Khaled Uckahun.

From: service@sfgreescapes.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 4:32:06 PM

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

Greenscapes Professional Plantscape Services

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Dennis Welch and I am the President of Greenscapes Professional Plant Service.

As a partner and vendor of many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future fringes on the ability to re-open hotels. As I recently learned of the new Healthy Buildings Ordinance and the unrealistic business expenses that will keep hotels shuttered, I became very concerned that our partners in the hotel industry will be able to open. **I write in strong opposition** to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The affect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Dennis Welch, President
Greenscapes Professional Plant Service
Service@sfgreescapes.com

From: [Claudette Quinsay](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Zetta Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 4:39:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Hotel Zetta's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

Sup Peskin, this is **not** about money, this is about getting real people back to work. Each day I come to work, I am laser focused on doing what I need to do to create business that will drive jobs. In the last few months we have brought back four room attendants and this week a houseman. We just increased the number of days our Dir of IT is working and we are talking about bringing back a sales manager. This is all really meaningful and your legislation will be ruining this progress . It is soul destroying.

It has taken a lot for my team, especially housekeepers to come back to work despite what they hear on the news but they came because we are following and are trained in CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines such as **not** going into stayover rooms and leaving rooms vacant for 24-72hr after checkout. If this ordinance passes we will need to tell our team that we are obligated to go against these guidelines because the Board of Supervisors are defying logic and science. How is this going to inspire our employees to come back to work? It is clearly illogical that hotels and offices need to follow these rules but government owned buildings do not. Why the risk of infection is less in the government buildings than hotels I don't know.

I am grappling to understand what I am missing here and how through this ordinance you are selflessly looking after your constituents. Hoteliers are in the business of maintaining the highest standards and have done so for years. We have protocol already in place that is based in objective science. You need to take this issue **off your plate** and **refocus on cleaning issues that you are responsible for, the streets.**

Again, I ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Sincerely,

Claudette

Claudette Quinsay | Senior Accountant

Hotel Zetta San Francisco

T 415 321 5131 **F** 415 543 5885

E claudette.quinsay@viceroyhotelgroup.com

55 Fifth Street

San Francisco, CA 94103

#RememberToLive | Follow us [@HotelZetta](https://www.instagram.com/HotelZetta)



[Vote for Viceroy](#) in the 2020 Travel + Leisure World's Best Awards for a chance to win one of five international travel prizes!

From: [Josey Ray Blanche](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Attention
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 4:44:30 PM

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

Hello. My name is Josey Blanche and I live in San Francisco and worked as a server at Scalas Bistro/Sir Francis Drake Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Additionally, if this ordinance is not rectified and I am not allowed to return to work, I may never get to go back and will not be able to find another job that treats me well and pays me as well. It will upend my life and jeopardize my future and I will hold this measure, and all who support it solely responsible. I know you have an obligation to protect public health, but you also have an obligation to protect jobs and industries.

Thank you for your time,

Josey Blanche

From: [Mark Murphy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: DO NOT PASS THE HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE!!!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:11:03 PM

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

Good Afternoon Mayor Breed and SF Board of Supervisors. The company I work for Owns 11 Hotels in San Francisco and hundreds, if not thousands of us adamantly disagree with the San Francisco Supervisors who are are trying to pass a Healthy building ordinance that will affect us negatively (hotels in San Francisco). We would really appreciate it if you could join us and oppose to this ordinance, and know that we are NOT happy about this ordinance even being proposed. I am reaching out to you to strongly oppose this unnecessary ordinance. It is scheduled to be approved on 7/7 and this cannot happen, if you are truly listening to the people. Your time is very much appreciated.

Thank you so VERY MUCH. Turning down this ordinance means a lot to the people of San Francisco.

Have a great rest of your day. Happy Fourth of July Holiday Weekend!!! God Bless America.

Best Regards, Mark

Mark S. Murphy
Director of Sales & Marketing
Villa Florence Hotel San Francisco
225 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-617-1063 (work)
781-254-3558 (cell)
mmurphy@villaflorence.com (Email)
www.villaflorence.com (Hotel Website)

From: [Lyndsay Hope Pullem](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); mayorlondonbreed@sfgov
Subject: Please don't pass this hotel restriction
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:17:00 PM

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

As a Chef and hotel worker, if you pass this SF Healthy Building ordinance requiring hotels to do these impossible tasks, you'll be subjecting many of us to permanent job loss. It's unfeasible and unfair. Please don't pass it. You're dooming the industry to fail and putting many of us on the street. Thank you.

Lyndsay H. Pullem
(415)728-1557
cheflyndsay@outlook.com

From: [RAUL RIVERA](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:22:00 PM

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

Hello. My name is cherry rivera and I worked as house keeper/house man at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Marsha Cogle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:34:29 PM

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

Good Day,

My name is Marsha Cogle Augustine and I worked as Director of Catering at the Argonaut Hotel in Fisherman's Wharf. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you

Marsha Cogle Augustine

From: [Jenny Patterson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance Opposition
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:34:46 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Jenny Patterson and I am the Director of Contracting and USA Business Development with Grupo Hotusa. As a partners and vendors of many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future, also fringe on the ability to re-open hotels. As I recently learned of the new Heathy Buildings Ordinance and the unrealistic business expenses that will keep hotels shuttered, I became very concerned that our partners in the hotel industry will be able to open. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,



Jenny Patterson
Director of Contracting – USA market
jenny@grupohotusa.com

P. (702) 210-9841
www.hotusa.com

From: [Bruce Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Hotel
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 5:39:37 PM

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

Hello. My name is Bruce Young and I worked as [server] at [Sir Francis Drake]. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards. Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Adriaan Vanderzwan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy building ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 6:00:54 PM

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

Good day. I am a hotel worker and have been for 42 years. I have been laid off since March 19 as well as all of my coworkers.

It is my understanding that if the board passes the new healthy building ordinance on Tuesday 7/7 it will affect my employer negatively. In fact we may all lose our jobs as the owners/investors and management may pull out of San Francisco entirely and sell for what they can. Please consider this ordinance carefully to avoid unnecessary restrictions and loss of business. Thank you.

From: [Denki Kaminari](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 6:02:24 PM

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

Hello. My name is MiaoQing Zhang and I worked as housekeeper at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

MiaoQing Zhang

From: [Leocadio Casilla](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Reopening Hotel Adagio to Return to Work
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 6:18:57 PM

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

July 3, 2020

To The Board of Supervisors & Mayor London Breed,

My name is Leocadio Casilla and I worked as a Houseman at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Leocadio Casilla

From: roger@iccsfbay.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org
Subject: proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 6:39:00 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

I have been operating businesses in the Fisherman's Wharf for over 40 years and the hotels in the City of San Francisco are extremely important to our success, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Roger S Kaufman
President
Alcatraz Enterprises, Inc.
2390 Powell Street, Suite A
San Francisco, CA 94133
Cell 415-308-5943
Fax 415-249-4682

From: [Declan 098](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please help open hotels in SF sooner rather than later...
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 6:44:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Lauraine Edir. I am a single mom that lives in the Sunset with two boys that attend Presidio Middle School. I worked as a Private Dining Manager at the Sir Francis Drake Hotel in Union Square. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I cannot afford to live in SF and pay my current rent on Unemployment Benefits. There are very few hospitality jobs in SF right now and it seems it will be this way for awhile. What am I to do? Where can I find a job that supports me and my family? I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

There are many people that are depending on you to make the right decision so we can **GET BACK TO WORK.**

Thank you for listening,

Lauraine Edir

From: [HUAN HONG DENG](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Tourism
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 6:52:26 PM

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

Hello. My name is Hui Huang and I worked as Housekeeper at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Hui Huang

From: [Oliver D.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 7:00:40 PM

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

Hello. My name is Oliver Daguro and I worked as Night Auditor/Supervisor at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction.

However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family.

These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Oliver Daguro

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Ben](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SF Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 7:06:46 PM

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

Hello.

My name is Benjamin Lau and I worked as a Front Office Supervisor at Hotel Zelos. I live in the Sunset in San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,
Benjamin Lau
25 Year Resident of the Sunset District and immigrant from Hong Kong

From: [Lonnie Shotwell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: lonnie26@pacbell.net
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance Regulations
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 7:10:44 PM

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

Greetings. My name is Lonnie Shotwell and I worked as Night Auditor at Hotel Adagio until the end of March 2020. I have been employed in the Hospitality Industry for over 30 years and enjoy my job.

I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance coming before the Board this week. I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards. Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotel workers, but minority groups especially. More than 80% of employees in the hotel industry are minorities. Federal and State health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors are increasing our exposure to the potentially infected guest by mandating we enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

I am the sole person financially supporting my family and need to return to work. The stimulus funds are due to expire at the end of July, and I cannot survive without this additional income. This means I need to move out of state or become homeless or go upon Welfare.

Please reconsider the damage this ordinance will do to the SF Hotel Industry.

From: [Arlene Samonte](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: The New Healthy Building Ordinance hurts hotel workers
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 7:15:51 PM

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

To Board of Supervisors/San Francisco:

Hello. My name is Arlene G. Samonte and I worked as Sales/Admin Assistant at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Your prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Arlene Samonte
Unemployed due to COVID-19
Hotel Adagio/SF

From: [Elias Moreno](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I'm ready to back to work
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 7:21:20 PM

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

e email:

Hello. My name is Elias and I worked as cook at argonaut hotel I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance.

My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction.

However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family.

These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

From: [Gregory August](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 7:53:09 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Gregory August
gaugust@mail.sfsu.edu
1135 Ellis st a211
Sf, California 94109

From: [Bernardo Dimarucut](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 8:00:20 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Bernardo Dimarucut
bernardodimarucut33@gmail.com
170 Lisbon
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Pierre Bee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Pierre Bee](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 8:07:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Pierre Bee and I am the local Hotel Textile Consultant, with Standard Textile.

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Pierre Bee
Northern California Textile Consultant

Jeanette Wiley
Inside Sales Textile Support – jwiley@standardtextile.com

STANDARD TEXTILE

One Knollcrest Dr. | Cincinnati, Ohio 45237 | standardtextile.com
415-637-9504

STANDARD
TEXTILE est. 1940

celebrating 80 years

From: [Dennis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please helping all of us get back to our jobs
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 8:33:54 PM
Attachments: [Hyatt letter to SF supervisors & Mayor 7-3-2020.docx](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors and Mayor London Breed

Hello. My name is [Dennis Fung] and I worked as [Banquet Bartender and Server] at [Hyatt Centric Fisherman's Wharf]. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. I want my hotel to continue to stay open and call me back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you for helping all of us get back to our jobs, welcoming guests back to San Francisco and reuniting our family once again.

Sincerely,

Dennis Fung

July 3rd 2020

Hyatt Centric SF

Dear San Francisco Supervisors and Mayor London Breed

Hello. My name is [Dennis Fung] and I worked as [Banquet Bartender and Server] at [Hyatt Centric Fisherman's Wharf]. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. I want my hotel to continue to stay open and call me back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you for helping all of us get back to our jobs, welcoming guests back to San Francisco and reuniting our family once again.

Sincerely,

Dennis Fung
Hyatt Centric SF

July 3rd 2020

From: [Susana Coronado](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Stefan Muhle](#)
Subject: Hotel Zoe Fisherman's Wharf
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 9:10:26 PM

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

Hello. My name is [GLADYS HERNANDEZ] and I worked as [HOUSE-KEEPING] at [HOTEL ZOE SF]. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance.

My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation

that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family.
These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.
Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jenny Ayala](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 10:04:42 PM

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

Hello. My name is Jenny Ayala and I worked as Kitchen steward at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

From: [Andrew Cuison](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Zelos 12 4th St. SF, CA 94103
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 10:16:07 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Andrew Cuison and I worked as Director of Engineering at Hotel Zelos. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Andrew Cuison | Director Of Engineering

HOTEL ZELOS SAN FRANCISCO | DIRTY HABIT

T 415 344 3310

E andrew.cuison@viceroyhotelgroup.com

12 Fourth Street

San Francisco, CA 94103



#RememberToLive | Follow us [@HotelZelos](#)



The advertisement banner is divided into three sections. On the left, the Hotel Zelos logo features a large number '1' followed by the text 'hotelzelos' and 'SAN FRANCISCO' below it. The middle section is a photograph of a man and a woman sitting on a bed, smiling and talking on their phones, with a tray of food and drinks in front of them. On the right, the text reads 'NEW ENERGY, NEW ATTITUDE' and 'NEW ROOMS' in all caps. Below this text is a black rectangular button with the white text 'BOOK NOW'.

[Vote for Viceroy](#) in the 2020 Travel + Leisure World's Best Awards for a chance to win one of five international travel prizes!

From: [Jenny Ayala](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Adagio
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 10:44:45 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

Hello. My name is Jenny Ayala and I worked as a Kitchen Steward at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards. Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotel workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Best regards,
Jenny Ayala

From: [Erick Ramirez Arce](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 12:08:45 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Erick Ramirez Arce
erickramirezarce@yahoo.com
5001 Fray Ave
Richmond, California 94804

From: [Kevin Carroll](#)
To: [Volkart, Jacqueline](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Kelly Powers](#); [Kimball, Jon](#); [Chen, Gena](#); [Chou, Spencer](#); [Gordon, James](#); [Hofilena, Henry](#); [O'Neill, Kevin \(SFOXR\)](#); [Taccioli, Lesley](#); [Weber, Stephen](#); [Wells, Felicity](#)
Subject: Re: The St. Regis San Francisco - Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 8:14:07 AM

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

Thank you so much Jackie

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 3, 2020, at 11:15 AM, Volkart, Jacqueline
<Jacqueline.Volkart@stregis.com> wrote:

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express **The St. Regis San Francisco's** strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines. Our company, Marriott International has followed strict cleaning guidelines for over 93 years, and has strengthened them even further to ensure our employees and guests experience a safe environment.

Personally, I have worked for over three decades with Marriott International. I am very proud of what we do to apply our fundamental philosophy of **“putting people first”**.

As Mr. Marriot says, if we take care of our people, they will take care of our guests and they will then return over and over again.

Supervisors, what you are trying to do is putting our industry at risk, my hosts (employees) love to come to work, are proud to work at The St. Regis San Francisco and know that their environment will be safe when they return. One of the most beautiful industries is hospitality, moving forward with the Ordinance you are proposing will destroy the livelihood of so many dedicated hospitality professional.

Please reconsider seriously, the future is bright, we need you to trust our

companies that we are doing the right thing to protect our most valuable asset,
our employees.

<image001.jpg>

Warm regards & Live Exquisite

Jackie

Jacqueline Volkart, MBA, CMA, CMP

General Manager

The St. Regis San Francisco

125 Third Street San Francisco, California 94103

t. +1 415 284 4050 | m. +1-415-748-7014

stregissanfrancisco.com

<image004.jpg>

From: smartiny@strategicbeveragesolutions.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Hotel Cleaning Regulations
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 8:59:36 AM

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

To whom it may concern,

Your proposed cleaning regulations for the hotel industry should not be approved. This is a ridiculous standard to impose and one you are not even imposing on all businesses??

Scott

Scott Martiny
CEO Strategic Beverage Solutions

From: [Laura Campi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please do not pass the HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 10:11:09 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

My name is Laura Campi and I am a fifth generation San Franciscan who is extremely passionate about our city.

I attended San Francisco State University and received a bachelor of science in hospitality management In 2010. I began working at Omni San Francisco Hotel in April 2010 as a front desk associate and over the years worked my way up to Senior Sales Manager.

In late March I was furloughed, along with my entire team (aka my family) and have been counting down the days until I can return to work. This time has been extremely difficult for all of us as we have been forced to live off unemployment, lost healthcare benefits and most importantly we miss each other. Personally, I only feel fulfilled when I am helping others and making people happy, something that I was able to do every day at work.

Omni Hotels & Resorts has adopted safety and cleaning standards that meet or exceed the guidelines set by the CDC and AHLA. For more information on these standards please see our website: <https://www.omnihotels.com/-/media/files/omni-safe-and-clean-standards>

I understand that the new Healthy Building Ordinance would NOT apply to government buildings. Why would you require cleaning standards for hotels and other offices that you do not feel is needed in your own space?

I agree that new safety and cleaning standards do need to be created as a result of Covid-19, however you should work WITH the San Francisco Hotel Council on creating these rules. I understand that the current ordinance was created only with the local unions, which should take part in the conversation; however they only have their best interest in mind (aka more money for themselves), not the interest of keeping guests safe.

I am incredibly concerned that if you pass this ordinance many hotels will never be able to reopen and large groups of furloughed employees will be laid off due to the unnecessary added labor and other costs to the hotels. Locals, like myself, will be forced to move out of the city because we can no longer find employment or pay rent.

Los Angeles and San Diego Hotels have already been able to reopen. Please consider reworking the ordinance with the Hotel Council, so we can get on track to reopen San Francisco to our much needed visitors.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Happy Independence Day!

Sincerely,
Laura Campi

From: [Alex Jung](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kapoulis, Michael \(SFOFW-F\)](#); gracia.shi@hyatt.com; [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: I need your help with a call to action!
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 10:14:39 AM

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

取得 [iOS 版 Outlook](#)

Hello. My name is [Alex Jung] and I worked as [Lobby porter] at [Hyatt Centric Hotel]. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. I want my hotel to continue to stay open and call me back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

-

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

-

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

-

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Ana Coreas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 10:27:10 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Ana Coreas
acoreas2003@gmail.com
629 spruce ave
South San Francisco , California 94080

From: [Michael Kapoulis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Save our jobs
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 10:43:40 AM

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

Hello. My name is Michael Kapoulis and I work as General Manager at Hyatt Centric Fishermans Wharf. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. I want my hotel to continue to stay open and call me back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Michael Kapoulis

From: [Padam Malasi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel openings and cleanliness
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 11:15:44 AM

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

Warm greetings everyone.

My name is padam singh malasi and i worked as a room service server at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction.

However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thanking you all in advance for the support and consideration in this critical situation.

Regards

Padam malasi
Sf
5103094724.

From: [Vicky He](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Tourism
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 12:04:49 PM
Importance: High

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

My name is Vicky He and I am the Accounting Manager with Harbor Court Hotel. As a partners and vendors of many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future, also fringe on the ability to re-open hotels. As I recently learned of the new Heathy Buildings Ordinance and the unrealistic business expenses that will keep hotels shuttered, I became very concerned that our partners in the hotel industry will be able to open. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The affect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Vicky He | Accounting Manager
D. 415.537.7581 | M. 415.882.1300 | E. vicky.he@harborcourthotel.com
165 Steuart Street San Francisco CA 94105



GET INTO BED WITH US



www.harborcourthotel.com

P Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail & any documents

From: [Dev oli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Opening and cleanliness of hotels
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 12:06:14 PM

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

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

From: **Padam Malasi** <padammalasi@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, Jul 4, 2020 at 12:04 PM
Subject: Opening and cleanliness of hotels
To: bashanti1979@gmail.com <bashanti1979@gmail.com>

Hello. My name is Devram Oli and I worked as server at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thanking you for supporting us.

Regards

devram oli
San Francisco

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Sandra Jimenez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 2:11:07 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Sandra Jimenez
ssofiajimenez788@gmail.com
283 mar vista rd
Bay point, California 94565

From: [John Kelly Saligo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to EHotel Zetta Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File # 200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 2:39:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express *John Kelly Saligo* strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

As a graveyard houseperson we need to keep our hotel in safety and keeping cleanliness for our guest satisfaction. Due to Covid 19 our work are affected by cutting three days every pay check, working 7 days in two weeks. Hotel Zetta still keeping to continue to business for saving employee for being jobless inspite our hotel are negative in earnings for this business. We are blessed for having this company and we are thankful for having a company owners with good heart and to have hardworking GM in our group. To our part is to protect and follow our leads for the safety for everyone. Thank you!

John Kelly Saligo

Graveyard Houseperson at Hotel Zetta

From: clarencandiaz@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Business Ordinance Fact Sheet THE NEW HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE HURTS HOTEL WORKERS
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 2:52:05 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter to beg and hope not to pass this bill. I am a hotel worker since i migrate to USA since 2012. I found and put my passion and life in hotel industry same with my other fellow employees. I understand the pandemic and we are putting all the efforts to keep our hotel safe and clean not only for our guest but also for employees and family. Thousands of people are loosing the job and future not only for the employee but also for the family and children that we are feeding and to provide for their school.

Please help us back to work and fight with the pandemic together and not left us behind.

Thank you so much in advance and please stay safe.

Clarence Diaz

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Eduardo Ponce](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Save San Francisco Tourism
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 3:20:38 PM

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

Hello. My name is Eduardo Ponce and I worked as Houseman at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Eduardo Ponce

On Friday, July 3, 2020, 12:11:24 PM PDT, Errol Reyes <ereyes@olshotels.com> wrote:

Hello Harbor Court Family,

We hope that you and your family are safe and doing well.

Please note that this is VOLUNTARY but we thought that we send this to you as well so you are aware.

We are sharing some important information about our future as a hotel family. The COVID-19 pandemic has closed our hotel for more than three months. We have worked hard to be prepared to reopen and re-start the careers you have worked equally hard to have.

Through the Hotel Council of San Francisco, we have worked closely with the guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention, Governor Newsom, the California Department of Public Health and San Francisco's public health office to develop safety standards that exceed any other industry, short of hospitals. We are following our own brand/owner guidelines closely to ensure your safety. They include:

- Customized plans for employee safety trainings
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning directions that keep employees and guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees when they return to work on enhanced cleaning protocols

We're prepared, we're safe and we want to reopen. We want you to return to work.

Unfortunately, we face roadblocks from the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and union leaders who have created re-opening standards that prevent you from returning to work, delay guests from returning to our hotel and, frankly, risk our future in San Francisco. Their ordinance would result in much higher costs from mandated continuous cleaning for areas which have been determined to be unnecessary as determined by the CDC such as walls, windows, drapes, floors, etc. Their cleaning protocols are regardless of need, and mandate daily room cleaning. We would need to achieve much higher occupancy levels to have a viable operation. To cover these costs, we would have to generate 30 to 40 more points of occupancy. And we all know there is virtually no demand currently.

At our hotel, these are how this ordinance would affect us:

1. It completely defies the logic of keeping our front line employees safe and social distanced. For example, having a room attendant enter stayover rooms every day increases your exposure to Covid-19 with other individuals who may not have the same safety concerns.
2. Cleaning areas in the hotel "at least every 30 minutes..." increases the exposure of the individual cleaning the area.
3. "Bed linens and towels will be changed no less than daily, unless the guest requests

otherwise.” Making this mandatory will be extra work.

4. If this becomes a law, they will ban the “use of shared beverage and food equipment.” So, associates can no longer use the microwave and refrigerator at work.

We already have high standards at our own Hotel, from our excellent customer service to the safety of everyone. Making this proposal into a law does NOT make it extra safe. It is extra cost to the hotel (and other hotels) which then affects all of us, from our future pay increase to the other fun associate events that we do in our own hotel. As a Harbor Court associate, we, all pride ourselves of our cleanliness and safety for everyone. Even our hotel guests agree as they mention that on social media/TripAdvisor reviews.

Please read the enclosed fact sheet about our struggle to reopen safely and bring you back to work. Although this is voluntary, we encourage you to reach out to the Board of Supervisors (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) and the Mayor (mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org) if you agree with our efforts to oppose this unnecessary ordinance. We have provided a sample letter template should you choose to do so. Just **cut and paste then put your name and title.**

Your voice makes a difference! Let it be heard.

Sincerely,

Errol Reyes, SHRM-CP, PHR | Director of Talent Development

OLS Hotels & Resorts

O: 415.537.7542 | F: 415.276-4543 | E: ereyes@olshotels.com



GET INTO BED WITH US



www.harborcourthotel.com

165 Steuart Street San Francisco CA 94105



"This communication from OLS Hotels & Resorts or its Subsidiaries may contain information that may be confidential, privileged and/or prohibited from disclosure. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law."



Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail & any documents.

From: [Eduardo Aguilar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: RE: Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 5:28:39 PM

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

Hello. My name is Eduardo Aguilar and I worked as Convention Services at Hyatt Centric San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. I want my hotel to continue to stay open and call me back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Chato Flores](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Letter of Petition to hear our voices.
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 6:30:38 PM

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

Hello. My name is Charito Flores and I worked as Housekeeping Supervisor at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance and hoping for your profound consideration.

From: [A. Patterson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Safety first
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 8:24:36 PM

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

Hello. My name is Geraldine Patterson and I worked as Front Office Supervisors at Hotel Zelos. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

--

Kind regards,
A. Patterson

From: [Azuregaming 2](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2020 9:56:12 PM

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

Hello. My name is Yong Ying Huang and I worked as House Keeper at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Mendez, Macky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: THE NEW HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE HURTS HOTEL WORKERS
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 7:23:18 AM

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

Please vote NO.

As you painfully know, many hotels in the city are closed, and most of our 15,000 hotel employees do not have jobs to provide for their families. San Francisco's hotels can resume operations only when there are enough guests to support reopening. The Supervisors' new cleaning ordinance, which is unproven, would significantly increase the cost to open every hotel. This means that a large number of hotels will remain closed, which means they will not be able to hire back workers.

The Supervisors are excluding all government buildings, including their own offices, from their new unproven cleaning standards. This shows this isn't about worker safety. This is about rewarding UniteHere, the largest national hotel union, who helped write this ordinance.

The hotel industry already has adopted new stringent and cleaning standards to fight COVID-19 that are based on the CDC's recommendations and other science experts. The standards will help keep you safe and encourage guests to return to San Francisco.

Macky Mendez

Complex Engineering Manager
Shell San Francisco

Wyndham Destinations

501 Post Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
office: 415-885-8841
fax: 415-885-8891
cell: 510-677-6041
macky.mendez@wyn.com

This email message (including all attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information, or may otherwise be protected by work product or other legal rules. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Unless otherwise indicated in the body of this email, nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature and this transmission cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Wyndham Destinations, Inc., and/or its affiliates may monitor all incoming and outgoing email communications, including the content of emails and attachments, for security, legal compliance, training, quality assurance and other purposes.

The sender believes that this email and any attachments were free of any virus, worm, Trojan horse, malicious code and/or other contaminants when sent. Email transmissions cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free, so this message and its attachments could have been infected, corrupted or made incomplete during transmission. By reading the message and opening any attachments, the recipient accepts full responsibility for any viruses or other defects that may arise, and for taking remedial action relating to such viruses and other defects. Neither Wyndham Destinations, Inc., nor any of its affiliated entities is liable for any loss or damage arising in any way from, or for errors or omissions in the contents of, this message or its attachments.

From: [Ashesh Manandhar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 8:44:36 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Hello.

My name is Ashesh Manandhar and I work as Revenue Analyst at Argonaut Hotel and Hotel Zoe. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. Both of our hotel is currently closed. I want the hotels to reopen, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing me and my co-workers exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating we enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,

Ashesh Manandhar
Revenue Analyst


FISHERMAN'S WHARF

ARGONAUT™
A NOBLE HOUSE HOTEL

495 Jefferson St, San Francisco, CA 94109
(O) 415.345.5516
amanandhar@noblehousehotels.com

From: [Edwina Tiongco](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Adagio Employee
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 9:07:29 AM
Attachments: [Adagio GM to Employee Email.docx](#)

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

Sent from my iPhone

Hello. My name is [Edwina Tiongco] and I worked as [Housekeeping] at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Sonia Melendez](#)
To: mayorlondeonbreed@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Harbor Court Hotel New Ordinance
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 1:36:43 PM

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

Hello.

My name is Sonia Melendez and I worked as the Executive Housekeeping Manager at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Sonia Melendez

From: [Jessica Santiago](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Harbor Court Hotel/ New Ordinance
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 1:37:37 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Jessica Wright and I worked as the Assistant Front Office Manager at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my coworkers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but targets minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Jessica Wright

From: [gee le](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opinion to the new ordinance provided by the CDC
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 2:06:41 PM

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

Hello. My name is Lily Guo and I worked as a Housekeeper at Argonaut Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure to hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco is increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds, and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [Jeremy Kueffner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Axiom Hotel Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 2:59:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Axiom Hotel's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

More than anything, we are prepared to welcome back our team with robust safety training and new cleaning procedures leveraging cutting-edge technology. This legislation is bad for business and will be detrimental to San Francisco's economy by forcing an unnecessary loss of jobs. Once safe and permitted from the state and county levels, we'll be more than ready to actively participate in reopening the City's economy.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide proper guidance.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Kueffner, CRDE | Hotel Manager

Email: jeremy.kueffner@axiomhotel.com

Tel: 415.39AXIOM ([415.392.9466](tel:415.392.9466)) **Direct:** [628.242.0303](tel:628.242.0303)

[28 Cyril Magnin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102](#)



<https://www.axiomhotel.com/>

From: [Kretsch, Kevin \(SFOBU\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 3:03:24 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco and the Bay Area!

Sincerely,

Kevin Kretsch
General Manager
Hyatt Regency San Francisco Airport
1333 Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, CA 94010

From: [Mei yun Xie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 3:05:08 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mei yun Xie
mimiusa2006@yahoo.com
4800 Hershey court
Richmond , California 94804

From: [Heiko Novak](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Axiom Hotel Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 4:23:12 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Axiom Hotel's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

More than anything, we are prepared to welcome back our team with robust safety training and new cleaning procedures leveraging cutting-edge technology. This legislation is bad for business and will be detrimental to San Francisco's economy by forcing an unnecessary loss of jobs. Once safe and permitted from the state and county levels, we'll be more than ready to actively participate in reopening the City's economy.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide proper guidance.

Sincerely,

Heiko Novak Director of Sales & Marketing

E-Mail: heiko.novak@axiomhotel.com

Main: 415.39AXIOM (415.392.9466) Direct: 628.242.0304

[28 Cyril Magnin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102](#)

From: [Yan Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Axiom Hotel Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 6:13:25 PM
Attachments: [image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image011.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Axiom Hotel's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

More than anything, we are prepared to welcome back our team with robust safety training and new cleaning procedures leveraging cutting-edge technology. This legislation is bad for business and will be detrimental to San Francisco's economy by forcing an unnecessary loss of jobs. Once safe and permitted from the state and county levels, we'll be more than ready to actively participate in reopening the City's economy.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide proper guidance.

Sincerely,

Yan Liu

[Yan Liu , Housekeeping Manager](#)

Email: yan.liu@axiomhotel.com

Tel: 415.39AXIOM ([415.392.9466](tel:415.392.9466)) **Direct:** 628.242.0301

[28 Cyril Magnin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102](#)



From: [erickson agustin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SAVE SAN FRANCISCO TOURISM:
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 6:28:18 PM

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

Hello. My name is [Ericson Agustin](#) and I worked as Houseman at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Ericson Agustin

From: [Anabel Jarillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Don't pass the law
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 7:02:38 PM

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

We already have high standards at our own Hotel, from our excellent customer service to the safety of everyone. Making this proposal into a law does NOT make it extra safe. It is extra cost to the hotel (and other hotels) which then affects all of us, from our future pay increase to the other fun associate events that we do in our own hotel. As a Harbor Court associate, we, all pride ourselves of our cleanliness and safety for everyone. Even our hotel guests agree as they mention that on social media/TripAdvisor reviews.

**Anabel Jarillo corona
Room cleaner**

From: [Xiomara Jarillo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do not pass the law
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 7:04:11 PM

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

We already have high standards at our own Hotel, from our excellent customer service to the safety of everyone. Making this proposal into a law does NOT make it extra safe. It is extra cost to the hotel (and other hotels) which then affects all of us, from our future pay increase to the other fun associate events that we do in our own hotel. As a Harbor Court associate, we, all pride ourselves of our cleanliness and safety for everyone. Even our hotel guests agree as they mention that on social media/TripAdvisor reviews.

Xiomara Jarillo

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Dilyana Batalova](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Zetta"s Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 7:22:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Dilyana Totin. I work in Hotel Zetta in San Francisco as a Room Division Supervisor. I am writing to you to express **my personal and hotel Zetta's strong opposition** to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority, more than ever now in the situation of pandemic. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines. It is completely illogical that hotels and offices need to follow these rules but government owned buildings do not have to. The risk of the virus infections is less in the government buildings than in the hotels???

As the number of people filing for unemployment benefits is rising, the approval of the Emergency Ordinance File # 200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards will worsen the situation for me and my colleagues in hotel Zetta. I might lose my job, together with thousands of people in the city working in the tourism industry. Many hotels in San Francisco won't be able to re-open, will remain closed and workers won't be hired back. People won't be able to come back to work and provide for their families. Thousands of people all over the world come each year to visit San Francisco and bring business in California. Instead of trying to improve and relieve the current travel and tourism situation in San Francisco, the Emergency Ordinance File # 200638 will have devastating impact on the industry! Do you want to kill the hotel jobs and end the tourism in San Francisco???

And it is not only about the hotels, this will impact restaurants, site seeing places, all businesses directly and indirectly connected to the travel industry.

Again, I ask that you DO NOT approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Thank you for your consideration and understanding,

Dilyana Totin

Room Division Supervisor

Hotel Zetta, San Francisco

From: [Margarita Zuniga](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 9:21:57 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Margarita Zuniga
Isabellaz1717@gmail.com
1975Grand Avenue
Sacramento , California 95838

From: [Margarita Zuniga](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 9:26:39 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Margarita Zuniga
Isabellaz1717@gmail.com
1975Grand Avenue
Sacramento California , California 95838

From: [Agnes Tubre](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to ordinance
Date: Sunday, July 5, 2020 10:58:37 PM

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

Hello. My name is Agnes Tubre and I worked as a Front Desk Agent the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,
Agnes Tubre

From: [Sonia Hernandez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: COVID New laws for SF Hotels
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:33:02 AM

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

Francisco H. From Bellman from OLS Hotels & Resorts.

We already have high standards at our own Hotel, from our excellent customer service to the safety of everyone. Making this proposal into a law does NOT make it extra safe. It is extra cost to the hotel (and other hotels) which then affects all of us, from our future pay increase to the other fun associate events that we do in our own hotel. As a Harbor Court associate, we, all pride ourselves of our cleanliness and safety for everyone. Even our hotel guests agree as they mention that on social media/TripAdvisor reviews.

Thank you.

From: [Marvin Navas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:12:43 AM

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

Subject: Hotel Zetta Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention

Standards

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express *Hotel Zetta's* strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

(Please take into consideration in this pass , it will more difficult to keep getting more hours at work , which means it will more harder to take care of my family, mortgage , and bills)

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Thank you

Marvin Navas
Night Auditor

From: [Stefan Muhle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:45:40 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[Indoor Water Conservation LLC San Francisco Hotel Cleaning Regulation.docx](#)

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed:

I am forwarding you the attached letter as requested by the co-founder and managing director of Indoor Water Conservation, LLC, Ken Leddon.

Thank you.

Stefan Mühle
Area Managing Director



495 Jefferson St, San Francisco, CA 94109

(O) 415-345-5505

(F) 415-345-5513

smuhle@noblehousehotels.com



From: Ken Leddon [mailto:kleddon@indoorh2o.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 4, 2020 2:36 PM

To: Stefan Muhle <smuhle@noblehousehotels.com>

Cc: Rick Skinker <rskinker@indoorh2o.com>

Subject: San Francisco Healthy Building Ordinance



Indoor Water Conservation LLC
750 Otay Lakes Road #334
Chula Vista, CA 91910

July 4, 2020

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Kenneth Leddon and I am a Managing Director with Indoor Water Conservation LLC.

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Leddon

Kenneth Leddon
Managing Director

Hi Stephan,

Please forward my attached letter to the San Francisco Mayor and Board of Supervisors regarding the proposed hotel cleaning regulations. We want to express our support to prevent this Ordinance from being implemented.

Best regards,

Ken

Kenneth Leddon

Managing Director and Co-Founder

Indoor Water Conservation LLC

kledon@indoorh2o.com

714.404.6970



From: [Stefan Muhle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:48:33 AM
Attachments: [image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image013.png](#)
[Skinker ES HCSF Petition 07-04-2020.pdf](#)
[Skinker HCSF Petition 07-04-2020.pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed:

Attached please find two letters by the managing director and project director of Indoor Water Conservation, LLC, in opposition of the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

I am forwarding them as per their request.

Thank you.

Stefan Mühle
Area Managing Director

Hotel Zoe
FISHERMAN'S WHARF

ARGONAUT™
A NOBLE HOUSE HOTEL

495 Jefferson St, San Francisco, CA 94109

(O) 415-345-5505

(F) 415-345-5513

smuhle@noblehousehotels.com



July 4, 2020

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Elaine Skinker and I am the Project Director of Indoor Water Conservation.

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,



Elaine Skinker
Project Director
(619) 392-89613



[Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)



July 4, 2020

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Rick Skinker and I am the Managing Director, Indoor Water Conservation.

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,



Rick Skinker
Managing Director
(619) 392-8961



View my
LinkedIn
Profile

[Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)



From: [Laurenne Douglas - Pacific Plaza Hotels](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:14:28 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Laurenne Douglas

Director of Operations
Pacific Plaza Hotels, Inc.
1000 Marina Village Square Pkwy
Alameda, CA 94501
510-832-6868

From: [Brad Shinn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:14:58 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)

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

Hello,

My name is Brad Shinn and I am the Corporate Director of Internal Audit for Noble House Hotels and Resorts. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance.

The two hotels we manage in Fisherman's Wharf (The Argonaut and Hotel Zoe) remain closed. I want our hotels to reopen and so we can call our employees back, and when that happens, I want them to feel safe in their work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of our hotel employees are out of work. Our employees were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing employees' exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of our employees' job but a #1 priority for all our hotels so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed our employees were not part of the conversation that is keeping them unemployed and affecting their families. These additional costs will certainly keep our hotels closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Brad Shinn
Corporate Director of Internal Audit

NOBLE HOUSE
HOTELS & RESORTS

600 6th Street S, Kirkland, WA 98033
(o) 425-636-5639

(c) 214-395-0998
bshinn@noblehousehotels.com



From: [Phelan, Jim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Strong Opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:44:39 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Hello. My name is Jim Phelan and I worked as Director of Revenue Strategy at Hotel Vitale. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping our teams unemployed and affecting their families. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Jim Phelan
Director of Revenue Strategy
HOTEL VITALE | AMERICANO RESTAURANT & BAR | SPA VITALE
A Joie de Vivre Hotel, Restaurant & Spa
Eight Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94105
Mobile 919-586-1885



jdvhoteles.com | hotelvitale.com

facebook.com/hotelvitale

instagram.com/hotelvitale

From: [Kimberly Atkinson](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:52:55 AM
Attachments: [image009.png](#)

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

Good Morning Mayor Breed,

.My name is Kimberly Atkinson and I work as the Director of Human Resources at the Hotel Zephyr Fisherman's Wharf. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel has been closed since March 2020. I want my hotel to reopen and call back our team members, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my team members exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of our jobs but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping that majority of our team members unemployed and affecting their families. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Kimberly Atkinson

Kimberly Atkinson



Area Director of People and Culture
250 Beach Street San Francisco, CA 94133
D: 415-617-6550
Kimberly.Atkinson@HotelZephyrSF.com
www.hotelzephyrsf.com



From: [Marco Perry](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:54:11 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

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

Hello,

My name is Marco Perry and I am the Vice President, Regional Managing Director for Noble House Hotels and Resorts for our West Coast properties. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. The two hotels we manage in Fisherman's Wharf (The Argonaut and Hotel Zoe) remain closed. I want our hotels to reopen and so we can call our employees back, and when that happens, I want them to feel safe in their work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of our hotel employees are out of work. Our employees were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing employees' exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of our employees' job but a #1 priority for all our hotels so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed our employees were not part of the conversation that is keeping them unemployed and affecting their families. These additional costs will certainly keep our hotels closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Marco Perry
Vice President, Regional Managing Director



NÖBLE HOUSE
HOTELS & RESORTS

600 6th St S, Kirkland, WA 98033

(O) 425-636-5631

(C) 714-916-6109

mperry@noblehousehotels.com



From: [Karen J. Ranker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: return to work
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:00:08 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

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

My name is Karen Ranker and I am the Vice President of Human Resources for Noble House Hotels and Resorts. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. The two hotels we manage in Fisherman's Wharf (The Argonaut and Hotel Zoe) remain closed. I want our hotels to reopen and so we can call our employees back, and when that happens, I want them to feel safe in their work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of our hotel employees are out of work. Our employees were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance unfairly targets hotel workers and deprives them of the ability to return to productive work and provide for their families.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing employees' exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of our employees' job but a #1 priority for all our hotels so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed our employees were not part of the conversation that is keeping them unemployed and affecting their families. These additional costs will certainly keep our hotels closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely, KR

Karen J Ranker
VP Human Resources



600 6th Street S, Kirkland, WA 98033

(O) 425-636-5683 message only

(C) 214-632-3743

kranker@noblehousehotels.com



From: [Rick Skinker](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Read
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:05:04 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[Skinker HCSF Petition 07-04-2020.pdf](#)
[Skinker ES HCSF Petition 07-04-2020.pdf](#)

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

Please consider out position.

Rick Skinker
Managing Director
(619) 392-8961



[Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)



July 4, 2020

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Rick Skinker and I am the Managing Director, Indoor Water Conservation.

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,



Rick Skinker
Managing Director
(619) 392-8961



View my
LinkedIn
Profile

[Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)



July 4, 2020

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Elaine Skinker and I am the Project Director of Indoor Water Conservation.

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,



Elaine Skinker
Project Director
(619) 392-89613



[Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)



From: [David Cook](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:17:30 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in San Francisco I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

David Cook

David Cook
Director of Operations
Hyatt Centric San Francisco

From: [Cook, David \(SFOFW-F\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:21:29 AM

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

Hello. My name is David Cook and I work as a Director of Operations at the Hyatt Centric Fishermans Wharf. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. I want my hotel to continue to stay open and call me back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

David Cook
Hyatt Centric San Francisco

From: [Ken Leddon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:23:12 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

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

Indoor Water Conservation LLC



750 Otay Lakes Road #334
Chula Vista, CA 91910

July 4, 2020

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Kenneth Leddon and I am a Managing Director with Indoor Water Conservation LLC.

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Leddon

Kenneth Leddon
Managing Director

Kenneth Leddon

Managing Director and Co-Founder

Indoor Water Conservation LLC

kledon@indoorh2o.com

714.404.6970



From: [Robel Seyoum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Axiom Hotel Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:35:15 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Axiom Hotel's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry’s number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

More than anything, we are prepared to welcome back our team with robust safety training and new cleaning procedures leveraging cutting-edge technology. This legislation is bad for business and will be detrimental to San Francisco's economy by forcing an unnecessary loss of jobs. Once safe and permitted from the state and county levels, we'll be more than ready to actively participate in reopening the City's economy.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide proper guidance.

Sincerely,

Robel Seyoum | Controller

Email: robel.seyoum@axiomhotel.com

Tel: 415.39AXIOM ([415.392.9466](tel:415.392.9466)) **Direct:** [628.242.0306](tel:628.242.0306)

[28 Cyril Magnin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102](#)



From: [Justin McCabe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:48:40 AM
Attachments: [image006.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

JUSTIN MCCABE

Regional Director, Revenue Management
1 Ravinia Dr BE #1600 | Atlanta, GA 30346
Mobile: 901.568.4122

jmccabe@davidsonhotels.com
www.davidsonhotels.com | www.pivohotels.com



Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, may contain confidential information intended solely for the use of intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of

this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer and all copies and backups thereof.

From: [Bettencourt, Heidi \(MRYDM-F\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:56:33 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Heidi Bettencourt-Keith
Director of Sales & Marketing

HYATT REGENCY MONTEREY HOTEL & SPA
One Old Golf Course Rd, Monterey, CA 93940, USA
T +1.831.657.6570 E heidi.bettencourt@hyatt.com
hyattregencymonterey.com

Top 25 Hotels in Northern California in Condé Nast Traveler's 2019 Readers Choice Awards

From: [Nikki Wood](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: DO NOT PASS HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:57:04 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

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

Dear Board of Supervisors

On behalf of myself, my company, my hotel partners and my tourism partners,
I am writing to implore you **not to pass the new Healthy Building ordinance.**

I have been speaking with my hotel partners weekly for the last 4 months to understand what measures are being taken for the health and well being of visitors and staff alike. Every hotel has stated that they are following the CDC guidelines to the letter and some to ensure the safety of reopening.

As I am sure you are all well aware, the guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other national scientific institutions **do not support** these new rules and regulations of the San Francisco Healthy Building ordinance. This is unjust.

The ripple effect of passing this bill and postponing the opening of hotels to the leisure visitors will be insurmountable. From local attractions, to the restaurants to the cultural institutions to the local guides like Where Traveler - it will be near impossible to come back from this.

PLEASE DO NOT PASS THIS ORDINANCE.

Nikki Wood
Group Publisher Where Traveler Northern California
Where Traveler | Where GuestBook
415 336 6682



Subscribe to our [Weekend Events Newsletter](#)

Be Social!



[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: [Billy Heitz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Clean Hotels Legislation
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:57:30 AM

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

To The Board of Supervisors:

I am a San Francisco hotel employee and urge you not to pass the Emergency Clean Hotels legislation.

I am concerned that this would endanger jobs at my hotel and further delay the reopening of hotels.

My Hotel has been working for months on cleaning, disinfection and social distancing measures recommended by the CDC and the State Health Department, as well as the SF Health Department. These are based on science, not politics. As someone who works in a hotel, I believe the rules to create a healthy hotel environment should be written by medical and scientific experts in health departments. Please do not pass this proposed ordinance.

Thank you,

Billy Heitz

Chief Engineer

The Orchard Hotels of San Francisco

Tel: 415-362-8878 ext 1343

Cell: 707-708-1309

Email: eng@theorchardhotels.com



[Vote for us: Conde Nast Traveler 2019 Readers' Choice Awards](#)





665 Bush Street, San
Francisco,
California 94108
W: www.theorchardhotel.com
Tel: 1-415-362-8878



466 Bush Street, San Francisco,
California 94108
W: www.theorchardgardenhotel.com
Tel: 1-415-399-9807



From: [Marisa Serrano](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:59:13 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Marisa Serrano | Regional Vice President of Operations



Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, may contain confidential information intended solely for the use of intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer and all copies and backups thereof.



From: [Justin Accornero](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:15:41 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Justin Accornero

Director of Revenue Management



Hilton Garden Inn San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge

1800 Powell Street

Emeryville, CA 94608

Phone #: 510-658-9300 ext. 2025

Direct #: 510-285-1725

Jaccornero@hgiemeryville.com

From: [Dovi Berger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Tourism - Healthy Building Ordinance Opposition
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:32:09 AM
Attachments: [V20njQh_d655853a-0bfc-41c1-a465-c56683a7c3a0.png](#)
Importance: High

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Dovi Berger and I am the Regional Director, with The Regency Group.

As a partners and vendors of many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future, also fringe on the ability to re-open hotels. As I recently learned of the new Heathy Buildings Ordinance and the unrealistic business expenses that will keep hotels shuttered, I became very concerned that our partners in the hotel industry will be able to open. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The affect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Dovi Berger

Regional Director

The Regency Group

dovi@theregencygroup.net

The logo for Regency Group, featuring the words "Regency Group" in a stylized, cursive script font.

Dovi Berger

Regional Director

1436 South La Cienega Blvd, Suite 109

Los Angeles, CA 90035

T. 323 879 9670

Dovi@theregencygroup.net

theregencygroup.net

From: [Czezar, Jenny \(SFOFW-F\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Regarding the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:37:08 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-yqexgnsww.png](#)

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

To whom it may concern:

My name is Jenny Czezar and I worked as Executive Housekeeper at Hyatt Centric Fisherman's Wharf. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. I want my hotel to continue to stay open and call staff back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in our work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.


Most of my co-workers are out of work. They were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating us entering occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed we were not part of the conversation that is keeping our staff unemployed, which also affects their families. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,

Jenny Czezar, *Executive Housekeeper- Hyatt Centric Fisherman's Wharf San Francisco*
555 North Point Street, San Francisco, CA 94133 | 415-486-4370 | jenny.czezar@hyatt.com



fishermanswharf.centric.hyatt.com/ | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: [Michael Baier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:39:13 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Highgate Hotels' strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

The proposed legislation does absolutely nothing to add to the health and safety of our workers yet adds millions in operation expense to an industry already suffering the effects of the pandemic. Should this legislation pass it will only unnecessarily delay thousands of workers from returning to work upon our industry's reopening.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Michael Baier
Managing Director
Highgate Hotels of Nob Hill
Huntington Hotel & Stanford Court
mbaier@stanfordcourt.com
+1 (415) 432-0857

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments

From: [Michelle Dzoan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:41:39 AM

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

Hello. My name is Michelle Dzoan and I worked as the Area Human Resources Manager at Hotel Zelos. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Max Nesser](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Dovi Berger](#)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:43:49 AM
Attachments: [V20njOh_d655853a-0bfc-41c1-a465-c56683a7c3a0.png](#)

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

To Supervisors and Mayor Breed:

My name is Max Nesser. I am the Regional Director of Sales with The Regency Group. We service the hospitality industry for the west coast.

My livelihood fringes upon the ability to reopen hotels. I recently learned of the new 'Healthy Buildings Ordinance', which carries with it unrealistic business expenses that will keep hotels shuttered.

I am extremely concerned that many hotels will subsequently never be able to reopen. I write in strong opposition to the proposed 'Healthy Buildings Ordinance' that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials, and will likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record- nine times worse than September 11th, and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who are unable to afford the required implementation, subsequently resulting in the closure of their businesses. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The affect across San Francisco will result in the loss of hundreds of millions of taxable revenue, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Furthermore, this ordinance contradicts both federal and state health officials, who recommend only the limiting of personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger negative economic impact that is sure to result from it.

Sincerely,

Max Nesser

Regency Group

E max@theregencygroup.net

D 323-480-9781

F 212- 714-0007

theregencygroup.net

501 South Fairfax Ave #205 Los Angeles CA 90036

Regency Group

Max Nesser

Director of Sales

1436 South la Cienega Blvd. Suite 109

Los Angeles, CA 90035

T. 323 480 9781

max@theregencygroup.net

theregencygroup.net

From: [Levi Kehaty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Tourism - Healthy Building Ordinance Opposition
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:45:20 AM
Attachments: [V20njQh_d655853a-0bfc-41c1-a465-c56683a7c3a0.png](#)
[Healthy Building Ordinance Vendor Opposition .pdf](#)

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

Dear Mayor and Board of supervisors of San Francisco,

Please read my attached email.

Thank you.

The logo for Regency Group, featuring the words "Regency Group" in a stylized, handwritten-style font.

Levi Kehaty

Regional Inventory & Production Manager

1436 South la Cienega Blvd. Suite 109

Los Angeles, CA 90035

T. 323 480 9780

levi@theregencygroup.net

theregencygroup.net

From: [John Trudeau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose the Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:48:53 AM

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

Hello. My name is John Trudeau and I work as the General Manager for the Hotel Whitcomb.

I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. When we reopen to the public, I want our entire staff to feel safe in the work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for all hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of our employees are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly targeted hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and State health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are recommending to INCREASE associate exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of their job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests.

I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping thousands of hotel workers unemployed. The additional costs in your proposed ordinance will certainly keep our hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.



JOHN TRUDEAU

*General Manager, Hotel Indigo Coachella
Task Force General Manager, Hotel Whitcomb, San Francisco*

C (760) 285-1957
JTRUDEAU@HIGHGATE.COM

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this

transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments

From: [Linda Yau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT - PLEASE READ
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:58:29 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Linda Yau
Vice President, Asset Management
Pebblebrook Hotel Trust (NYSE: PEB)

Please note new address:

4747 Bethesda Avenue, Suite 1100
Bethesda, MD 20814

240.507.1367 (O)

347.256.7381 (M)

lyau@pebblebrookhotels.com

From: [Clara Sohn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please save San Francisco Tourism
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:11:15 AM

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

Hello.

My name is Clara Sohn and I worked as Front Office Agent at the Harbor Court Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Clara Sohn

From: [Baltazar Ceja](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:12:33 AM

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

Hello. My name is Baltazar Ceja and I worked as Dir. Engineering at Hotel Zeppelin. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Baltazar Ceja | Director of Engineering

Hotel Zelos | Hotel Zeppelin | Hotel Zetta

T 415-447-6986 **M** 707-344-7662 **F** 415-563-6831

E baltazar.ceja@viceroyhotelgroup.com

545 Post Street

San Francisco, CA 94102

Follow us [@HotelZelos](#) [@HotelZetta](#) [@HotelZeppelin](#)

From: [Alan McConnell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:13:23 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Alan McConnell | Director of Sales & Marketing | Embassy Suites San Diego Bay-Downtown | [601 Pacific Hwy, San Diego, CA 92101](#)

P: [619-819-0185](#) | M: [619-251-5392](#) | F: [619-239-](#)

[1520](#) | **web:**www.sandiegobay.embassysuites.com | **email:**alan.mcconnell@hilton.com



This transmission is not a digital or electronic signature and cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Hilton and its affiliates accept no liability arising in connection with this transmission. Copyright 2020 Hilton Proprietary and Confidential

From: [Ashley Gochnauer](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to SF Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:23:40 AM

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

Dear Mayor Breed & Board of Supervisors,

My name is Ashley Gochnauer and I am the General Manager of Hotel Zelos located at 4th and Market. I both live and work in San Francisco, and I am writing you today to oppose this legislation. At my hotel specifically, 70% of our employees are San Francisco residents. We actively give back through advocacy and volunteering to help marginalized groups within our community.

This ordinance will increase the risk of exposure to our employees and guests, most notably from the mandated daily room cleaning, which goes against industry expert recommendations as well as state and CDC guidelines. It bears mentioning that this ordinance would also disproportionately affect minority groups who overwhelmingly occupy the positions who would be at the highest risk of exposure should this ordinance pass.

I would also like to call attention to the mandate of single use plastics, which aside from the exorbitant cost, also defies sustainability efforts. In California we have been at the forefront of green initiatives such as banning plastic straws and reducing water waste. This ordinance would mandate an excessive amount of waste rather than giving the hotel community the opportunity to come up with creative alternatives.

Additionally, passing this ordinance will make it cost prohibitive for hotels to reopen, and it is not financially sustainable during the slow ramp up to pre-COVID business levels.

This ordinance exempts City, State and Federal office buildings. Targeting specific industries is inconsistent and suggests bias.

I know I speak for many in our industry when I ask that you oppose this legislation.

Thank you,
Ashley Gochnauer

ASHLEY GOCHNAUER | GENERAL MANAGER

Hotel Zelos | Dirty Habit

T 415 344 3301 **M** 424 901 5160

E ashley.gochnauer@viceroyhotelgroup.com

12 4th Street

San Francisco, CA 94103

Follow us [@HotelZelos](#) [@DirtyHabitSF](#)

From: [Beth Patty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Covid 19 and Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:26:02 AM

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

Beth Patty
1289 16th Avenue
San Francisco, Ca 94122
415-269-6457

Dear Board of Supervisors;

My name is Beth Patty, I have worked the hospitality industry in San Francisco for 45 years and recently worked as a Convention Services Manager at the Argonaut Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed since March due to Covid 19. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back to work, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US based scientific experts. Furthermore it adds significant cost with no benefit to associates or guests. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. NO OTHER CITY in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and State health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotel workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating that staff enter occupied rooms, stripping beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of our job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting myself and my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,

Beth Patty

From: [Honan, Irene](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Let Hospitality Get Back to Work!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:27:11 AM
Attachments: [Letter to SF Leads.pdf](#)

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

Attached is my letter outlining my need and strong desire to begin working full time again. I hope that you will read acknowledge the strong will that hospitality has to get back to work.

STAY HOME, STAY SAFE

IRENE HONAN, CMP


DIRECTOR OF EVENT MANAGEMENT / W SAN FRANCISCO

181 Third Street / San Francisco, CA 94103

T 415.817.7858 / E irene.honan@whotels.com

[EXPLORE WHAT'S NEW / NEXT AT W HOTELS WORLDWIDE](#)

WHOTELS.COM / facebook.com/wsanfrancisco / twitter.com/wsanfrancisco / Instagram [@wsanfrancisco](#) & [@tracewsf](#)



July 6th 2020

Hello Mayor Breed and The San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

My name is Irene Honan and I worked as the Director of Events at W San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back. When that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Irene Honan', with a stylized, cursive script.

Irene Honan

From: [Nick Hoppe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:35:06 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I own restaurants and retail stores at Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco and we are obviously struggling right now. We need the hotels to open back up for leisure travelers if we are to have a chance of improving our business. The Healthy Building Ordinance, if approved, will apparently prevent many hotels from opening due to exorbitant costs involved.

Existing guidelines for hotel cleaning from the CDC will protect visitors to San Francisco hotels, just as they are doing throughout the country. To add more stringent measures in San Francisco is unfair not only to the hotels, but to the many, many businesses that rely on hotels for their customers.

An "abundance of caution" is a noble idea, but not when it costs thousands of jobs and the livelihoods of business owners. Caution is enough---we don't need to add the abundance. Let's do what the rest of the country is doing and not only protect the travelers to hotels, but also protect the jobs and businesses that hotels provide. Please vote no on the Healthy Building Ordinance.

Sincerely,

--

Nick Hoppe
President/CEO
SFO Forecast, Inc/Portco, Inc.
496 Jefferson St.
San Francisco, Ca. 94109
415-699-4140 (cell)
www.hoppecolumns.com

From: [Vermolen, Raymond](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: InterContinental San Francisco Hotel: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:41:53 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-zx4l2qm2.png](#)
[Outlook-s4er0m0k.png](#)
[Outlook-v5tttliu.png](#)
[Outlook-jfzp1ivc.png](#)
[Outlook-zbyrhw5j.png](#)
[Outlook-zbgqp2we.png](#)
[Outlook-10q4i2yh.png](#)
[Outlook-al0dmqvf.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express InterContinental San Francisco Hotel's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

We are not in favor of sending our employees into occupied rooms for example. The less interaction with guests and guests' belongings the better.


We ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Sincerely,

Raymond Vermolen
General Manager
INTERCONTINENTAL SAN FRANCISCO HOTEL

Tel: +1 415 616 6532
Fax: +1 415 616 6531
Email: raymond.vermolen@ihg.com

Live the InterContinental life



The advertisement banner is divided into three sections. The left section features the InterContinental logo (a gold shield with a white 'I') above the text 'INTERCONTINENTAL. SAN FRANCISCO' and the website 'intercontinentalsanfrancisco.com'. The middle section is a photograph of a modern lounge with large windows overlooking a city, furnished with blue and orange armchairs and a white coffee table. The right section contains the text 'Your health & safety are our top priority.' above two certification logos: the 'IHG CLEAN PROMISE' logo and the 'CLEAN + SAFE CERTIFIED' logo.

INTERCONTINENTAL[®] SAN FRANCISCO

888 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Tel: +1 415 616 6500 Fax: +1 415 616 6581

From: [Erik Hilburn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:42:48 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Erik Hilburn

Erik Hilburn
samba67@me.com
1905 Pacific Ave
San Francisco, California 94109-2335

From: [Jenny Chow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Save San Francisco Hotels and Tourism
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:45:34 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

My name is Jenny Chow and I am the mother of Vicky He, who works at the Harbor Court Hotel as an Accounting Manager. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. Her hotel is currently closed. I want her hotel to reopen and call her back to work, and when that happens, I want her to feel safe in her work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of her co-workers are out of work. They were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of her job but a #1 priority for her hotel so they can serve their guests. I am disappointed that they were not part of the conversation that is keeping my daughter unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep her hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Jenny Chow

From: [Jimmy He](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Hotels and Tourism
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:53:15 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

My name is Jimmy He and I am the brother of Vicky He, who works at the Harbor Court Hotel as an Accounting Manager. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. Her hotel is currently closed. I want her hotel to reopen and call her back to work, and when that happens, I want her to feel safe in her work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of her co-workers are out of work. They were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotel workers, but targets minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of her job but a #1 priority for her hotel so they can serve their guests. I am disappointed that they were not part of the conversation that is keeping my sister unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep her hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Jimmy He

From: [Michelle Lau](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Harbor Court Hotel
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:05:56 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors (Mayor Breed),

My name is Michelle and I am the friend of Vicky He, who works at the Harbor Court Hotel as an Accounting Manager. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. Her hotel is currently closed. I want her hotel to reopen and call her back to work, and when that happens, I want her to feel safe in her work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of her co-workers are out of work. They were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of her job but a #1 priority for her hotel so they can serve their guests. I am disappointed that they were not part of the conversation that is keeping my friend unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep her hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Michelle L.

From: [Jeanne Doyle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:05:58 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you today, as ally of the San Francisco hotel community. The new cleaning ordinance will likely impact the opening of hotels in San Francisco. The hotel industry already has adopted new stringent and cleaning standards to fight COVID-19 that are based on the CDC's recommendations and other science experts. This ordinance excludes all government buildings, including San Francisco officials.

I would like to ask that the Board revisits this ordinance before the final vote on July 7.

The welfare of workers should be very important, but it does not appear that this ordinance has been well thought out on the full impact.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeanne Doyle
360 Tampa Ct, Foster City, CA 94070

From: [Natalia](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance.
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:20:50 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Natalia Godina and I worked as a Revenue Analyst at Hotel Vitale in SF. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating employees enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of a hospitality job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,

Natalia

From: [Michelle Chodor](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do NOT approve healthy building ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:24:14 PM

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

Please do not approve this. Our hospitality community needs to welcome guests in a safe way. Requiring masks and the other social distance protocols can be successfully done.

Please!
Thank you,
Michelle Chodor

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Brittany Wimer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose the Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:26:41 PM

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

Hello. My name is Brittany Wimer and I work as the Chief Accountant for the Hotel Whitcomb.

I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. When we reopen to the public, I want our entire staff to feel safe in the work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for all hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of our employees are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly targeted hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and State health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are recommending to INCREASE associate exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of their job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests.

I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping thousands of hotel workers unemployed. The additional costs in your proposed ordinance will certainly keep our hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Thank you,



Brittany Wimer, Chief Accountant
Hotel Whitcomb
1231 Market Street | San Francisco, CA 94103
Email: bwimer@hotelwhitcomb.com
Direct: 415-487-4428
www.hotelwhitcomb.com

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments

From: [Orchard Hotel Food & Beverages](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: NO to pass the Emergency Clean Hotels legislation
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:27:51 PM

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

To The Board of Supervisors:

I am a San Francisco hotel employee and urge you not to pass the Emergency Clean Hotels legislation.

I am concerned that this would endanger jobs at my hotel and further delay the reopening of hotels.

My Hotel has been working for months on cleaning, disinfection and social distancing measures recommended by the CDC and the State Health Department, as well as the SF Health Department. These are based on science, not politics. As someone who works in a hotel, I believe the rules to create a healthy hotel environment should be written by medical and scientific experts in health departments. Please do not pass this proposed ordinance.

Thank you,

--

Isabela Maravilla / Restaurant Manager

The Orchard Hotel & The Orchard Garden Hotel

San Francisco, USA

Email | fb@theorchardhotels.com

Phone | (415) 365-0313

Cell | (415) 724-4293

From: [Travis Jay](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:29:41 PM

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

Hello.

My name is Travis Jay and I worked as Marketing Manager at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards. Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Best Regards,
Travis Jay

From: [Collins Chu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Hotel Cleaning Legislation
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:30:04 PM

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

To The Board of Supervisors:

I am a San Francisco hotel employee and urge you not to pass the Emergency Clean Hotels legislation.

I am concerned that this would endanger jobs at my hotel and further delay the reopening of hotels.

My Hotel has been working for months on cleaning, disinfection and social distancing measures recommended by the CDC and the State Health Department, as well as the SF Health Department. These are based on science, not politics. As someone who works in a hotel, I believe the rules to create a healthy hotel environment should be written by medical and scientific experts in health departments. Please do not pass this proposed ordinance.

Thank you

--

Collins Chu / Front Office Manager

The Orchard Hotel & The Orchard Garden Hotel

San Francisco, USA

Email | fom@theorchardhotels.com

Phone | (415) 362-8878

From: [Tyler Layton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:34:20 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Tyler Layton and I am the General Manager with Hotel Diva and Hotel Union Square. .

As a partner and vendor to many hotels in the City of San Francisco, my livelihood and my business's future depend upon the ability to re-open hotels. I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk of a disastrous economic ripple effect that could lead to permanent job loss and migration of our businesses and communities.

The effect across San Francisco would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

I strongly oppose this ordinance and beg of you to consider the larger economic impact.

Sincerely,

Tyler Layton
Complex General Manager
C: 408.891.1258
Hotel Union Square / Hotel Diva
440 Geary Street | San Francisco CA 94102
www.hotelunionsquare.com | www.hoteldiva.com



This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments

From: [Aric Briggle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Vote NO - Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:34:37 PM
Attachments: [image006.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

ARIC BRIGGLE
Regional Controller
One Ravinia Drive, Suite 1600 | Atlanta, GA 30346
Direct: 678.221.2161

abriggle@davidsonhotels.com
www.davidsonhotels.com | www.pivohotels.com



Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, may contain confidential information intended solely for the use of intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer and all copies and backups thereof.

From: [Bess Liboro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose the Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:36:09 PM

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

Hello. My name is Bess Liboro and I work as the Director of Sales for the Hotel Whitcomb.

I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. When we reopen to the public, I want our entire staff to feel safe in the work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for all hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of our employees are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly targeted hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and State health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are recommending to INCREASE associate exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of their job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests.

I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping thousands of hotel workers unemployed. The additional costs in your proposed ordinance will certainly keep our hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Many Thanks and have a great day,



Bess Liboro
Director of Sales
Hotel Whitcomb
1231 Market Street | San Francisco, CA 94103
P: (415) 487-4466
E: bliboro@hotelwhitcomb.com
www.hotelwhitcomb.com

-

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments

From: [johanna hurlock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Re-Open San Francisco's Hotels
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:37:07 PM

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

To The Board of Supervisors:

We have all been enduring this challenging time and for the most part, we San Franciscans have done a very good job staying safe. Our COVID-19 cases and deaths have been low due to our adherence. Please consider allowing our hotels to reopen.

Recently, I stayed five days at a hotel in Ventura County, and found it to be a safe experience: masks were required, hand sanitizer stations everywhere, limited people in elevators, maid service as requested, no food service, exercise equipment placed outdoors, 48 hours between room turns, plexiglass at the check-in desk, cleaning crews wiping and mopping. And, these were just what I observed. I felt more safe there than I feel walking down Union and Chestnut Street these days which feels like Spring Break.

Additionally, I am in the hospitality business, and have been placed on furlough. If the City's hotels do not open soon, this 61 year old will never get her job back. And, at my age, it will become almost impossible to find other employment.

Please allow our hotels to re-open. It can be done safely!

Kind regards,

Johanna Hurlock

1916 Vallejo St. 94123

435.901.2552

From: [Gonzalez, Irelis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:59:02 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-Gold State.png](#)

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

Hello. My name is Irelis Gonzalez and I worked as Bars and Restaurant Manager at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Best Regards,
IRELIS GONZALEZ


Bars and restaurant manager / W SAN FRANCISCO

181 Third Street / San Francisco, CA 94103

T 939.272.4955 / E irelis.gonzalez@whotels.com

EXPLORE WHAT'S NEW / NEXT AT W HOTELS WORLDWIDE

whotels.com / facebook.com/wsanfrancisco / twitter.com/wsanfrancisco / Instagram [@wsanfrancisco](https://www.instagram.com/wsanfrancisco) & [@tracewsf](https://www.instagram.com/tracewsf)



From: [Mary Grace Arellano](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Villa Florence Hotel San Francisco
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:10:48 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Hello,

My name is Mary Arellano and I worked as Hotel Manager at the Villa Florence Hotel. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Stay safe and healthy,

MARY ARELLANO
HOTEL MANAGER

VILLA FLORENCE SAN FRANCISCO

225 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.villaflorence.com

H 415.397.7700

D 415.397.1081

F 415.397.1006

E MArellano@villaflorence.com

From: [Farmer, Mary](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:12:35 PM

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

I am writing to express my opposition to the ordinance for the Hotel Industry. The hospitality industry, specifically in San Francisco proper, has been hit so severely relative to the rest of the country. While efforts to curb Covid-19 have been positive as a result of your leadership – I must express that tighter restrictions on this fragile industry will only negatively impact the hotel industry to such a significant extent, that many hotels will not be able to bounce back.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Farmer

From: [Nina Pham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Hotels & Tourism
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:20:14 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

My name is Nina Pham and I am the friend of Vicky He, who works at the Harbor Court Hotel as an Accounting Manager. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. Her hotel is currently closed. I want her hotel to reopen and call her back to work, and when that happens, I want her to feel safe in her work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of her co-workers are out of work. They were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing her exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating that she enters occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of her job but a #1 priority for her hotel so they can serve their guests. I am disappointed that they were not part of the conversation that is keeping my friend unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep her hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Nina Pham

From: [Jon Handlery](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:28:37 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am extremely concerned about this new Emergency Ordinance that was passed last Tuesday by the Land Use Committee. The health and safety of our employees and guests are paramount and my number one priority before re-opening our hotel. These rules developed by the supervisors of the ordinance should have been reviewed and determined by the medical staff at the Department of Health. We already have guidelines that were created in collaboration with the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging Association and the American Hotel and Lodging Association. The hotel industry has in the past and in the future will maintain the highest level of safe and clean protocols for the benefit of our employees and guests. I feel this ordinance will increase contact between our employees and guests and is counter to the recommendations by health experts and our Governor to practice safe distancing. We've already seen a surge in new COVID 19 cases because of loosening of social distancing. If this ordinance should be passed it would seriously hinder my ability to open my hotel again both from a health concern but also would put me back in the same economic situation that lead to the closing our family run hotel for the first time in its 112 year history. We want to bring our employees back to our hotels but should you pass this, it will only lead to them remaining on the unemployment line.

Sincerely,

Jon S. Handlery
President
Handlery Hotels, Inc.
351 Geary Street
San Francisco, Ca 94102
www.handlery.com
Telephone: 1-415-781-7800
Fax: 1-415-362-1157
"Creating great experiences"

From: [Eric Williams](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:28:37 PM

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

Hello. My name is Eric Williams and I work as the Director of Sales and Marketing for the Hotel Whitcomb.

I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. When we reopen to the public, I want our entire staff to feel safe in the work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for all hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of our employees are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly targeted hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.



Federal and State health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are recommending to INCREASE associate exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating they enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of their job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests.

I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping thousands of hotel workers unemployed. The additional costs in your proposed ordinance will certainly keep our hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Eric Williams
Director of Sales and Marketing
Hotel Whitcomb
1231 Market Street | San Francisco, CA 94103
P: (415) 487-4468
E: ewilliams@hotelwhitcomb.com
www.hotelwhitcomb.com

-

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is

strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments

From: [Stephanie Chui](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save San Francisco Hotels & Tourism
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:28:58 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors (Mayor Breed),

My name is Stephanie Chui and I am the friend of Vicky He, who works at the Harbor Court Hotel as an Accounting Manager. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. Her hotel is currently closed. I want her hotel to reopen and call her back to work, and when that happens, I want her to feel safe in her work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of her co-workers are out of work. They were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of her job but a #1 priority for her hotel so they can serve their guests. I am disappointed that they were not part of the conversation that is keeping my friend unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep her hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Chui

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jane Hopley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:29:27 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Jane Hopley | Director of Revenue Management

435 6th Avenue San Diego, CA 92101

Dir: 619.248.6241

www.hotelsolamar.com | www.jsixrestaurant.com



From: [Aly W](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Business Ordinance- Save San Francisco Hotels & Tourism
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:50:41 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors (Mayor Breed),

My name is Alyssa Wu and I am the friend of Vicky He, who works at the Harbor Court Hotel as an Accounting Manager. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. Her hotel is currently closed. I want her hotel to reopen and call her back to work, and when that happens, I want her to feel safe in her work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of her co-workers are out of work. They were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This unfair ordinance attacks not only hotels workers, but target minority groups, especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing her exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating the employees to enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of her job but a #1 priority for her hotel so they can serve their guests. I am disappointed that they were not part of the conversation that is keeping my friend unemployed and affecting her family. These additional costs will certainly keep her hotel closed longer than previously planned.

Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Wu

From: anamejia1212@yahoo.co.uk
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Health Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:03:03 PM

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

Hello. Board of San Francisco Supervisor, My name is, Ana Mejia and I worked as Director of Housekeeping at the Hotel Zelos at 12 Fourth street . I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. **Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.**

If you have any question you can reach at any time either by email, phone or mail at :286 Hahn Street San Francisco CA, 94134 # (415)312-5921

Att. Ana Mejia.

From: [Joseph Bojanowski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:04:16 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk.

I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Regards,

JOSEPH BOJANOWSKI
President
PM HOTEL GROUP

From: [Ford, John \(GM\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:21:36 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

John Ford

From: [nicolas.althuser](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:26:11 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Nicolas Althuser and I worked as Bars and Restaurant Manager at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Atte,

Nicolas Althuser

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Bennett, Jim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No on Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:30:47 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Jim Bennett

Director of Engineering, **ME FMA**

From: [juan robledo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:32:27 PM

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

Hello. My name is [___Juan Carlos robledo___] and I worked as [waiter] at (Argonath hotels). I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

From: [Mike Walsh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Help Us Put Employees Back To Work
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:32:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Viceroy Hotel Group's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

The COVID-19 pandemic has closed our hotels for more than three months. As a management company, we have been working day in and day out preparing readiness plans to reopen and re-start the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Through the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines and Governor Newsom, the California Department of Public Health and San Francisco's public health office to develop safety standards that exceed any other industry, short of hospitals. We are following our own brand/owner guidelines closely to ensure your safety. They include:

- Customized plans for employee safety trainings
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning directions that keep employees and guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees when they return to work on enhanced cleaning protocols

Unfortunately, we face roadblocks from you, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and union leaders, who have created re-opening standards that would prevent us from bringing our colleagues back to work, delay guests from returning to our hotels and risk our future in San Francisco. The ordinance will result in much higher costs from mandated continuous cleaning for areas which have been determined to be unnecessary as determined by the CDC such as walls, windows, drapes, floors, etc. Their cleaning protocols are regardless of need, and mandate daily room cleaning. We would need to achieve much higher occupancy levels to have a viable operation. To cover these costs, we would have to generate 30 to 40 more points of occupancy. And we all know there is virtually no demand currently in San Francisco for the next 30, 60, 90 days nor any encouraging signs for business in Q1 2021.

We're prepared, we're safe and we want to reopen. Once again, we want to restart the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Mike Walsh | Chief Operating Officer

Viceroy Hotel Group

T 323 930 3736 M 323 365 8949

E mike.walsh@viceroyhotelgroup.com

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Follow us [@ViceroyHotels](https://www.instagram.com/ViceroyHotels)



From: walkerdca@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:37:56 PM

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

Dear Sirs and Madams:

My name is Diana Walker and I live and work in San Francisco. I am an employee that works as a PBX operator/Guest Services agent at Hotel Vitale which is currently closed due to the Covid19 pandemic. I desperately want to return to work and understand the reasons for the current hotel closures, however I do believe the current Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance is unnecessary and may do more damage than good. Passing this ordinance will cause even more economic hardship and stress on individuals and families that are already struggling with the current shelter in place and business closures. Please reconsider putting this ordinance in place.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Diana Walker
415.519.4968

From: [Nixon, Sharon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Vote No on Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:41:20 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Sharon Nixon

Sharon M. Nixon, SPHR-SCP

Director of Human Resources

THE WESTIN SAN DIEGO GASLAMP QUARTER

910 Broadway Circle
San Diego, CA 92101, USA
westin.com/gaslampquarter

T +1 619.610.8980 M +1 619.847.2390

[FACEBOOK](#) | [TWITTER](#) | [INSTAGRAM](#) | [TRIPADVISOR](#)

Apply for an job opportunity via the internet at <http://www.careers.marriott.com>

From: [Sam Torgerson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please - help us put San Francisco employees back to work quickly
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:47:25 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

Viceroy Hotel Group manages four hotels in the heart of the San Francisco Union Square area, which employ hundreds of colleagues (in our hospitality industry – we call them colleagues, not employees).

Unfortunately, the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638 is creating significant challenges for us in trying to bring them back to work. The hospitality industry would not be possible if the health and safety of our employees and guests weren't our first priority – we are hosts, first and always - but it is reasonable to express that health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health (and should not be by the Board of Supervisors).

We are following our own brand/owner guidelines all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines closely to ensure your safety, and they include:

- Customized plans for employee safety trainings
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning directions that keep employees and guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees when they return to work on enhanced cleaning protocols

Unfortunately, we face roadblocks from you, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and union leaders, who have created re-opening standards that would prevent us from bringing our colleagues back to work, delay guests from returning to our hotels and risk our future in San Francisco. The ordinance will result in much higher costs from mandated continuous cleaning for areas which have been determined to be unnecessary as determined by the CDC such as walls, windows, drapes, floors, etc. Their cleaning protocols are regardless of need, and mandate daily room cleaning. We would need to achieve much higher occupancy levels to have a viable operation. To cover these costs, we would have to generate 30 to 40 more points of occupancy. And we all know there is virtually no demand currently in San Francisco for the next 30, 60, 90 days nor any encouraging signs for business in Q1 2021.

We're prepared, we're safe and we want to reopen. Once again, we want to restart the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the

guidance.

Thank you,

Sam

Sam Torgerson | Director of Global Sales

Viceroy Hotel Group

M 970 390 8903

E sam.torgerson@viceroyhotelgroup.com

750 North San Vicente Boulevard – East, Suite 1000

West Hollywood, CA 90069

#RememberToLive | Follow us @ViceroyHotels



From: [Kate Foster, CMP, CWC](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: NO vote on Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:57:01 PM

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

The Healthy Building Ordinance would put undue financial burden on dozens of hotels in the San Francisco area. These unproven and excessive sanitation restrictions will have far greater negative impact than the potential spread of the COVID infection. Many of my clients in the SF area would have their business devastated with this ordinance. I beg you to vote NOT on The Healthy Building Ordinance July 7th.

Thank you in advance,

Kate Foster, CWC, CMP
Hospitality Marketing Solutions, Inc.
President

Greater Los Angeles Area
1-800-856-5075
www.hospitalitymarketingsolutions.com

From: [Said Mohamed](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:05:51 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Said Mohamed
yoyoakabeth@yahoo.com
1602 jetty dr
Richmond California , California 94804

From: [Roberto Vizcaino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Help Us Put Employees Back To Work
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:08:30 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Viceroy Hotel Group's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

The COVID-19 pandemic has closed our hotels for more than three months. As a management company, we have been working day in and day out preparing readiness plans to reopen and re-start the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Through the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines and Governor Newsom, the California Department of Public Health and San Francisco's public health office to develop safety standards that exceed any other industry, short of hospitals. We are following our own brand/owner guidelines closely to ensure your safety. They include:

- Customized plans for employee safety trainings
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning directions that keep employees and guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees when they return to work on enhanced cleaning protocols

Unfortunately, we face roadblocks from you, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and union leaders, who have created re-opening standards that would prevent us from bringing our colleagues back to work, delay guests from returning to our hotels and risk our future in San Francisco. The ordinance will result in much higher costs from mandated continuous cleaning for areas which have been determined to be unnecessary as determined by the CDC such as walls, windows, drapes, floors, etc. Their cleaning protocols are regardless of need, and mandate daily room cleaning. We would need to achieve much higher occupancy levels to have a viable operation. To cover these costs, we would have to generate 30 to 40 more points of occupancy. And we all know there is virtually no demand currently in San Francisco for the next 30, 60, 90 days nor any encouraging signs for business in Q1 2021.

We're prepared, we're safe and we want to reopen. Once again, we want to restart the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Roberto Vizcaino | Vice President, Learning & Development

VICEROY HOTEL GROUP

T +1 323 930 3730 M +1 213 361 2292

E Roberto.Vizcaino@viceroyhotelgroup.com

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Follow us [@ViceroyHotels](#)

signature_717640532



From: [Vivian Peng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:15:04 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,
Vivian Peng

Vivian Peng
vivianpeng212@gmail.com
59 Vienna Street
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Randy Wilson](#)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:16:10 PM

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

Sample email to send-

Hello. My name is Randall Wilson and I worked as a food service employee at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly targets hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

--

RANDALL WILSON

Director of Food and Beverage
T + 415 296 2924 F + 415 296 2919

N 37° 47' W 122° 24'

N 37° 47' W 122° 24'

LE MERIDIEN SAN FRANCISCO 333 Battery Street | San Francisco, CA 94111 USA

Winter_email banner LF



From: [Moses Villanueva](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:16:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,
Moses Villanueva

Moses Villanueva
mosesdumdumaya@gmail.com
761 Girard Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [loc mai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Concerns - Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:16:40 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Loc Mai and I worked as Engineer at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Best regards,
Loc Mai

From: [Ai Tang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:20:23 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Ai Tang and I worked Office Coordinator at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Best wishes,
Ai Tang

From: [Thomas Joubert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:22:03 PM
Attachments: [LSF 2017_sophisticationreinterpreted.png](#)

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

Hello. My name is Thomas Joubert and I worked as the Director of Housekeeping at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

I implore you to respect all of the hotel workers in San Francisco and let out voices be heard through this process.

Respectfully,
Thomas Joubert

--

THOMAS JOUBERT

Executive Director of Housekeeping

T + 415 296 2970 F + 415 296 2939

N 37° 47' W 122° 24'

LE MERIDIEN

SAN FRANCISCO

333 Battery Street | San Francisco, CA 94111 USA

lemeridien.com



From: [Lynn Mohrfeld](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File # 200638 Comments
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:23:32 PM
Attachments: [Cal-OSHA Opinion on SF Healthy Buildings Ordinance 07-06-20.pdf](#)

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

To Whom It May Concern:

Please see that the attached letter is provided to the Board of Supervisors in advance of tomorrow's meeting.

Thank you –

Lynn

Lynn S. Mohrfeld, CAE
President & CEO

CA Hotel & Lodging Assn. - www.calodging.com

Office: 916.554.2664 | Mobile: 916.799.4592

**A. Lennox Welsh, Attorney
3060 El Cerrito Plaza, No. 262
El Cerrito, CA 94530
415-850-4085
lenwelsh@berkeley.edu**

6 July 2020

Lynn S. Mohrfeld, CAE
President and CEO
California Hotel and Lodging Association
414 29th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816-3211

Dear Mr. Mohrfeld:

You have asked me to review an emergency ordinance proposed by the City and County Board of Supervisors Pekin, Safari, Walton, and Preston entitled "*Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings*," File No.200638, and to provide my opinion on whether any parts of it appear unnecessary to minimize the risk of hotel guests or employees from becoming infected with SARS-CoV-2, commonly referred to as the coronavirus, producing the disease officially named COVID-19.

This proposed ordinance, which was amended in the Land Use and Transportation Committee on June 29, 2020, is informally referred to as the "Healthy Buildings Ordinance."

The following is my opinion:

At the outset, it is important to understand that protecting against any environmental hazard is a matter of reducing risk to the extent reasonably possible. Arriving at reasonably acceptable risk is a matter of balancing the protection sought to be gained against the availability and feasibility of protective measures and equipment. It is for this reason that the California Department of Public Health guidance on preventing exposure to the coronavirus mandates the wearing of masks as a measure the wearer can take to protect others in case he or she is infected, as well as to protect the wearer.

Due to considerations of availability of personal protective equipment that may be more effective as well as the likelihood of people complying with the advice given, the mandate has not gone as far as specifying the material to be used as a mask or how the mask is designed, other than to state that the nose and mouth should be covered,

Lynn S. Mohrfeld, CAE
6 July 2020
Page two

and if a respirator is used as a mask, that it should not have a valve that releases unfiltered exhalation air.

Compliance with this masking advice and with other measures like social distancing will reduce risk, but we should all have a clear understanding that this is a matter of risk reduction, not absolute protection.

That said, the following are my observations about the proposed San Francisco Emergency Ordinance.

There are two provisions that stand out as being unnecessary and possibly likely to *increase* the risk of disease transmission, as follows:

Daily Guest Room Cleaning - Section (4)(e)(1)

This provision states that:

“[a]ll surfaces in Tourist Hotel guest rooms that have been occupied in the preceding 24 hours shall be cleaned and disinfected on a daily basis, unless the guest requests otherwise.”

It appears the intent of this provision is to require daily cleaning even for occupants who continue in a room for more than one day unless they request that daily cleaning not be performed. However, I do not see any reason to disallow what I understand is a current, commonly employed hotel policy of encouraging occupants to forego daily cleaning when they are staying for more than one day. Such cleaning is unlikely to reduce occupant exposure to the coronavirus, and if it were, we would probably be seeing government guidance to the effect that wherever a person resides, they should be cleaning their premises daily to reduce risk.

This policy, to the extent it results in a greater frequency of room cleaning by staff, will also unnecessarily cause the staff performing cleaning services to be exposed to greater workload pressure, to cleaning materials, and potentially to the risk of exposure to the coronavirus.

I also expect this language will be amended to make it clearer that guestrooms will always be cleaned before a new occupant enters.

Lynn S. Mohrfeld, CAE
6 July 2020
Page three

Door and Door Handle Cleaning - Section (4)(d)(7)

This provision states that:

“[d]oors and door handles at all exterior entrances, and door handles at interior entrances regularly accessed by multiple Employees and guests” must be cleaned and disinfected multiple times daily...”

I do not see a benefit to be gained by cleaning exterior doors, and similarly, I question the benefit to be derived from cleaning interior door handles other than as part of standard room-cleaning procedures that precede a new occupant's first entry into the room. In my view, compliance with these proposed requirements is likely to create unnecessary work for staff and unnecessary staff exposure to occupants, while being unlikely to reduce exposure to the coronavirus.

To summarize, it is generally a prudent practice to be cleaning surfaces where there is a significant chance the surface may be contaminated and that the surface will be contacted in a way that transmits the virus if not cleaned. Cleaning surfaces that are not likely to transmit the virus is not advisable, because the act of cleaning carries some likelihood that the person doing it will be doing so with other people in proximity who may be symptom free but still infectious.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the above.

Sincerely,



Len Welsh

From: [Kat S.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: hotels
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:27:43 PM

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

Hello. My name is Katherine Szeto and I worked as a communications agent at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my colleagues are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotel workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Alysia Briggs](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:27:59 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 on behalf of Viceroy Hotel Group and our strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638.

We as a management company have seen first hand how COVID-19 has impacted our industry and put so many of our valued colleagues out of work. Our main focus over the past few months while our hotels have been closed, has been to conduct as much research as possible to set up the most stringent Stand Operating Procedures and ensure that upon reopening our colleague would be returning to safe work place. This research has been done through the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines as well as Governor Newsom, the California Department of Public Health and San Francisco's public health office. We put together an entire task force to develop safety standards based on these guidelines that exceed any other industry, short of hospitals.

We want to bring our colleagues back to work, and we assure you that their safety is our first priority. This ordinance will create an unnecessary protocols that would be a road block and hinder our ability to reopen our hotels and bring some 200 colleagues of San Francisco back to work. For example, experts have already stated that it is much safer to have guest room left vacant for 24-48 hours after a guest checks out, yet this ordinance would require daily cleanings which then is exposing our colleagues unnecessarily.

We urge you to vote NO on this ordinance and allow us to continue to listen to the experts with regards to the safest way to reopen hotels in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Alysia Briggs

Alysia Briggs | VP, Human Resources
Viceroy Hotel Group

T +1 323-330-2206 **M** +1 323-363-6766

E alysia.briggs@viceroyhotelgroup.com

750 North San Vicente Boulevard – East, Suite 1000

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Follow us [@ViceroyHotels](https://www.instagram.com/ViceroyHotels)



VICEROY

VIBE WITH #VICEROYATHOME
MUSIC, RECIPES & MORE

EXPLORE NOW

The banner is a horizontal rectangle with a thin gold border. On the left, the word "VICEROY" is written in a gold, serif font. In the center is a black and white photograph of a woman and a man sitting up in bed. The woman is on the left, wearing a dark top and shorts, talking on a mobile phone. The man is on the right, wearing a dark shirt and shorts, reading a magazine. A tray with a glass of water and a bottle is on a table in front of them. On the right side of the banner, the text "VIBE WITH #VICEROYATHOME" is in a bold, black, sans-serif font, with "MUSIC, RECIPES & MORE" in a smaller font below it. At the bottom right, there is a gold rectangular button with the text "EXPLORE NOW" in black, sans-serif font.

From: [Kevin Steindler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance - Vote No
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:32:27 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

KEVIN STEINDLER
Assistant General Manager
Kevin.Steindler@achotelsunnyvale.com

AC HOTELS BY MARRIOTT SUNNYVALE CUPERTINO
597 E EL CAMINO REAL, SUNNYVALE, CA 94087



From: [Scott Muety](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Work smarter, not harder
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:35:11 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing today to express my opposition, and Viceroy Hotel Group's opposition, to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health & safety of our guests, colleagues, and family members is of the utmost importance. The tourism industry, like all industries, lost many jobs because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Fear not, this industry is ready to listen, learn, adapt and embrace the changes needed. Guidance to defeat a pandemic **must incorporate expertise from medical experts**, and we are lucky to have organizations that acknowledge this cornerstone. Some of these organizations include the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and the American Hotel & Lodging Association. Each of those organizations has liaised with reputable and recognized medical experts to deploy health and safety guidelines of the future. Some changes include:

- Customized plans for employee safety training
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing protocol and signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning instructions that keep employees **and** guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees returning to work on enhanced cleaning protocols.

Unfortunately, your ordinance File #200638 erodes the great progress our industry has already made therefore delaying our ability to bring colleagues back to work. We are ready today to open our doors, we have a couple hundred employees wishing to work today. Additionally, we have couple hundred more ready to start work when stronger demand returns and occupancy rises.

Your ordinance puts employees in harm's way, by forcing them to work in confined spaces inhabited by guests. Medical experts and Tourism associations oppose your guidance, and instead suggest limiting entering inhabited spaces until a waiting period at least 24 hours. Our employees do not want to be put in harm's way.

Your ordinance is a burden too great for any business to 'not lose more money' than they already have. It is not feasible to clean public spaces every 30 minutes. We all agree increased cleaning is a necessity, but where does 30 minutes come from? Is the city cleaning public office lobbies every 30 minutes? Are public transportation vehicles and terminals cleaned every 30 minutes? No, they are not. Passing this ordinance does not make spaces cleaner, and instead puts too many businesses in jeopardy of forever closing its doors, resulting in lost jobs for many many months to come.

We are prepared. We are safe. We want to open. We want to work. 200 of my colleagues want to

work.

We support the guidance of Medical Experts. We oppose this ordinance.

Thank you,
Scott

Scott Muety | VP, Revenue Management

Viceroy Hotel Group

M 212 882 1090

E scott.muety@viceroyhotelgroup.com

#RememberToLive | Follow us [@ViceroyHotels](https://www.instagram.com/ViceroyHotels)



From: [KACI MATSUYAMA](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:39:56 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Kaci Matsuyama and I worked as an Assistant Director of Finance at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Health Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to open and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not enforced by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotel workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job, but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,
Kaci Matsuyama

From: [Taylor Kralovenec](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Help Us Put Our Colleagues Back To Work
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:44:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Viceroy Hotel Group's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our colleagues and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

The COVID-19 pandemic has closed our hotels for more than three months. As a management company, we have been working day in and day out preparing readiness plans to reopen and re-start the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Through the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines and Governor Newsom, the California Department of Public Health and San Francisco's public health office to develop safety standards that exceed any other industry, short of hospitals. We are following our own brand/owner guidelines closely to ensure your safety. They include:

- Customized plans for employee safety trainings
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning directions that keep employees and guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees when they return to work on enhanced cleaning protocols

Unfortunately, we face roadblocks from you, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and union leaders, who have created re-opening standards that would prevent us from bringing our colleagues back to work, delay guests from returning to our hotels and risk our future in San Francisco. The ordinance will result in much higher costs from mandated continuous cleaning for areas which have been determined to be unnecessary as determined by the CDC such as walls, windows, drapes, floors, etc. Their cleaning protocols are regardless of need, and mandate daily room cleaning. We would need to achieve much higher occupancy levels to have a viable operation. To cover these costs, we would have to generate 30 to 40 more points of occupancy. And we all know there is virtually no demand currently in San Francisco for the next 30, 60, 90 days nor any encouraging signs for business in Q1 2021.

We're prepared, we're safe and we want to reopen. Once again, we want to restart the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Thank you,

Taylor Kralovenec

Taylor Kralovenec | Human Resources Manager
Viceroy Hotel Group

T +1 323 330 2262

E taylor.kralovenec@viceroyhotelgroup.com

750 North San Vicente Boulevard – East, Suite 1000

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Follow us [@ViceroyHotels](https://www.instagram.com/ViceroyHotels)



A promotional banner for Viceroy Hotels. On the left, the word "VICEROY" is written in a gold, serif font. In the center is a black and white photograph of a woman sitting on a bed, talking on a mobile phone, while a man sits next to her reading a magazine. On the right, the text "VIBE WITH #VICEROYATHOME" is displayed in a bold, sans-serif font, with "MUSIC, RECIPES & MORE" underneath it. Below this text is a gold button with the words "EXPLORE NOW" in white, uppercase letters.

From: [Amanda Allan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Help Us Bring Our Colleagues Back To Work
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:48:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Viceroy Hotel Group's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our colleagues and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

The COVID-19 pandemic has closed our hotels for more than three months. As a management company, we have been working day in and day out preparing readiness plans to reopen and re-start the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Through the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines and Governor Newsom, the California Department of Public Health and San Francisco's public health office to develop safety standards that exceed any other industry, short of hospitals. We are following our own brand/owner guidelines closely to ensure your safety. They include:

- Customized plans for employee safety trainings
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning directions that keep employees and guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees when they return to work on enhanced cleaning protocols

Unfortunately, we face roadblocks from you, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and union leaders, who have created re-opening standards that would prevent us from bringing our colleagues back to work, delay guests from returning to our hotels and risk our future in San Francisco. The ordinance will result in much higher costs from mandated continuous cleaning for areas which have been determined to be unnecessary as determined by the CDC such as walls, windows, drapes, floors, etc. Their cleaning protocols are regardless of need, and mandate daily room cleaning. We would need to achieve much higher occupancy levels to have a viable operation. To cover these costs, we would have to generate 30 to 40 more points of occupancy. And we all know there is virtually no demand currently in San Francisco for the next 30, 60, 90 days nor any encouraging signs for business in Q1 2021.

We're prepared, we're safe and we want to reopen. Once again, we want to restart the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Amanda Allan | AVP, Head of Compensation & Benefits

Viceroy Hotel Group

T +1 323 330 2220

E amanda.allan@viceroyhotelgroup.com

750 North San Vicente Boulevard – East, Suite 1000

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Follow us [@ViceroyHotels](https://www.instagram.com/ViceroyHotels)



From: [Marc Intermaggio](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Colfax, Grant \(DPH\)](#); [Aragon, Tomas \(DPH\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Torres, Joaquin \(ECN\)](#); kevin@hotelcouncilsf.org; [Rodney Fong](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance - Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings, File #200638
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:54:30 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[Emergency Ordinance Letter.pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) of San Francisco remains opposed to the proposed emergency ordinance on cleaning and disease prevention standards in tourist hotels and large commercial office buildings.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional input to the above-referenced proposed legislation. BOMA San Francisco members own, operate and service 75 million square feet of office space. Although our buildings were 96% occupied in March, San Francisco's office occupancy has dropped to five percent at best. When buildings are fully occupied, our members spend \$1.5 billion annually to operate and service them, benefitting businesses in dozens of categories and their employees, who in turn, support other businesses throughout our community. The cost burden of this proposed ordinance will make it more difficult for us to bring building service firms and office tenants back downtown, and without those tenants and the employees working for the companies providing products and services to office buildings, there won't be people to patronize sandwich shops, restaurants, copy shops, coffee joints and any manner of other small businesses that provide jobs and tax revenue to the City.

We first expressed our objections in our June 24, 2020 communication that was made part of the public hearing record (thank you). While we are appreciative of certain amendments that were made as a result of that hearing, most particularly changing the required cleaning frequency from "at least every 30 minutes" to "multiple times daily", many of our original concerns remain and we respectfully remain opposed to the proposed ordinance.

- This ordinance is redundant when we have guidance from agencies such as Cal/OSHA and the California Department of Public Health covering the same topics. Having multiple authorities issuing guidance and standards is confusing and accomplishes little. The other agencies are the ones tasked by law with issuing this type of guidance and they have done so and the City should be aligned with these health authorities.
- The fact that SFHD just issued new Office Facility guidelines on June 13th further confuses as to why this new 'emergency' order is being considered.
- The exemption for buildings owned by governments is an acknowledgement that compliance

with this ordinance will be burdensome and very expensive, so the City does not want to impose those burdens on itself. It is ironic that the building in which this ordinance has been drafted is exempt from that ordinance, which is being imposed on all *but* public, government buildings.

- We certainly share your concern for ensuring the public safety in buildings, but there are already multiple guidance documents from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), and San Francisco's Department of Public Health (DPH), and property managers and tenants are following them.
- The private cause of action for employees to enforce violations in court is unnecessary with all of the worker protections already in existence. This is burdensome and redundant. This is in contrast with both state and federal whistleblower programs, which call for an administrative fact-finding process, with appeals to administrative judges and then to court as a last resort. Furthermore, the enforcement provision is not limited to retaliation; it creates a right for an employee to bring an action of any violation of the EO in court, to be awarded damages, including a penalty of \$1,000 per violation, exemplary damages, and attorney fees. This is clearly creating a whole separate enforcement regime from the authorized Cal/OSHA system of inspections, enforcement and penalties, undercutting that program, and is likely not acceptable to either Cal/OSHA or federal OSHA. California went through this years ago with Proposition 65, when federal OSHA said that the occupational exposure arm of Proposition 65 could not lawfully be implemented until Cal/OSHA adopted regulations addressing Proposition 65 in the context of workplace exposures and federal OSHA approved those regulations with notice in the Federal Register. Violations of occupational safety standards belong in the Cal/OSHA system, not the courts.
- The increased costs that will result from this unnecessary ordinance will likely force further layoffs, as the reduced occupancy of buildings continues across 2020 and into 2021. Put simply, there is not enough cash flow to afford the increased operating costs, and owners will seek to reduce that cost burden. For example, while most buildings have kept janitors at pre-lock down full staffing levels, this new ordinance will only accelerate and increase the likelihood of staffing reductions. It's a simple fact of life: reduced operating revenue will lead to reduced staffing.
- The definition of large buildings as greater than 50,000 square feet is problematic. There are many buildings in the lower end of this size range that simply won't be able to operationally accomplish the ordinance's intent. In a smaller property, cleaning costs would jump by 25% just by having to hire one additional day porter.
- The ordinance is asking for regular cleaning and disinfection of "High-contact" areas. Is this just during business hours? A full-time, union day porter costs approximately \$8K per month. Depending on the interpretation of "regular cleaning", if buildings are to maintain restrooms, elevators and stairwells, they could be required to hire at least 3 additional day porters. That's an additional and unbudgeted expense of \$24K a month. This is simply not reasonable.

- Ultimately, tenants will foot the bill for these increased costs, and it's just another reason to drive office occupancy lower. Many buildings have tenants who have not occupied their space since March 17th. These tenants have been begrudgingly paying base rent and Operating Expenses every month. If we are now expected to hand them a bill for this additional expense, it's another major impediment to San Francisco's economic recovery.

As to operational impacts to office buildings, please understand these additional concerns:

- Chemicals which disinfect must often be left on surfaces for a period of time to be effective, i.e., 5+ minutes. If occupants are in the building during cleaning, this won't be feasible. Other options include using much stronger chemicals which can have negative impacts of their own when left on surfaces such as desks and high touch areas.
- This so-called "Healthy Building" ordinance is introducing new environmental health concerns due to the frequency and amount of locations where disinfectant cleaning product will be used (i.e., flooring and walls).
- Cleaning elevators completely - floors, walls, ceilings - several times a day will take those cars out of service while being cleaned and lead to passengers being further delayed (because of existing wait times due to social distancing), thus adding even more persons congregating together.
- The cost to completely clean fire stairwells multiple times a day (including floors) will simply lead to fire stairs being closed off again. Handrails are already being cleaned in those fire stairwells where tenants are being allowed to travel.
- It is unclear how soon the required number of janitorial personnel can be trained and available for this new requirement.
- Disinfecting carpets multiple times a day is not physically possible in any practical way during the day, when people are in occupancy. The same is true with disinfecting lobby floors and other common area floors multiple times a day - this is a safety concern due to increase of slipping while floors dry.
- Disinfecting windows? Several times a day? Not sure how that is going to happen in a high rise office building. Cleaning interior windows is usually one once per year by a crew of window washers and takes anywhere from 1 to 3 days to complete.

Please reject this proposed ordinance. It is redundant in many respects, not necessary, and will further cripple local employers to the further detriment of San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Marc Intermaggio, CAE
Executive Vice President, BOMA San Francisco

Marc Intermaggio, CAE
Executive Vice President, BOMA San Francisco
Executive Director & CEO, BOMA San Francisco Foundation
233 Sansome Street, 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104-2314
P: 415-362-8567, ext. 1117
E: mli@boma.com
<http://www.bomasf.org>
<http://www.createworkforce.org>





July 6, 2020

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

Re: Opposition to Emergency Ordinance - Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings, File #200638

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional input to the above-referenced proposed legislation. BOMA San Francisco members own, operate and service 75 million square feet of office space. Although our buildings were 96% occupied in March, San Francisco's office occupancy has dropped to five percent at best. When buildings are fully occupied, our members spend \$1.5 billion annually to operate and service them, benefitting businesses in dozens of categories and their employees, who in turn, support other businesses throughout our community. The cost burden of this proposed ordinance will make it more difficult for us to bring building service firms and office tenants back downtown, and without those tenants and the employees working for the companies providing products and services to office buildings, there won't be people to patronize sandwich shops, restaurants, copy shops, coffee joints and any manner of other small businesses that provide jobs and tax revenue to the City.

We first expressed our objections in our June 24, 2020 communication that was made part of the public hearing record (thank you). While we are appreciative of certain amendments that were made as a result of that hearing, most particularly changing the required cleaning frequency from "at least every 30 minutes" to "multiple times daily", many of our original concerns remain and we respectfully remain opposed to the proposed ordinance.

- This ordinance is redundant when we have guidance from agencies such as Cal/OSHA and the California Department of Public Health covering the same topics. Having multiple authorities issuing guidance and standards is confusing and accomplishes little. The other agencies are the ones tasked by law with issuing this type of guidance and they have done so and the City should be aligned with these health authorities.
- The fact that SFHD just issued new Office Facility guidelines on June 13th further confuses as to why this new 'emergency' order is being considered.
- The exemption for buildings owned by governments is an acknowledgement that compliance with this ordinance will be burdensome and very expensive, so the City does not want to impose those burdens on itself. It is ironic that the building in which this ordinance has been drafted is exempt from that ordinance, which is being imposed on all *but* public, government buildings.
- We certainly share your concern for ensuring the public safety in buildings, but there are already multiple guidance documents from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), California Department of



Opposition to Emergency Ordinance - Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings

Page two

Public Health (CDPH), and San Francisco's Department of Public Health (DPH), and property managers and tenants are following them.

- The private cause of action for employees to enforce violations in court is unnecessary with all of the worker protections already in existence. This is burdensome and redundant. This is in contrast with both state and federal whistleblower programs, which call for an administrative fact-finding process, with appeals to administrative judges and then to court as a last resort. Furthermore, the enforcement provision is not limited to retaliation; it creates a right for an employee to bring an action of any violation of the EO in court, to be awarded damages, including a penalty of \$1,000 per violation, exemplary damages, and attorney fees. This is clearly creating a whole separate enforcement regime from the authorized Cal/OSHA system of inspections, enforcement and penalties, undercutting that program, and is likely not acceptable to either Cal/OSHA or federal OSHA. California went through this years ago with Proposition 65, when federal OSHA said that the occupational exposure arm of Proposition 65 could not lawfully be implemented until Cal/OSHA adopted regulations addressing Proposition 65 in the context of workplace exposures and federal OSHA approved those regulations with notice in the Federal Register. Violations of occupational safety standards belong in the Cal/OSHA system, not the courts.
- The increased costs that will result from this unnecessary ordinance will likely force further layoffs, as the reduced occupancy of buildings continues across 2020 and into 2021. Put simply, there is not enough cash flow to afford the increased operating costs, and owners will seek to reduce that cost burden. For example, while most buildings have kept janitors at pre-lock down full staffing levels, this new ordinance will only accelerate and increase the likelihood of staffing reductions. It's a simple fact of life: reduced operating revenue will lead to reduced staffing.
- The definition of large buildings as greater than 50,000 square feet is problematic. There are many buildings in the lower end of this size range that simply won't be able to operationally accomplish the ordinance's intent. In a smaller property, cleaning costs would jump by 25% just by having to hire one additional day porter.
- The ordinance is asking for regular cleaning and disinfection of "High-contact" areas. Is this just during business hours? A full-time, union day porter costs approximately \$8K per month. Depending on the interpretation of "regular cleaning", if buildings are to maintain restrooms, elevators and stairwells, they could be required to hire at least 3 additional day porters. That's an additional and unbudgeted expense of \$24K a month. This is simply not reasonable.
- Ultimately, tenants will foot the bill for these increased costs, and it's just another reason to drive office occupancy lower. Many buildings have tenants who have not occupied their space since March 17th. These tenants have been begrudgingly paying base rent and Operating Expenses every



Opposition to Emergency Ordinance - Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings

Page three

month. If we are now expected to hand them a bill for this additional expense, it's another major impediment to San Francisco's economic recovery.

As to operational impacts to office buildings, please understand these additional concerns:

- Chemicals which disinfect must often be left on surfaces for a period of time to be effective, i.e., 5+ minutes. If occupants are in the building during cleaning, this won't be feasible. Other options include using much stronger chemicals which can have negative impacts of their own when left on surfaces such as desks and high touch areas.
- This so-called "Healthy Building" ordinance is introducing new environmental health concerns due to the frequency and amount of locations where disinfectant cleaning product will be used (i.e., flooring and walls).
- Cleaning elevators completely - floors, walls, ceilings - several times a day will take those cars out of service while being cleaned and lead to passengers being further delayed (because of existing wait times due to social distancing), thus adding even more persons congregating together.
- The cost to completely clean fire stairwells multiple times a day (including floors) will simply lead to fire stairs being closed off again. Handrails are already being cleaned in those fire stairwells where tenants are being allowed to travel.
- It is unclear how soon the required number of janitorial personnel can be trained and available for this new requirement.
- Disinfecting carpets multiple times a day is not physically possible in any practical way during the day, when people are in occupancy. The same is true with disinfecting lobby floors and other common area floors multiple times a day - this is a safety concern due to increase of slipping while floors dry.
- Disinfecting windows? Several times a day? Not sure how that is going to happen in a high rise office building. Cleaning interior windows is usually one once per year by a crew of window washers and takes anywhere from 1 to 3 days to complete.

Please reject this proposed ordinance. It is redundant in many respects, not necessary, and will further cripple local employers to the further detriment of San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Marc Intermaggio, CAE
Executive Vice President, BOMA San Francisco

From: [Gino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Letter of opposition to Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 3:55:59 PM
Attachments: [scanf.pdf](#)

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

Good afternoon all. Kindly see my attached letter of opposition to the proposed Healthy Building Ordinance to be decided upon tomorrow afternoon. This health ordinance, although well intentioned, is incredibly short sighted and will cause the continued unemployment of thousands of hospitality employees directly in San Francisco.

In preparation for our hopeful August 1st reopening, numerous hotels in San Francisco have already begun to design and prepare intensive cleaning programs, all in alignment with the very stringent all guidelines as prescribed by the CDC. This proposed initiative will cause numerous hotels to delay their planned reopening which will then result in hotel employees going from a "furloughed status" to a "permanently laid off status". Moreover, as thousands of us employees have already been receiving unemployment benefits and compensation since mid-March, any further delay by the hotels will cause tremendously dire financial difficulties for thousands of us hotel workers as those very same benefits and compensation are quickly approaching their expiration dates by the end of July. I beseech each of you to please vote NO to this initiative tomorrow afternoon.

Sincerely,

Eugene Santistevan
Director of Rooms
Hotel Zeppelin
545 Post Street, San Francisco, CA

4 Iris Lane, San Carlos, CA
415-971-9439 cellphone

Hello. My name is Eugene Santistevan, and I worked as the Director of Rooms at Hotel Zeppelin, San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family.

These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,



Eugene L Santistevan
415-971-9439
4 Iris Ln, San Carlos, CA 94070

From: [Jens Von Gierke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposing the Health Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 4:36:24 PM

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

Dear Board:

We are strongly opposing the new legislation for the new Health Building ordinance. We don't believe it will do anymore than rewarding the Union, instead of keep hotels open and jobs for the workers. All hotels are already following all CDC cleaning standards and the highest priority is already the workers safety.

Best.

Jens von Gierke

From: [Alison Li](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 4:54:42 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

Hello. My name is Alison Li and I worked as a Front Desk Agent at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,

Alison

From: [nihad vatres](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hotel reopening
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 4:56:19 PM

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

Hello. My name is Nihad Vatres and I worked as Front Desk Agent at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Sarah Mabry](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:05:06 PM

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

Hello. My name is Sarah Mabry and I worked as Associate Director of Sales at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks and unfairly targets hotel workers, minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Adrian Ramirez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:12:13 PM

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

Hello. My name is [adrian ramirez] and I worked as [line cook] at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Noyes, Mark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Noyes, Mark](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:14:59 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

My name is Mark Noyes and I worked as the General Manager at Hotel Vitale. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed and has been since March. I want my hotel to reopen soon and when that happens, I want my hotel to feel safe for my guests and employees. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no real benefit. It will only result in more exposure for my hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance unfairly targets hotel workers and will have a negative impact on many minorities trying to get back to work. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, you will be increasing my teams exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating we enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform unnecessary deep cleaning activities on a daily basis. This is not a good use of time, money and effort to maintain cleanliness in my hotel.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests and employees. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me, as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Respectfully,

Mark Noyes

General Manager

HOTEL VITALE | AMERICANO RESTAURANT & BAR | SPA VITALE

A Joie de Vivre Hotel, Restaurant & Spa

Eight Mission Street

San Francisco, California 94105

Tel: (415) 278-3710

Mark Noyes

General Manager

HOTEL VITALE | AMERICANO RESTAURANT & BAR | SPA VITALE

A Joie de Vivre Hotel, Restaurant & Spa

Eight Mission Street

San Francisco, California 94105

Tel: (415) 278-3710



jdvhoteles.com | hotelvitale.com

facebook.com/hotelvitale

instagram.com/hotelvitale

From: [Katie Rueland](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:22:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors and Ms. London Breed,

I would like to write to you in opposition of the Healthy Business Ordinance for Cleaning and Disease Prevention legislation. I work for a small business in the Bay Area who supplies Top of Bed to the hospitality industry.

As you are aware, the hotel industry has been deeply impacted by the Covid-19 situation. The new legislation enforcing certain cleaning policies would cause hotels to remain closed for the foreseeable future; ultimately having a disastrous ripple effect on the city, our industries and our communities.

As the guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other national scientific institutions do not support these new rules and regulations we also do not feel they are necessary and are prohibitive to the success of hotels in San Francisco.

We ask that re-examine this Ordinance for the future of Hospitality in San Francisco.

We support your efforts to reduce the spread through reasonable practices, but this is not reasonable.

Thank you!

Katie Reuland
Down Etc
305 Adrian Road
Millbrae, CA 94030
415-348-0084 p.
415-348-0085 f.
ops@downetc.com
www.downetc.com

From: [Mina, Vanessa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please Help Hotel Workers
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:41:55 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Vanessa Mina and I worked as the W Insider at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts.

Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Kindest Regards,

Vanessa Mina
W Insider - W San Francisco Hotel

From: [Mary Ann Moratto](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:42:52 PM

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

Hello. My name is Mary Ann Moratto and I worked as a telephone operator in Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds a significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Respectfully Yours,

Mary Ann Moratto

From: [Frederic Hoffmann](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: W San Francisco Hotel
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:49:07 PM

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

Dear Board of supervisors and Mayor London Breed,

My name is *Frederic Hoffmann* and I worked as Executive Chef at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Frédéric Hoffmann

Frederic Hoffmann
Executive Chef W San Francisco

From: [Julieta de Lara](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:53:12 PM

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

Hello. My name is Julieta Delara and I worked the housekeeping department of Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds a significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Respectfully Yours,

Julieta Delara

From: [Frances Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 5:57:03 PM

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

Hello:

Please don't pass the Healthy Building Ordinance. Hotels provide good paying jobs to immigrants and their families.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Maisha Daniel Jamerson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please vote NO on the Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:04:52 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing you today because while I do not live in your District, one of the hotels that I have the privilege of working with as the Vice President of Human Resources and Deputy Labor Counsel for Highgate Hotels is in your district and six more hotels with hundreds of associates are also managed by Highgate in San Francisco.

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Warm Regards,

MDJ

MAISHA DANIEL-JAMERSON

Regional Vice President Human Resources and
Deputy Labor Counsel, West Coast

Direct: 626.429.5602

MDJamerson@highgate.com

Office:

[@hotelfiguerna](#) [@hotelfigueroadtla](#)



**This email may have been dictated and not read.*

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments.

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments

From: [yolanda rosales](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:12:28 PM

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

Hello. My name is Ana Yolanda Hernandez and I worked as Line Cook at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly targeting hotel workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Regards

Ana Yolanda Hernandez

From: [Max Ehlert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Regarding Emergency Health Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:13:31 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Maximilian Ehlert, Director of guest services at W hotel San Francisco.

I humbly and urgently ask you to please review the Emergency Health Business Ordinance. The proposed regulations, from my perspective as a hospitality professional, are unreasonable and have the very realistic potential of detrimentally impacting the San Francisco hospitality industry. I sincerely ask that guidelines and standards are based on health and cleaning expert opinions and testimony - not driven by political motives. From the perspective of a self declared reasonable person with relative expertise in hotel cleanliness standards, current industry COVID-19 prevention standards, and hotel housekeeping operations - I would like to express my concern that the proposed regulations are not reasonable nor feasible.

I would be happy to discuss this matter further and answer any questions this may leave you with. Thank you for considering my concerns and for doing the best for San Francisco.

Humbly and Sincerely.

Maximilian Ehlert

Sent from my iPhone

From: [D Cheri](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: "Healthy Buildings Ordinance" - please do NOT approve
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:13:47 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern:

Please take into consideration NOT approving the Healthy Buildings Ordinance scheduled to be voted on July 7. The ordinance will greatly delay multiple hotels from reopening after the already tragic state that COVID-19 has left us in.

Over 10,000 hospitality industry workers have been laid off or furloughed since the pandemic has started as numerous hotels have been forced to close due to lack of business. The measure will add heightened costs to an industry already struggling to reopen and will further cause a delay in tourism for the city of San Francisco. The current cleaning protocols for hotels in San Francisco are already aligned with and exceed the guidelines given by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the proposed measure does not further benefit hotels and their cleanliness. In addition, the expectation set by the Healthy Buildings Ordinance is redundant to guidelines given by Cal/OSHA and the California Department of Public Health. These guidelines should be held as standard and any further measure issued by the city of San Francisco should align with them.

While UniteHere represents numerous hotel employees and has pushed for this measure, the union does not correctly represent the hospitality industry. The CEO of the Hotel Council of San Francisco, Kevin Carroll, has stated that the hotel community has not been asked for input regarding the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. Had the hotel industry been consulted regarding this matter, it would have been able to provide information that would have been in the best interest for hotel employees, guests, and tourism in San Francisco.

Please consider not approving the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Thank you,
Danielle Ranoa

From: [Laura Lara](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:02:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Laura Lara
anamin03@hotmail.com
521 holly hock circle
Patterson , California 95363

From: [Elizabeth Sanders](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:05:12 PM

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

Hello. My name is Elizabeth Sanders and I worked as an Event Manager at W San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

--

Beth Sanders
m. 415.301.8458

From: [Donna Lum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:05:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Donna Lum
lum_dg@yahoo.com
2641 Tuller Avenue
El Cerrito, California 94530

From: [Jorge Canales](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:06:09 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,


Jorge Canales
joalcagu@yahoo.com
366 Imperial Dr.
Pacifica, California 94044

From: [nelson ramirez](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:11:35 PM
Attachments: [Sample email cut and paste and email to.pdf](#)

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

Sample email: cut and paste and email to
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org and copy
mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

Hello. My name is [Nelson Ramirez] and I worked as [Job Title] at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards. Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.



From: [Xing lan Huang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:15:52 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Xing lan Huang
hk13882@hotmail.com
65 partridge lane
Daly city, California 94014

From: [Luis Nunez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:34:32 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Luis Nunez
l.nunez81@icloud.com
1763San Andres dr
Pittsburgh C A, California 94565

From: [Chuen ming Chung lai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:39:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Chuen ming Chung lai
chuenming2012@gmail.com
1093 Ashbury Dr
Concord CA, California 94520

From: [Rafael Romero López](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:41:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Rafael Romero López
rafaelromerolopez3@gmail.com
3311 mission st apt 222
San Francisco ca, California 94110

From: [Beatriz Chavez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:57:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Beatriz Chavez
m4beatriz@hotmail.com
26 Isis Street
San Francisco , California 94103

From: [Maricar Miller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:57:30 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Best,

MARICAR MILLER
Area Director of Finance



Hotel Spero | 405 Taylor Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Direct: 707-688-4632 | Email: mmiller@hotelspero.com



The Marker | 501 Geary Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Direct: 707-688-4632 | Email: mmiller@TheMarkerSF.com

From: [Lasantha Ranasinha](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 7:57:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Lasantha Ranasinha
lasantha.ranasinha@gmail.com
619, 16th Avenue
San Francisco, Colorado CA-94118

From: [Ana Erickson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:03:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Ana Erickson
ana.moreno402010@yahoo.com
2695 Bryant street
San Francisco , California 94110

From: [Rong Xu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:15:39 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Rong Xu
rongjuanxu@yahoo.com
1451 Silver Ave.
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Precioso Santiago Adena](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:28:27 PM

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

Hello. My name is Precioso Adena and I work as Valet/Bellman at Hyatt Centric Fisherman's Wharf San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotel workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [David Lu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 8:31:49 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

David Lu
dvdlu5810@gmail.com
503 Gellert Blvd
Daly City , California 94015

From: [Jessica Carvalho](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Vote No and protect Hospitality industry in SF!!!!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:02:07 PM

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

Hello BOSSF,

My name is Jessica Carey and I worked as Group Sales Manager at Le Meridien San Francisco a place I've called my second home for 4 years and many of my colleagues have worked for decades. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed and has been since end of March. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is NOT endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts.

Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself since March. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color!

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am more than disappointed that I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family and my colleagues. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance!

Stop this insanity and let us get back to work!

Thank you for your valued time and consideration!

Jessica Carey
Le Meridien Hotel

From: [Carlin Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:06:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Carlin Wong
Swtytofu@hotmail.com
2094 17th ave
San Francisco , California 94116

From: [Jorge Vidrios](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:08:32 PM

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

Hello. My name is Jorge Vidrios and I worked as a cook at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Blanca Flores](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:16:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Blanca Flores
blanca.flores348@gmail.com
3042
Antioch , California 94509

From: [Tecla Duran](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Reopen SF Hotels
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:55:38 PM

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

Hello. My name is Tecla Duran and I worked as Assistant Front Office Manager at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you for hearing us.

Tecla Duran

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

From: **Tecla Duran** <tecla143duran@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 6, 2020, 9:45 PM
Subject: Reopen SF Hotels
To: <mayorlondonbreed@sf.gov>

Hello. My name is Tecla Duran and I worked as Assistant Front Office Manager at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority

groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you for hearing us.

From: [Mouna Saadini](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:03:54 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mouna Saadini
mouna_saadini@hotmail.com
132 Shipley ave
San Francisco , California 94015

From: [Fabian, Karen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:05:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors and Mayor London Breed,

Please consider revising the Healthy Building Ordinance. As it reads now, the standards will actually put our guests and staff more at risk. Going into an occupied room to do “touch up” cleaning on a daily basis may only bring more of a possibility of contamination. Sure there are a lot of cost factors when it comes to staffing an operation that requires daily cleaning but what really needs to be addressed are the uncontrollable factors which are outside of the building and in public.

I propose and support that once the guests have checked out, the room sets for 24 to 48 hours before it is entered and cleaned. This will give our housekeeping staff the confidence to come to work and perform to their best ability knowing that we as their employer are taking their health into consideration.

Karen Fabian

Office Supervisor - Wyndham Canterbury San Francisco

Wyndham Destinations

750 Sutter Street

San Francisco, CA 94109

Office: 415-345-3210

Fax: 415-345-4996

Karen.Fabian@wyn.com

This email message (including all attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information, or may otherwise be protected by work product or other legal rules. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Unless otherwise indicated in the body of this email, nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature and this transmission cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Wyndham Destinations, Inc., and/or its affiliates may monitor all incoming and outgoing email communications, including the content of emails and attachments, for security, legal compliance, training, quality assurance and other purposes.

The sender believes that this email and any attachments were free of any virus, worm, Trojan horse, malicious code and/or other contaminants when sent. Email transmissions cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free, so this message and its attachments could have been infected, corrupted or made incomplete during transmission. By reading the message and opening any attachments, the recipient accepts full responsibility for any viruses or other defects that may arise, and for taking remedial action relating to such viruses and other defects. Neither Wyndham Destinations, Inc., nor any of its affiliated entities is liable for any loss or damage arising in any way from, or for errors or omissions in the contents of, this message or its attachments.

From: [Francisca Corena](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:06:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Francisca Corena
finacorena@yahoo.com
349 Baden Av
South San Francisco , Ca 94080

From: [Francisca Corena](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:06:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Francisca Corena
finacorena@yahoo.com
349 Baden Av
South San Francisco , Ca 94080

From: [Maria Corena](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:08:27 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Maria Corena
mariacorena45@gmail.com
1404 Floribunda ave apt 211 Burlingame
Ca , California 94010

From: [Maria Corena](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:08:27 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Maria Corena
mariacorena45@gmail.com
1404 Floribunda ave apt 211 Burlingame
Ca , California 94010

From: [Xuexiao Zhao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:14:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Xuexiao Zhao
ukiitomi@gmail.com
1632 141st Ave
San Leandro , California 94578

From: [Xuexiao Zhao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:14:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Xuexiao Zhao
ukiitomi@gmail.com
1632 141st Ave
San Leandro , California 94578

From: [Denise Lao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:18:07 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Denise Lao
jessicaaom@gmail.com
601. London Street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Denise Lao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:18:07 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Denise Lao
jessicaaom@gmail.com
601. London Street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Estefania Fabian](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hello
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:50:05 PM

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

Hello. My name is [__Estefania__] and I worked as [Housekeeping] at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Enviado desde mi iPhone

From: [Carlos Vargas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Reopen hotels in SF!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:54:10 PM

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

To Whom This May Concern,

Hello. My name is Carlos Vargas and I worked as a cook at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,
Carlos Vargas

From: [Carlos Vargas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Reopen hotels in SF!
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:54:10 PM

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

To Whom This May Concern,

Hello. My name is Carlos Vargas and I worked as a cook at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,
Carlos Vargas

From: [- Karen -](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:26:34 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Government,

I understand that you are trying to make a decision on whether to close our SF hotels for the rest of the year. I am one of the many people affected by the hotels closing and have been unemployed since March.

It is utterly contradictory that you will keep hotels closed YET have allowed the remodeling to resume in my SF apartment building. There are countless numbers of people/workers/delivery people in and out of my building every, single day. They are not always six feet apart, and from what I can tell, they do wear masks but they are touching every, single surface in our building. (And I will also mention the inhumane noise from their machines that have deafened us, along with made us bonkers as we SHELTER IN PLACE).

If you are going to open up all construction in occupied buildings, then you should at least consider slowly reopening hotels as I can assure you, the hotels will follow stricter guidelines than what is happening all around me in my home.

Karen Wilkinson
861 Sutter Street

From: [- Karen -](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:26:34 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Government,

I understand that you are trying to make a decision on whether to close our SF hotels for the rest of the year. I am one of the many people affected by the hotels closing and have been unemployed since March.

It is utterly contradictory that you will keep hotels closed YET have allowed the remodeling to resume in my SF apartment building. There are countless numbers of people/workers/delivery people in and out of my building every, single day. They are not always six feet apart, and from what I can tell, they do wear masks but they are touching every, single surface in our building. (And I will also mention the inhumane noise from their machines that have deafened us, along with made us bonkers as we SHELTER IN PLACE).

If you are going to open up all construction in occupied buildings, then you should at least consider slowly reopening hotels as I can assure you, the hotels will follow stricter guidelines than what is happening all around me in my home.

Karen Wilkinson
861 Sutter Street

From: [Irfan PM](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Hotels
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:32:52 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Irfan Peer Mohamed and I worked as Director of Food & Beverage at Argonaut Hotel I'm writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Irfan PM

From: [Irfan PM](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Hotels
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:32:52 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Irfan Peer Mohamed and I worked as Director of Food & Beverage at Argonaut Hotel I'm writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you.

Irfan PM

From: [Rafael Fernandes](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Business Ordinance Fact Sheet
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:11:22 AM

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

Hello. My name is Rafael Fernandes de Medeiros and I worked as a Bellman at Hotel Zeppelin. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no benefit. It will only result in more exposure for hotel employees. No other city in the US is following these troublesome cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed and affecting my family. These additional costs will certainly keep my hotel closed longer than previously planned. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Jane O'Shea](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Help Us To Put Our Employees Back To Work
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 4:53:23 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Viceroy Hotel Group's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

The COVID-19 pandemic has closed our hotels for more than three months. As a management company, we have been working day in and day out preparing readiness plans to reopen and re-start the careers of over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Through the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines and Governor Newsom, the California Department of Public Health and San Francisco's public health office to develop safety standards that exceed any other industry, short of hospitals. We are following our own brand/owner guidelines closely to ensure your safety. They include:

- Customized plans for employee safety trainings
- Clear and appropriate physical distancing signage
- Delivery and use of personal protective equipment for employees
- Cleaning directions that keep employees and guests safe
- Plans to educate and train employees when they return to work on enhanced cleaning protocols

Unfortunately, we face roadblocks from you, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and union leaders, who have created re-opening standards that would prevent us from bringing our colleagues back to work, delay guests from returning to our hotels and risk our future in San Francisco. The ordinance will result in much higher costs from mandated continuous cleaning for areas which have been determined to be unnecessary as determined by the CDC such as walls, windows, drapes, floors, etc. Their cleaning protocols are regardless of need, and mandate daily room cleaning. We would need to achieve much higher occupancy levels to have a viable operation. To cover these costs, we would have to generate 30 to 40 more points of occupancy. And we all know there is virtually no demand currently in San Francisco for the next 30, 60, 90 days nor any encouraging signs for business in Q1 2021.

We're prepared, we're safe and we want to reopen. Once again, we want to restart the careers of

over 200 of our colleagues in San Francisco.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide the guidance.

Jane O'Shea | Vice President of Sales

VICEROY HOTEL GROUP

M +44 7801 456 798

E Jane.oshea@viceroymotelgroup.com

#RememberToLive | Follow us [@ViceroyHotels](https://www.instagram.com/ViceroyHotels)



From: [Lourdes Chow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please Do Not Approve New Healthy Building Ordinance 2020
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 5:13:28 AM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

Please do not approve the New Healthy Building Ordinance, it hurts Hotel Workers and our respective families. This is an unfair step that targets the loss of thousands of hotel jobs. Tourism in San Francisco will dwindle down and will eventually affect the entire community. I hope this note will help everyone out in finding a better solution for not just our health and safety, but also for our community, environment and tourists.



Healthy Business Ordinance Fact Sheet

THE NEW HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE HURTS HOTEL WORKERS

- San Francisco Supervisors moved the Healthy Buildings ordinance on June 29, 2020 for approval. It's scheduled to be approved July 7th by the full Board of Supervisors and, if that happens, it will result in massive job losses at hotels in San Francisco.
- While hotels in many cities across the country are reopening, including Los Angeles and San Diego, the San Francisco Supervisors are doing the opposite. They are making up rules about how hotel rooms and hotels should be cleaned. The guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other national scientific institutions do not support these new rules and regulations.
- If passed, this will keep many hotels in San Francisco closed for the rest of 2020, and possibly much longer. This means many of our employees will not be able to return to work.
- Why will this occur? As you painfully know, many hotels in the city are closed, and most of our 15,000 hotel employees do not have jobs to provide for their families. San Francisco's hotels can resume operations only when there are enough guests to support reopening. The Supervisors' new cleaning ordinance, which is unproven, would significantly increase the cost to open every hotel. This means that a large number of hotels will remain closed, which means they will not be able to hire back workers.
- The hotels, the tourism industry and San Francisco businesses pleaded with the Supervisors not to pass this bill because of its impact on our employees. San Francisco is the only city in the nation that passed such standards. The hotel industry already has adopted new stringent and cleaning standards to fight COVID-19 that are based on the CDC's recommendations and other science experts. The standards will help keep you safe and encourage guests to return to San Francisco.
- The Supervisors are excluding all government buildings, including their own offices, from their new unproven cleaning standards. This shows this isn't about worker safety. This is about rewarding UniteHere, the largest national hotel union, who helped write this ordinance.
- As you know so well, our business depends on our hotels being clean and safe. You already are dedicated to ensuring our rooms, our lobbies, our restaurants and our meeting rooms and all public areas are clean. We're one of the few industries the San Francisco Board of Supervisors do not need to over-regulate on cleanliness.
- What can you do to save hotel jobs, and help reopen hotels in San Francisco? Please send a letter or email to the Supervisors and ask them NOT to approve the Healthy Building ordinance. This new ordinance unfairly targets hotel workers and is a hotel jobs killer.
- Email: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org and copy mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

Sincerely,

Lourdes Chow

From: [Jay Shah](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance - Opposition
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 7:22:08 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

My name is Jay Shah, I am the Managing Director at The Wharf Inn.

The Wharf Inn is a family business, the only remaining family run hotel at the Wharf. We have been in the hotel industry for 20+ years having gone through the 9/11 disaster as well as the 2008 Great Depression. Sadly, the economic impact from Covid19 significantly outweighs the economic damage that was caused by the previous 2 disasters, **combined**. I'm sure SF has its own data to show the same.

My livelihood, my family's livelihood, and the livelihood of our business significantly depend on our ability to re-open our hotel in a fair manner. Attached is a picture of a Study done by the Texas Medical Association, showing the risk exposure of COVID19 to daily activities. In this Study, a hotel stay of 2 nights is ranked low compared to the things that we do everyday.

While I agree with the intention of the Emergency Healthy Building Ordinance, frankly it does not make sense. The hotel industry has created multiple programs in which hotels can be reopened safely, as the safe reopening has been our concern for the last few months, not something that has been drafted in a knee jerk reaction over the last few weeks.

The Healthy Building Ordinance far exceeds the guidance that Federal and State public health officials have recommended which puts an incredible burden on hotels, especially the smaller run properties like mine, where it would be impossible to sustain the overhead from the required manpower, Furthermore, this ordinance is creating an unintended double standard. A reason that this Ordinance has been drafted is to let future visitors know that SF is a safe place to visit, essentially protecting our City's #1 industry, Tourism. The double standard that is being set, is why is this Ordinance only to hotels/offices?

To illustrate this example - How would the future tourist get to the hotel? How would the office worker get to their Office? Public transportation? Uber/Taxi? So, why is the transportation industry (public & private) or other industries not involved in this Ordinance? As a member on the Ownership side of a hotel, we understand that the Labor Unions have had a say in this Ordinance to protect their jobs. If there are no hotels, there are no jobs and simply this is not a time for politics.

The hotel industry, and travel as a whole are hurting severely. We should not be kicked while we are down. We strongly oppose the proposed Healthy Building Ordinance.

Thank you

--

Jay Shah, CHIA
Managing Director
Wharf Inn - Located in the Heart of Fisherman's Wharf
2601 Mason Street

COVID-19

CORONAVIRUS DISEASE

BE INFORMED:

Know Your Risk During COVID-19

On a scale of 1 to 10, how risky is...

Ranked by physicians from the TMA COVID-19 Task Force and the TMA Committee on Infectious Diseases



Advancing the Health of Texas



San Francisco, CA 94133

Website: www.wharfinn.com

Book Direct and Save! Best rates and availability are always directly through the hotel.

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged and *confidential*. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient or an authorized representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, notify the sender immediately by return email and delete the message and any attachments from your system.

From: [Hunter Dietz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Do Not Approve Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 7:38:30 AM

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

Good morning,

My family and thousands of your residents will be personally effected by the bill that is planned for approval today.

Hotels are the backbone of San Francisco's thriving tourism economy and these new rules will be devastating not only to the hotels themselves, but also to the men and women that run them.

I urge you to please vote No on the Healthy Building Ordinance for the betterment of your citizens and tourism industry.

Thanks,

Hunter Dietz

From: [Esmirna Aguilar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:21:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Esmirna Aguilar
aleyda437@gmail.com
2000 18th st
San pablo, California 94806

From: [Dennis Berris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Vote NO
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:31:37 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco and Oakland markets!

Sincerely,

Dennis Berris

General Manager -CHA
Homewood Suites Oakland - Waterfront
1103 Embarcadero
Oakland, CA 94606
(P) 510.663.2700
(F) 510.663.2701
(E) dennis.berris@hilton.com

"It has been, and continues to be, our responsibility to fill the earth with the light and warmth of hospitality." - Conrad Hilton

From: [Anna Le](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:32:33 AM

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

Hello. My name is Anh Le and I worked as an Human Resources Generalist at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Anna Tram Anh Le

Hospitality and Tourism Management minoring in Business Administration

San Francisco State University, Spring 2014

C: 408.886.8862|[Email](#)|[LinkedIn](#)

"You can always be taught about Hospitality, but what you cannot be taught is the heart to serve others."

From: [dave mac](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Hotels
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:01:04 AM

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

Hello,

My name is David McBurney, and I worked as a Banquet Manager at W San Francisco, I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,
David McBurney

From: [Jenny Yu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reopening our hotel
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:09:53 AM

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

Hello. My name is Jenny Yu and I worked as Room attendant at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards. Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds, and perform deep cleaning daily. Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [DaisyMae Salvador](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: New Health Building Ordinance for Hotels
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:19:03 AM

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

Hello,

Please hold off or do not vote for the extreme cleaning guidelines beyond CDC hotel cleaning regulations. This is detriment to San Francisco's economy, the city and to the lives of 15000 housekeepers, bell persons, front and back of the house team, operational and sales leaders in the hotel industry.

Sincerely,
DaisyMae

From: [Daisy Salvador](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: New Health Building Ordinance for Hotels
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:19:41 AM

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

Hello,

Please hold off or do not vote for the extreme cleaning guidelines beyond CDC hotel cleaning regulations. This is detriment to San Francisco's economy, the city and to the lives of 15000 housekeepers, bell persons, front and back of the house team, operational and sales leaders in the hotel industry.

Sincerely,
DaisyMae

From: [DaisyMae Salvador](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: New Health Building Ordinance for Hotels
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:20:18 AM

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

Hello,

Please hold off or do not vote for the extreme cleaning guidelines beyond CDC hotel cleaning regulations. This is detriment to San Francisco's economy, the city and to the lives of 15000 housekeepers, bell persons, front and back of the house team, operational and sales leaders in the hotel industry.

Sincerely,
DaisyMae

From: [Sanjuana Rodriguez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:28:10 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Sanjuana Rodriguez
rsanjuana844@gmail.com
2565 Clinton ave
Richmond ca, California 94804

From: [Luis Blanco](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strong cleaning standards for reopening!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:58:25 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am a San Francisco hotel worker. Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance. We need this law to make sure no company takes shortcuts when it comes to cleaning.

I've been laid off since the start of this crisis. And I want to go back to work. But not until it's safe for everyone. When that day comes, I want San Francisco to be able to tell tourists everywhere that our city has the highest cleaning standards in the world, and there is nowhere better to travel than the city by the Bay.

Please vote for the Healthy Buildings Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Luis Blanco
luisblanco2873@gmail.com
1486 South Van Ness Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Stacey Bradetich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Buildings Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:24:38 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Mayor London Breed,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. I'm concerned that this new ordinance is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts, and that it seems to add significant costs without benefit. In my view, it will result in more exposure for hotel employees, putting our colleagues and guests at risk. No other city in the US is following these prohibitive cleaning standards.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes our ability to re-open our doors and bring our teams back to work. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. I'm also concerned that this ordinance not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Stacey Bradetich
Viceroy Hotel Group | Hotel Zeppelin

Stacey Bradetich | Area Director of Finance, SF
D 415 447 6951 | M 208 290 7837 | F 415 563 6831
E stacey.bradetich@viceroymotelgroup.com

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 16 letters for File No. 200638
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:47:00 PM
Attachments: [16 letters for File No. 200638.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached 16 letters for File No. 200638.

File No.200638 - Emergency ordinance to establish cleaning and disease prevention standards in tourist hotels and large commercial office buildings to help contain COVID-19; to require training related to these standards for employees on paid time and to provide certain protections to employees as they perform cleaning duties; to prohibit retaliation against employees for refusing to perform work under conditions they believe may be unsafe or for reporting such conditions or exercising rights protected by the ordinance; and providing for administrative enforcement by the Department of Public Health and financial penalties as authorized by state law.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Jack B. Paul](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jack B. Paul](#)
Subject: Thank you for your consideration
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 3:22:48 PM
Attachments: [image846001.png](#)
[image761002.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors, As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Respectfully submitted,



Jack B. Paul

Vice President of Hotel Operations

www.sbcos.com

jpaul@sbcos.com

direct 303-785-3148

cell 303-246-3259

From: [Sean Mullen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urgent
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:45:00 PM
Attachments: [ATT00001.png](#)
[ATT00002.png](#)
[ATT00003.png](#)
[ATT00004.png](#)
[ATT00005.png](#)

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors, As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Sean Mullen
President, Acquisitions, Sales & Revenue Management

NOBLE HOUSE
HOTELS & RESORTS

600 6th Street S, Kirkland, WA 98033
(o) 425-636-5668
smullen@noblehousehotels.com



From: [Kevin Carroll](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Colfax, Grant \(DPH\)](#); [Aragon, Tomas \(DPH\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Torres, Joaquin \(ECN\)](#); [Kevin Carroll](#); [Rodney Fong](#); [lmohrfeld@calodging.com](#); [Chip Rogers](#); [mli@boma.com](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition Letter: Economic and Job Impacts of "Healthy Buildings Ordinance" File #200638
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:05:35 PM
Attachments: [image010.png](#)
[Healthy Business Ordinance Impacts Hotel Opposition Letter 7.7.20.pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

Your vote today on the proposed Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings ordinance will have deep financial impacts on San Francisco hotels and, as a result, extend their closures and keep our employees out of work well beyond the expected August reopening timetable.

An independent analysis of the ordinance's cleaning mandates estimates labor, cleaning material and laundering of cleaning material will cost San Francisco 215 hotels \$47 million annually with an average 250-room hotel incurring \$220,000 costs. These costs come at a time when hotels have been closed for tourism for almost four months and, at the earliest, expected to reopen mid-August, leaving 15,000 employees without work for a minimum of six months.

San Francisco hotels commissioned a study by Hotel Asset Value Enhancement based on the ordinance as amended in the Land Use and Transportation Committee last week. The study calculated costs per occupied room of the incremental cleaning and operating requirements unique to the proposed Healthy Buildings ordinance and concluded they would cost the average-sized San Francisco hotel \$220,000. The study assumed an occupancy rate of 63 percent, which is in line with the CBRE forecast for 2021. These costs are on top of an estimated \$498,000 that an average 250-room hotel will incur to install the best practices for cleaning and social distancing as recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the California Department of Public Health and hotel associations and major hotel brands.

This is untenable for the ongoing livelihood of San Francisco hotels, who have had no tourism business for four months. How do you, as a supervisor, think every hotel will afford an additional \$220,000 when they have no guests?

Let's be clear: These higher costs will keep San Francisco hotels closed and will keep 15,000 hotel employees out of work.

Can you honestly say the overreaching cleaning standards imposed by this ordinance will protect employees and guests any better than what the CDC, Gov. Newsom's

Office of Emergency Services, the CDPH recommend?

Can you look our 15,000 out-of-work employees in the eye and tell them they can't work because you know public health better than the experts – a number of whom are suggesting the repeated room entry demanded by the ordinance actually will increase infection risks to employees.

We understand the Board of Supervisors has a long-standing belief that hotel money just “happens” and hotels will survive. We are telling you today in clear language that the pandemic, the loss of tourism already substantial because of San Francisco's street conditions, anticipated tax increases this fall and this ordinance risks irreparable harm to the city's No. 1 industry and to our fantastic employees.

Please consider the impact of your vote today.



Kevin Carroll
President & CEO
Hotel Council of San Francisco.



Lynn S. Mohrfeld
President & CEO
California Hotel and Lodging Association



Chip Rodgers
President & CEO
American Hotel and Lodging Association

Cc: Board of Supervisors, Mayor London Breed



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

July 7, 2020

Dear Supervisors

Your vote today on the proposed Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings ordinance will have deep financial impacts on San Francisco hotels and, as a result, extend their closures and keep our employees out of work well beyond the expected August reopening timetable.

An independent analysis of the ordinance's cleaning mandates estimates labor, cleaning material and laundering of cleaning material will cost San Francisco 215 hotels \$47 million annually with an average 250-room hotel incurring \$220,000 costs. These costs come at a time when hotels have been closed for tourism for almost four months and, at the earliest, expected to reopen mid-August, leaving 15,000 employees without work for a minimum of six months.

San Francisco hotels commissioned a study by Hotel Asset Value Enhancement based on the ordinance as amended in the Land Use and Transportation Committee last week. The study calculated costs per occupied room of the incremental cleaning and operating requirements unique to the proposed Healthy Buildings ordinance and concluded they would cost the average-sized San Francisco hotel \$220,000. The study assumed an occupancy rate of 63 percent, which is in line with the CBRE forecast for 2021. These costs are on top of an estimated \$498,000 that an average 250-room hotel will incur to install the best practices for cleaning and social distancing as recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the California Department of Public Health and hotel associations and major hotel brands.

This is untenable for the ongoing livelihood of San Francisco hotels, who have had no tourism business for four months. How do you, as a supervisor, think every hotel will afford an additional \$220,000 when they have no guests?

Let's be clear: These higher costs will keep San Francisco hotels closed and will keep 15,000 hotel employees out of work.

Can you honestly say the overreaching cleaning standards imposed by this ordinance will protect employees and guests any better than what the CDC, Gov. Newsom's Office of Emergency Services, the CDPH recommend?



Can you look our 15,000 out-of-work employees in the eye and tell them they can't work because you know public health better than the experts – a number of whom are suggesting the repeated room entry demanded by the ordinance actually will increase infection risks to employees.

We understand the Board of Supervisors has a long-standing belief that hotel money just “happens” and hotels will survive. We are telling you today in clear language that the pandemic, the loss of tourism already substantial because of San Francisco’s street conditions, anticipated tax increases this fall and this ordinance risks irreparable harm to the city’s No. 1 industry and to our fantastic employees.

Please consider the impact of your vote today.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin Carroll".

Kevin Carroll
President & CEO
Hotel Council of San Francisco.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lynn S. Mohrfeld".

Lynn S. Mohrfeld
President & CEO
California Hotel and Lodging Association

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chip Rodgers".

Chip Rodgers
President & CEO
American Hotel and Lodging Association

Cc: Board of Supervisors, Mayor London Breed

From: [michelle villar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:36:44 PM

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

Hello. My name is [_Amy Balingit_____] and I worked as [House Keeping] at Hotel Adagio. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: [Taylor Medina](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Axiom Hotel Opposition to Emergency Ordinance File #200638 Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:02:13 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Axiom Hotel's strong opposition to the Emergency Ordinance – Cleaning and Disease Prevention Standards in Tourist Hotels and Large Commercial Office Buildings File #200638. The health and safety of our employees and guests is our industry's number one priority. However, health guidelines must be determined by the medical experts in the Department of Health, not by the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Hotels already have guidelines developed by the Hotel Council of San Francisco, California Hotel & Lodging, and American Hotel & Lodging that are all based on medical expert guidance from CDC, CDPH and CAL OSHA guidelines.

More than anything, we are prepared to welcome back our team with robust safety training and new cleaning procedures leveraging cutting-edge technology. This legislation is bad for business and will be detrimental to San Francisco's economy by forcing an unnecessary loss of jobs. Once safe and permitted from the state and county levels, we'll be more than ready to actively participate in reopening the City's economy.

Again, we ask that you not approve this ordinance and allow the medical experts to provide proper guidance.

Sincerely,
Taylor Medina

From: [Jennie Ellorin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:36:59 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Jennielyn Gutierrez

Sent from my iPhone

From: [mark walsh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Guidelines for Reopening my hotel
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:40:30 PM
Attachments: [SF Hotel Fact Sheet Final.pdf](#)

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

To;

Distinguished members of the Board.

Hello. My name is Mark Walsh and I am an employee of Hyatt Centric at Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco. I am writing today in the hopes of persuading you to reconsider implementing the well intended but ultimately detrimental Healthy Building Ordinance. My hotel remains one of the only hotels open in the entire Fisherman's Wharf area and are operating at minimal capacity. The vast majority of workers, myself included, have not worked since the middle of March and are eager to return to work and restore San Francisco to it's status as a world renowned tourist destination. Like all of you, I want and recognize the need for a safe working environment, social distancing, masks and disinfecting of all common environments shared by large numbers of people. Hyatt also recognizes this and has worked diligently to not only meet but exceed what is required of them in this regard. They began this process even before I left and have worked vigorously to maintain it in my absence. Hyatt is an exceptional company with a great and well established reputation for making the needs and concerns of guests AND employees paramount. Their desires for a safe and enjoyable visit experience and work environment are the same as yours and they have done everything they can to ensure public safety. While I can't speak to what other hotels have done I think we can safely assume that they, motivated by the same common interest, have also taken great pains to ensure public safety. I hope you will compel you to reconsider this ordinance that, on its face, has the best of intentions but may ultimately prove devastating to thousands of workers like me, the hospitality industry and the economy of San Francisco. Hospitality is the life blood of our city. Please don't leave us high and dry.

Thank You

Mark Walsh
houdini816@yahoo.com



Healthy Business Ordinance Fact Sheet

THE NEW HEALTHY BUILDING ORDINANCE HURTS HOTEL WORKERS

- San Francisco Supervisors moved the Healthy Buildings ordinance on June 29, 2020 for approval. It's scheduled to be approved July 7th by the full Board of Supervisors and, if that happens, it will result in massive job losses at hotels in San Francisco.
- While hotels in many cities across the country are reopening, including Los Angeles and San Diego, the San Francisco Supervisors are doing the opposite. They are making up rules about how hotel rooms and hotels should be cleaned. The guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other national scientific institutions do not support these new rules and regulations.
- If passed, this will keep many hotels in San Francisco closed for the rest of 2020, and possibly much longer. This means many of our employees will not be able to return to work.
- Why will this occur? As you painfully know, many hotels in the city are closed, and most of our 15,000 hotel employees do not have jobs to provide for their families. San Francisco's hotels can resume operations only when there are enough guests to support reopening. The Supervisors' new cleaning ordinance, which is unproven, would significantly increase the cost to open every hotel. This means that a large number of hotels will remain closed, which means they will not be able to hire back workers.
- The hotels, the tourism industry and San Francisco businesses pleaded with the Supervisors not to pass this bill because of its impact on our employees. San Francisco is the only city in the nation that passed such standards. The hotel industry already has adopted new stringent and cleaning standards to fight COVID-19 that are based on the CDC's recommendations and other science experts. The standards will help keep you safe and encourage guests to return to San Francisco.
- The Supervisors are excluding all government buildings, including their own offices, from their new unproven cleaning standards. This shows this isn't about worker safety. This is about rewarding UniteHere, the largest national hotel union, who helped write this ordinance.
- As you know so well, our business depends on our hotels being clean and safe. You already are dedicated to ensuring our rooms, our lobbies, our restaurants and our meeting rooms and all public areas are clean. We're one of the few industries the San Francisco Board of Supervisors do not need to over-regulate on cleanliness.
- What can you do to save hotel jobs, and help reopen hotels in San Francisco? Please send a letter or email to the Supervisors and ask them NOT to approve the Healthy Building ordinance. This new ordinance unfairly targets hotel workers and is a hotel jobs killer.
- Email: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org and copy mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

From: [Angel Cheung](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 3:15:47 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple effect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Angel Cheung
167 Paris St
San Francisco CA 94112

From: [Karen Poon Gotico](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Healthy Building Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 4:54:10 PM

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in regards to the new healthy building ordinance that is up for review and approval. Please do not approve this ordinance for San Francisco city, this will result in job losses and further hurt the hospitality industry in San Francisco.

As a hotel employee, I have lost my job because of Coronavirus. If the ordinance is passed, it will further delay the opening of hotels because of the new cleaning guidelines, which will impact the tourism industry in San Francisco. I ask that you please do not approve the new guidelines so that San Francisco can recover like the rest of California.

Sincerely,
Karen G.

From: [Patterson, Paul](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please do not put hotel workers at risk!
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 5:42:45 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed.

With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever.

The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services.

Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis.

The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,

Paul A. Patterson

THE WESTIN SAN DIEGO GASLAMP QUARTER

910 Broadway Circle, San Diego, CA 92101

T 619.610.8940 F 619.239.0449

paul.patterson@westin.com

From: [Ada](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Adagio Hotel. I am a housekeeping
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 6:15:20 PM

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

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Steven Kirkish](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Emergency Ordinance for Healthy Buildings
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:05:10 PM

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

Good Afternoon Mayr Breed,

I wanted to inform you guys of my major disappointment in the unanimous decision in the board of supervisors meeting yesterday to pass the Healthy Buildings ordinance which puts my co-workers safety in extreme jeopardy. As a front desk agent at a San Francisco hotel, I've actually spoken with my colleagues that are room attendants and they are now very scared to go to work. This ordinance puts them in harms way. The board of supervisors was going off of what the labor unions told them. Local 2, unfortunately, with this ordinance is only interested in getting as many employees back to work so they can start collecting as many union dues as possible and not looking out for employee safety and here's why.

* Around the country, majore hotels brands are telling guests that they will not service their guest room until after check out. This limits the exposure of my co-workers to potentially asymptomatic guests that are staying in the hotel.

* This ordinance requires the room attendants to clean the room which increase interaction between healthy employees and potentially asymptomatic guests

* This ordinance requires that the bed linens be changed daily. This creates a horrific environmental impact by increasing energy usage, Soap and Bleach being put into our bays, and having the laundry associates more exposed to potentially contaminated linen at a faster rate. If i'm personally staying in a hotel for 2 nights, why do I need to to have my bed sheets changed after 1 night? This will not stop the spread of Covid-19 and is ridiculous.

*Several hotels are saying they will not open this year due to the ordinance which means, leans jobs, more unemployment claims, less tax revenue for the city and state.

Again, this ordinance creates a very unsafe work environment. I urge you to please not listen completely to the labor unions that are trying to get more revenue from union dues and listen to the actual employees that are scared to go into a hotel room where a guest is occupying it and potentially get themselves and their family sick.

Thank you for doing the safe thing,
Steven James

From: [Daisy Cano](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Reopen Hotels in SF!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:45:33 PM

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

To Whom This May Concern,

Hello. My name is Daisy Cano-Sandoval and I worked as Front Desk Agent at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color. Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

Thank you,
Daisy Cano-Sandoval

From: [Jaygo g](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please hear us! Please open the hotels.
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 8:45:40 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors, As a hotelier in California, I write in strong opposition to the proposed Healthy Buildings Ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is considering. This proposal far exceeds guidance from federal and state public health officials and will increase exposure risks for our employees and guests and likely force hotels to remain closed. With hotels facing the worst economic crisis on record, nine times worse than September 11 and lower occupancy than the Great Depression, this ordinance jeopardizes small business hotel owners who could not afford to implement it and keep their doors open. It will force San Francisco hotels to shut down for the remainder of the year, putting many at risk at closing permanently and leading to thousands of jobs lost forever. The ripple affect across San Francisco and California would result in hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue lost, impacting important funding for education, transportation, parks, and other vital government services. Further, the ordinance contradicts federal and state health officials who recommend limiting personal interaction, not mandating that it occur on a daily basis. The economic and health implications of the mandate would cause immense harm to our industry and put our employees at risk. I urge you to vote NO on the proposed ordinance and keep hotels open in San Francisco!

Sincerely,
Jossie Go
73 Leland Avenue, San Francisco CA 94134

From: [Selena Lu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: The New Healthy Building Ordinance HURTS Hotel worker and Event Industry
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 9:54:07 AM

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

Hi Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am against the Healthy Building ordinance. This new ordinance unfairly targets hotel workers and is a hotel jobs killer. It will also hurt the event industry. Hotel rates in San Francisco are already VERY HIGH compared to other metropolitans like New York . The extra cost at hotels will eventually be paid by hotel guests like conference attendees.

- If passed, this will keep many hotels in San Francisco closed for the rest of 2020, and possibly much longer. This means many of our employees will not be able to return to work.
- Why will this occur? As you painfully know, many hotels in the city are closed, and most of our 15,000 hotel employees do not have jobs to provide for their families. San Francisco's hotels can resume operations only when there are enough guests to support reopening. The Supervisors' new cleaning ordinance, which is unproven, would significantly increase the cost to open every hotel. This means that a large number of hotels will remain closed, which means they will not be able to hire back workers.
- The hotels, the tourism industry and San Francisco businesses pleaded with the Supervisors not to pass this bill because of its impact on our employees. San Francisco is the only city in the nation that passed such standards. The hotel industry already has adopted new stringent and cleaning standards to fight COVID-19 that are based on the CDC's recommendations and other science experts. The standards will help keep you safe and encourage guests to return to San Francisco.
- The Supervisors are excluding all government buildings, including their own offices, from their new unproven cleaning standards. This shows this isn't about worker safety. This is about rewarding UniteHere, the largest national hotel union, who helped write this ordinance.
- As you know so well, our business depends on our hotels being clean and safe. You already are dedicated to ensuring our rooms, our lobbies, our restaurants and our meeting rooms and all public areas are clean. We're one of the few industries the San Francisco Board of Supervisors do not need to over-regulate on cleanliness.

Warmest regards,

Selena Lu

Sr. Housing Project Manager

George P. Johnson Experience Marketing

217 2nd Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

selena.lu@gpj.com

We Power Brand Experiences



A Project Worldwide Agency

gpj.com | George P. Johnson is the world's leading experiential marketing agency. We unleash the power of creativity to deliver experiences that elevate brands and drive tangible results. We're part of Project, an independent network in service of creativity. Project's agencies include Argonaut, Darkhorse, Dig&Fish, George P. Johnson, G7 Entertainment Marketing, JUXT, Motive, Partners + Napier, Praytell, Raumtechnik, Shoptology, Spinifex Group, and Wondersauce. Project.com

This email may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it and notify the sender of the error.

From: [Will Herrera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Hotel reopening
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 11:32:23 AM

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

Hello. My name is Mario Herrera and I worked as a busser at Le Meridien San Francisco. I am writing to express strong opposition to the Emergency Healthy Business Ordinance. My hotel is currently closed. I want my hotel to reopen and call me back, and when that happens, I want to feel safe in my work environment. This new ordinance is unproven and is not endorsed by the CDC or other US-based scientific experts. Furthermore, it adds significant costs with no proven benefit. No other city in the US is following these unproven cleaning standards.

Most of my co-workers are out of work, including myself. We were not included in the decision to stray from the cleaning protocols provided by the CDC, as well as federal and state health officials. This ordinance attacks not only unfairly target hotels workers, but minority groups especially. More than 75% of the employees in the hotel industry are people of color.

Federal and state health officials recommend limiting personal interaction. However, the City Supervisors in San Francisco are increasing my exposure to potentially infected guests by mandating I enter occupied rooms, strip beds and perform deep cleaning daily.

Cleanliness is not only a critical and essential part of my job but a #1 priority for our hotel so we can serve our guests. I am disappointed I was not part of the conversation that is keeping me unemployed, which also affects my family. Please hear me now as I express strong opposition to this ordinance.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Non-conformity of Development Agreement with Principles & Parameters (File Nos. 200422, 200423, 200635)
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:35:00 AM

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:26 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Wong, Linda (BOS) <linda.wong@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>
Cc: Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>; cgodinez <cgodinez@lwhs.org>; mikeahrens5 <mikeahrens5@gmail.com>; sunnyside.balboa.reservoir <sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com>; Brigitte Davila <bdavila@ccsf.edu>; Peter Tham <peter.tham@ltgroupre.com>; marktang.cac@gmail.com; jumpstreet1983 <jumpstreet1983@gmail.com>; rmuehlbauer <rmuehlbauer@live.com>; SNA BRC <sna-brc@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Non-conformity of Development Agreement with Principles & Parameters

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

BRCAC, Land Use & Transportation Committee, Budget & Finance Committee, BOS, Files 200422, 200423, 200635:

As the Reservoir Project approvals reach the final stages, I urge a review of how the Development Agreement conforms with the Principles & Parameters:

Preamble:

- **Transportation and Neighborhood Congestion:** Traffic congestion and the availability of street parking are already major problems facing the local community. No development proposal is likely to garner community support if it would worsen these conditions.

- **City College:** The community cares deeply about City College's long-term health and growth. We are especially concerned that the Balboa Reservoir development will displace a surface parking lot currently utilized by City College students. It will be critical for the Balboa Reservoir developer to work with City College to address parking needs by identifying alternative parking and transportation solutions that do not compromise students' ability to access their education.

- **Affordable Housing:** Members of the CAC and the community are deeply concerned about housing affordability. We would like to see a significant proportion of the housing at Balboa Reservoir be affordable to a combination of low, moderate, and middle-income people. However, housing cannot come at the cost of increased congestion.

Principles & Parameters:

HOUSING

Principle #1: Build new housing for people at a range of income levels. Parameters:

a. Make at least 50% of total housing units permanently affordable in perpetuity to low (up to 55% of Area Median Income (AMI)), moderate (up to 120% of AMI), and middleincome (up to 150% AMI) households, provided that this can be achieved while also ensuring project feasibility and providing the economic return to SFPUC ratepayers that is required by law.

1. Make at least 33% of total housing units permanently affordable in perpetuity to low or moderate-income households, consistent with Proposition K (2014).


aj comment:

Contrary to "permanently affordable in perpetuity" the Development Agreement's Exhibit D 'AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM' states:

4. Affordability Restrictions.

(a) Each Affordable Parcel will be subject to a recorded regulatory agreement approved by MOHCD to maintain affordability levels for the life of the Project or fifty-seven (57) years,

*A cautionary tale for people to look into the future, 57 years from now:
[‘There’s nowhere to go:’ Peninsula tenants face eviction as rent control expires](#)*



‘There’s nowhere to go:’ Peninsula tenants face eviction as rent control...

The Foster’s Landing complex has for years provided housing for low-income families.

https://www.smdailyjournal.com/news/local/affordable-rents-to-expire-at-foster-city-apartment-building/article_198deaa8-6024-11ea-9440-33aa98e33239.html

Principle #3: Help to alleviate City's undersupply of housing.

Parameters:

b. Create housing **without** compromising the quality of design or construction or **outpacing needed transportation infrastructure.**

aj comment:

The Transit Mitigation Measures in the Development Agreement has 3 elements: 1) A boarding island for the southbound 43 Masonic at Frida Kahlo/Ocean-Geneva; 2) Signal timing changes at Ocean/Brighton with no westbound to southbound left turns, and protected EB to NB left turn phase; 3) Signal timing changes at Ocean/Plymouth (?! shouldn't this be Lee?!!) with no WB to SB left turns, and protected EB to NB left turn phase.

These 3 mitigation measures are token measures that are incommensurate with transit delay that will be caused by the 1,100-unit project. The limiting factor is the fact that the 1100-unit project will only have ingress/egress at Lee and at one location on Kahlo Way. Tinkering with signal changes and adding a boarding island will not be able to solve the inherent problem of the limited roadway access to a landlocked parcel.

TRANSPORTATION

Principle #1: Manage parking availability for onsite residents while managing parking to meet City College enrollment goals and coordinating with City parking policies for the surrounding neighborhoods.

c. Working with City College and the City, describe an **appropriate parking** and transportation demand management plan that accommodates **all appropriate City College student and employee demand at full enrollment, including access to the City College's future Performing Arts and Education Center.** The TDM plan (including assumptions such as data and projections) should be coordinated with City College and consistent with recommendations in the forthcoming Balboa Area TDM Plan. If expert analysis demonstrates that shared parking is a viable approach, explore accommodating City College affiliates and other non-residents in shared parking facilities (garages where the same parking spaces are utilized by residents during non-peak hours and accessible to all others, including City College students and employees at other times).

aj comment:

*The Development Agreement does not conform with this Principle. The Development Agreement calls for an absolute maximum of 450 spaces, deliberately ignoring "full enrollment, including access to the...future PAEC." The Fehr & Peers CCSF TDM & Parking Plan--which accounts for PAEC--shows " there would be unserved demand for around **980 to 1,767** parking spaces."*

PROJECT'S RELATIONSHIP TO CITY COLLEGE

Principle #3: In coordination with City College, design and implement the project's transportation program in such a way that also creates new sustainable transportation opportunities for City College students, faculty, and staff.

b. Working with City College and the City, develop an appropriate parking and TDM strategy that accommodates City College students and employees. If expert analysis demonstrates that shared parking is a viable approach, explore accommodating City College affiliates and other non-residents in shared parking facilities (garages where the same parking spaces are utilized by residents during non-peak hours and accessible to all others, including City College students, faculty, and staff, at other times).

aj comment:

The Development Agreement does not conform with this Principle. The Development Agreement calls for an absolute maximum of 450 spaces. And if nobody had been looking at the fine print, the DA would only specify 220 spaces, based on a cherry-picked figure from the Fehr Peers TDM Study. Even the current 450 spaces deliberately ignores "full enrollment, including access to the...future PAEC."

The Fehr & Peers CCSF TDM & Parking Plan--which does account for PAEC--shows " there would be unserved demand for around 980 to 1,767 parking spaces."

c. Phase the project in such a way that changes to the current parking lot can occur gradually, allowing for incremental adaptations rather than the wholesale removal of all parking spaces at once.

aj comment:

The Development Agreement does not conform with Principle 3c. Exhibit J of the DA, "Transportation" states:

b. Interim Parking

During the initial site-wide grading phase of construction of the Project no publicly-available parking spaces will be provided.

Principle #4: To ensure that the Balboa Reservoir project is sensitive to City College's mission and operations, work with City College and its master planning consultants to ensure that the Balboa Reservoir site plan and City

College's forthcoming new Facilities Master Plan are well coordinated and complementary.

b. Assume that City College's planned Performing Arts & Education Center, designed for City College property immediately to the east of the Balboa Reservoir site, will be built. Working with City College and the City, describe an appropriate parking and transportation demand management plan that accommodates access to the future Performing Arts and Education Center (see Transportation parameter 1c).

aj comment:

The Development Agreement does not conform with this Principle. The Development Agreement calls for an absolute maximum of 450 spaces. And if nobody had been looking at the fine print, the DA would only specify 220 spaces, based on a cherry-picked figure from the Fehr Peers TDM Study. Even the current 450 spaces deliberately ignores "full enrollment, including access to the...future PAEC."

The Fehr & Peers CCSF TDM & Parking Plan--which does account for PAEC-- shows " there would be unserved demand for around 980 to 1,767 parking spaces."

--Alvin Ja

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Fallacy of "developer equity and project revenues" subsidizing affordable unit (File Nos. 200422, 200423, 200635)
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 12:05:00 PM

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:08 PM
To: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Wong, Linda (BOS) <linda.wong@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>
Cc: SNA BRC <sna-brc@googlegroups.com>; Public Lands for Public Good <publiclandsforpublicgood@gmail.com>; CCSF Collective <kien.eira@gmail.com>; ccsfheat@gmail.com; Defend City College Alliance <madelinenmueller@gmail.com>
Subject: Fallacy of "developer equity and project revenues" subsidizing affordable unit

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

Land Use & Transportation Committee, Budget & Finance Committee, BOS (Files 200422, 200423, 200635):

One of the key assumptions of the Balboa Reservoir Project is the concept of Public-Private Partnership in which market-rate housing would be subsidizing affordable housing.

However, this assumption that the citizenry would benefit substantially from the market-rate units helping to pay for the affordable units is not borne out by information contained in the Economic & Planning Systems, Inc's (EPS) 5/12/2020 Fiscal Feasibility Memo (p. 1247 of 2256-page PDF <https://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2018-007883GPAPCAMAPDVA.pdf>).

Here is a simple summary drawn from the EPS Memo regarding who's actually paying for the affordable units:

Of the 550 affordable units:

- Developer pays for 234 units (\$72.5 Million) = 42.5% of 550 affordable units
- State of CA pays for 129 units (\$40 Million) = 23.5% of 550 affordable units
- City of SF pays for 187 units (\$44.7 Million) = 34.0% of 550 affordable units

So, of the 550 affordable units, 316 units (57.5%) will be paid for with public funds, and only 42.5% will be paid for from "developer equity and project revenues"!

Budget & Legislative Analyst Report, File 18-0163 (3/9/2018)

The Budget & Legislative Analyst's determination of feasibility and responsibility rested on the assumption that, associated with the 550 market-rate units, developer equity and revenue would subsidize 363 affordable units.

The March 2018 Budget & Legislative Analyst's Fiscal Feasibility & Responsibility Report

assumes--incorrectly-- that the developer's 363 affordable units would be financed by "developer equity and project revenues."

This assumption is not borne out in fact, based on information contained in the 5/12/2020 EPS Memo.

"Key Points" of the Budget & Legislative Analyst Report's Executive Summary states:

Key Points

• *The Balboa Reservoir is a 17-acre site adjacent to San Francisco City CollegeThe development is approximately 1,100 housing units, of which 50 percent would be market rate and 33 percent would be affordable to low- and moderate-income households, funded by developer equity and project revenues. The remaining 17 percent of housing units would be affordable housing, funded by City and other sources not yet identified.*

Information provided by the 5/12/2020 EPS Memo shows that the assumption that the developer's 363 affordable units **will not** really be funded fully by developer equity and revenue. The reality is that the developer is expecting its 363 affordable units to be subsidized substantially with public funding.

The EPS Memo estimates that its 363 affordable units to cost \$112.5 Million.

Of the \$112.5 Million cost, the developer expects to pay \$72.5 Million, and State grants to pay \$40.0 Million. In other words, instead of the market-rate units subsidizing 363 units, the State of California will be subsidizing 36% of the developer's responsibility for 363 affordable units.

Of the 550 affordable units:

- Developer pays for 234 units (\$72.5 Million) = 42.5% of 550 affordable units @ \$310K/ unit
- State of CA pays for 129 units (\$40 Million) = 23.5% of 550 affordable units @ \$310K/ unit
- City of SF pays for 187 units (\$44.7 Million) = 34.0% of 550 affordable units @ \$239K/ unit

The Reservoir Project's reliance on \$40 Million in public funds to subsidize the developer's 363 units invalidates the the 3/2018 Budget Analyst determination because the Report's assumption of "developer equity and project revenues" is untrue.

Do not approve the Reservoir Project.

Do not facilitate this Privatization Scam.

Sincerely,
Alvin Ja, District 7

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Appoint Rocky Chau To Animal Welfare Commission
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:47:00 PM

From: Jordan Davis <jodav1026@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:52 AM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (BOS) <han.zou@sfgov.org>
Subject: Appoint Rocky Chau To Animal Welfare Commission

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

Dear Animal Control and Welfare Commission,

I am writing to you today to support my fellow D6 neighbor Rocky Chau to the Animal Welfare Commission. I had the opportunity to work with him on several projects.

Rocky successfully runs Direct Action Everywhere's (DxE) working group and regularly conducts investigations into animal cruelty. I believe that Rocky would be an asset to your commission, as he brings a tremendous amount of energy and enthusiasm to animal advocacy. He provides fresh insights as a native San Franciscan, person of Chinese background (there are few POC and no Asian representation on the community, and a grassroots activist.

I was impressed by his ability to communicate the effectiveness of our approach to actions, community building, and getting buy in on group decisions, and he has always been a compassionate individual who helps to develop budding animal rights activists such as myself

I believe that Rocky would be an excellent commissioner for vacant Seat 1 or Seat 2.

Please feel free to contact me at jodav1026@gmail.com if you need any additional information or clarification.

Sincerely,
Jordan Davis
(she/her)

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 9 letters for File No. 200735
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:54:00 PM
Attachments: [9 letters for File No. 200735.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached 9 letters for File No. 200735.

File No. 200735 - Ordinance amending the Police Code to make it unlawful to cause a peace officer to contact a person solely to discriminate against the person on the basis of the person's race, ethnicity, religious affiliation, gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity; creating a civil cause of action and providing for damages for violating the prohibition.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Erik Triana](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CAREN act
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:23:14 AM

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

Thoroughly disgusted by the overtly racist act by shamann walton and the curiously racist naming of her proposed legislation. looking forward to the introduction of the Newly Integrated Grocery Generating Emergency Resources for the Supervisors consideration. State Providers of Infants Children & Kids, Freedom And Gyroscopes all good legislation as well. Racist pieces of shit. White Lives Matter too assholes.

From: [Karen Kesseru](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CAREN act
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 7:51:05 AM

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

Dear entire Board of Supervisors:

There is a stereotyping meme on social media that has created yet another name-calling pejorative towards a group of people, this time WOMEN and especially women - sisters, daughters, mothers, wives, friends - named Karen.

How clever of you to create a mnemonic and to change the spelling to name your new law outlawing racially motivated calls to 911, a mnemonic that promotes this hurtful stereotype. Surely you didn't mean to purposely move the city consciousness towards continued negativity, surely you just thought you were socially instep.

There are men included in this racist mindset. There are people named every other name. Yet you chose to disparage every woman named Karen, Karin, Carin, Caryn..... were you aware there is even an ethnolinguistic group named Karen located in Thailand and Myanmar?

The socially responsible action to take is to apologize and then make a name change to this law.

Thank You,
Karen Kesseru

From: [Krista Ranta](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: About the Sexist, Ageist Karen/Caren slur - I hoped the oppression would fade away. Please do not institutionalize it by naming an Act after it!
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 8:10:34 AM

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

Dear Shamman Walton,

Please reconsider the naming an important bill with a contempt-filled pop-reference to the slur "Karen or Caren". "Caren/"Karen" memes and references are an example of the ugliness of prejudices we want to leave behind us. It almost seems like someone is trying to sabotage the act by giving it a discriminatory name. Is the Council trying to get PR by bringing attention the a problem of creating new derogatory terms? If so, It seems like very bad timing since we are in the middle of several divisive crises.

Please take a moment to read this op-ed out of the Sydney Morning Herald that starts a dialogue about what is so incredibly wrong, cruel and narrow-minded use of the term "Karen" or "Caren". A "Caren act" is just another signal that we are a long way from ending institutionalized prejudices and discrimination. The term "Karen/Caren" is all about putting generations of women back in their place.

https://www.smh.com.au/national/thanks-for-noticing-us-gen-z-but-we-need-to-talk-about-karen-20200213-p540mv.html?utm_medium=Social&utm_source=Facebook&fbclid=IwAR1y8nk2yCd53y-nr6DVrBqpJXW8cLMDSU6HR8eQP06xgTmf4uGi3alAGfs#Echobox=1581724244

My Mother-In-Law is a lovely, gracious woman named Karen who never found her voice and people walk all over her. Her departed husband was a kind, generous man named Dick. Karen was lucky to find Dick. Would San Francisco propose a "Dick Act" too?

I worked as one of the first women that worked for a major municipality in trades that had a male monopoly. I was criticized for taking a job away from "a family". I had to put up with lots of hazing and dangerous set-ups as they tried to get me to quit. I had hopes that future women could hold jobs that paid enough so that they could take care of themselves and I wanted to prove that women were capable of the work. I was proud of our trailblazing. I am now so disheartened after hearing so many people trying to discount us and shut us down again.

Krista Ranta
360-943-1007

From: [Karen Shane](#)
To: [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please Reconsider the name of the CAREN Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 8:53:32 AM

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

Dear Honorable Supervisor Walton, all San Francisco Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

Please reconsider the naming of the Ordinance that was introduced at last night's Supervisor Meeting. Yes, I am named Karen, and I do speak up for injustices on a regular occasion. However, the 3 other Karen's I know and I are not like portrayed. I could go on how this is like any other profiling done to Race, Religion or you name it, but think that is understood.

I appreciate the use of the Capital C. However, it is still pronounced as a hard C and like our name. So could we attempt at coming up with some other acronym that doesn't vilify a whole group of people named Karen/Caryn/Caren.

I did consider adding KRON news as a cc to this request, but decided that would be a "Karen."

Thank you for your time,

Shane (my new name)

From: [Shannon Drake](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CAREN Act is unenforceable & divisive.
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 1:28:51 PM

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

The proposed CAREN act is a bad idea, in most cases it is nearly impossible to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a call is racially motivated, this creates incredibly dangerous grey area in our legal system that can easily be abused. It will also cause more division in our communities as people will undoubtedly read bias into the rulings.

This will drive a wedge between the racial groups of our city and create prejudice where none existed previously as groups start to blame each other for erroneous convictions. We are already dealing with this issue when it comes to police brutality, we don't need to add more fire to that pot.

It will also promote segregation between racial groups as the potential for negative interactions start to carry more dramatic consequences. It will become safer to just avoid other racial groups than it will be worth it to work together.

It will also create an incentive for criminals to target other races because they will be able to claim "racial discrimination" if a person calls the cops on them and the cops arrive before a crime was committed. The criminal can easily say "I wasn't trying to do XYZ, the caller is obviously racist!"

I urge the BOS to drop this bill, it is toxic to our city.

From: [Carynn Silva](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CAREN ACT? Name hypocritical, you think?
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 5:54:50 PM

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

I take the name of this Act introduced by Mr. Walton as highly insulting and ignorant. Someone decided to create this racist meaning to the name "KAREN" in which has come to symbolize a stereotype of whiteness and continue to use it and spread it around social media without the consideration that this name is of birth names people personally use.

This causes discrimination and is being used as a racist term against white women. This "CAREN Act" is "This bill could protect millions of Californians from becoming targets of hate and prevent the weaponization of our law enforcement against communities of color". However the use of this name "CAREN Act" is racist in itself for it's use. Be considerate to the fact that this name belongs to actual people that have to live, breathe, and survive in their society. White, Black, Brown, doesn't matter, people of authority need to stop dividing us.

Choose another name.

Thank you,
Carynn Silva (And I absolutely love my first name my Mother gave me when I was born).

From: [Vic Vicari](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Caren Act
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 7:01:37 PM

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

To whom it may concern:

I do not have objection to this act; the issue it is trying to address is wrong. I do strongly object to the the name. The insensitive choice of many people to use the name Karen as a general purpose term of disapproval for middle age white women needs to stop. It has a significant negative impact on too many good women with this name. The name you have chosen for this act perpetuates this problem and that is wrong.

Two wrongs do not make a right. Please rename your act.
Sincerely,
Vic Vicari.
Sent from my iPad

From: [Karen Simon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Caren Act
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 7:27:49 AM

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

I heard on the news this morning that you are considering enacting a statute that you are naming the Caren Act. While I find the Karen memes funny, to stereotype and stigmatize any group of people, even a group identified solely by their name, is neither funny nor is it appropriate. It is, in fact, legalizing discrimination.

As a person who is a member of that group, I hope your Board will not take an action that is clearly harmful and belittling to anyone. Proof of my point is that expressing my opinion about this action will be mocked and dismissed due to the stereotype.

Karen Simon
704-517-8814

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Caren Batides](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Caren Act
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 10:58:00 AM

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

Hello

As a white woman named Caren, I am asking you to please consider changing the name of your new Act referenced below.

The "CAREN Act" (Caution Against Racially Exploitative Non-Emergencies) was introduced on Tuesday at a San Francisco Board of Supervisors meeting by Supervisor Shamann Walton.

The name of the act places a target on my name as a racist and I am not. By associating the name "Caren" or anyone else's name with such a law, really is offensive. It is at its face a form of bullying. I am sure that Shamann would not want to have their name made fun of and associated with demeaning behavior.

Thank you for your consideration
Caren Batides

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Letters in Support of Caltrain Ballot Measure
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:08:00 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[Caltrain Support - American Railway and Airline Supervisors .pdf](#)
[Caltrain Support - Int'l Assoc. of Machinists and Aerospace Workers .pdf](#)
[Caltrain Support - SMART .pdf](#)
[Caltrain Support - TCU IAM.pdf](#)
[Caltrain Support -NFCO.pdf](#)
[Caltrain Support -Signalmen .pdf](#)
[Caltrain Support -SMART 2.pdf](#)

From: Linehan, Amy <LinehanA@samtrans.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2020 11:06 AM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Groom, Carole [cgroom@smcgov.org] <cgroom@smcgov.org>; Horsley, Don [dhorsley@smcgov.org] <dhorsley@smcgov.org>; wslocum@smcgov.org; dcanepa@smcgov.org; mike.wasserman@bos.sccgov.org; Chavez, Cindy [cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org] <cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org>; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.ellenberg@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.simitian@bos.sccgov.org; MTABoard@SFMTA.com; board.secretary@vta.org; marie.blankley@ci.gilroy.us; Bruins, Jeannie [jbruins@losaltosca.gov] <jbruins@losaltosca.gov>; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; district5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; hendrickscouncil@sunnyvale.ca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; john.mcalister@mountainview.gov; liz.kniss@cityofpaloalto.org; hmiller@saratoga.ca.us; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; mayorandcouncil@santaclaraca.gov; district3@sanjoseca.gov; rrennie@losgatosca.gov
Cc: Fromson, Casey <Fromsonc@samtrans.com>
Subject: Letters in Support of Caltrain Ballot Measure

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

All:

Attached for your review and consideration are several letters that have submitted to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors in support of Caltrain and the proposed 1/8 cent sales tax ballot measure.

Letters of Support have been submitted by the following organizations:

- The American Railway and Airway Supervisors Association/TCU
- International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers –District Lodge 19
- International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers – Railroad, Mechanical and Engineering Department
- Transportation Communications Union/IAM
- National Conference of Firemen and Oilers/SEIU

- The Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen
- Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation – Transportation Division

Please let us know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Best,
Amy C. Linehan

Amy Colleen Linehan, Public Affairs Specialist

1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA 94070

Cell: 650.418.0095

San Mateo County Transit District



The American Railway and Airway Supervisors Association/TCU

*International Association
of Machinists and Aerospace Workers*



**Michael R. Miller
National Representative**

July 8, 2020

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax ballot measure

Dear Chair Pine:

Thank you for everything the Caltrain Board is doing to keep the system operating in the face of truly unprecedented challenges. [YOUR ORGANIZATION] was pleased to support the allocation of Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We understand that in the absence of significant ridership gains, those funds are likely to run out before the end of the year. We also understand that identifying new external revenues will be critical to maintaining service and personnel during the remainder of the fiscal year and through FY 22. Given the urgent need to identify new funding, we urge you to take the actions needed to place a 1/8-cent sales tax on the November 2020 ballot.

Caltrain provides a vital link in the region's transit network. Thousands of essential workers and transit dependent riders continue to use the service. Former riders have indicated that they are prepared to return to the system when allowed to do so, and as the regional economy continues to struggle, we will likely see a growing number of transit dependent riders throughout the Bay Area. Allowing Caltrain to fail will leave all of these riders without a transit option. We owe it to the communities we serve to do everything we can to prevent that from happening.

We were excited to learn that Caltrain's recent poll revealed that support for new revenue to maintain and improve Caltrain has actually increased compared to where it was a year ago. Voters clearly understand how important Caltrain is to regional economic recovery, managing traffic congestion, and enhancing mobility. We cannot let this opportunity to secure Caltrain's future go by. This is an opportunity to save Caltrain, and at the same time create revenue to improve it, tripling ridership and making the system more affordable and accessible for everyone.

Improving Caltrain was always dependent on dedicated funding, but now the system's survival depends on it. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious. Opportunities to create new funding for transit operations are incredibly limited. With so much at stake, we cannot let this one pass us by.



◆ 3 Research Place ◆ Rockville, Maryland 20850-3279 ◆
Phone—301-948-4910 ◆ FAX—301-948-1369 ◆ Website—www.tcuunion.org




Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael Miller".

Michael Miller
ARASA National Representative

Cc: San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS
AND AEROSPACE WORKERS
DISTRICT LODGE 19

OFFICE OF GENERAL CHAIRMAN: JUAN ESTRADA

July 9, 2020

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax ballot measure

Dear Chair Pine:

Thank you for everything the Caltrain Board is doing to keep the system operating in the face of truly unprecedented challenges. [YOUR ORGANIZATION] was pleased to support the allocation of Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We understand that in the absence of significant ridership gains, those funds are likely to run out before the end of the year. We also understand that identifying new external revenues will be critical to maintaining service and personnel during the remainder of the fiscal year and through FY 22. Given the urgent need to identify new funding, we urge you to take the actions needed to place a 1/8-cent sales tax on the November 2020 ballot.

Caltrain provides a vital link in the region's transit network. Thousands of essential workers and transit dependent riders continue to use the service. Former riders have indicated that they are prepared to return to the system when allowed to do so, and as the regional economy continues to struggle, we will likely see a growing number of transit dependent riders throughout the Bay Area. Allowing Caltrain to fail will leave all of these riders without a transit option. We owe it to the communities we serve to do everything we can to prevent that from happening.

We were excited to learn that Caltrain's recent poll revealed that support for new revenue to maintain and improve Caltrain has actually increased compared to where it was a year ago. Voters clearly understand how important Caltrain is to regional economic recovery, managing traffic congestion, and enhancing mobility. We cannot let this opportunity to secure Caltrain's future go by. This is an opportunity to save Caltrain, and at the same time create revenue to

improve it, tripling ridership and making the system more affordable and accessible for everyone.

Improving Caltrain was always dependent on dedicated funding , but now the system's survival depends on it. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious. Opportunities to create new funding for transit operations are incredibly limited. With so much at stake, we cannot let this one pass us by.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Juan Estrada', with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

Juan Estrada
General Chairman
District 19, IAMAW

Cc: San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors

**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF
SHEET METAL, AIR, RAIL AND TRANSPORTATION WORKERS
RAILROAD, MECHANICAL AND ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

25 Amanda Circle
Bear, DE 19701



Phone: (302) 836-1158
Fax: (302) 836-8178
jmccloskey@smart-gc2.org

JOHN MCCLOSKEY
General Chairman

July 8, 2020

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax ballot measure

Dear Chair Pine:

Thank you for everything the Caltrain Board is doing to keep the system operating in the face of truly unprecedented challenges. SMART Mechanical was pleased to support the allocation of Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We understand that in the absence of significant ridership gains, those funds are likely to run out before the end of the year. We also understand that identifying new external revenues will be critical to maintaining service and personnel during the remainder of the fiscal year and through FY 22. Given the urgent need to identify new funding, we urge you to take the actions needed to place a 1/8-cent sales tax on the November 2020 ballot.

Caltrain provides a vital link in the region's transit network. Thousands of essential workers and transit dependent riders continue to use the service. Former riders have indicated that they are prepared to return to the system when allowed to do so, and as the regional economy continues to struggle, we will likely see a growing number of transit dependent riders throughout the Bay Area. Allowing Caltrain to fail will leave all of these riders without a transit option. We owe it to the communities we serve to do everything we can to prevent that from happening.

We were excited to learn that Caltrain's recent poll revealed that support for new revenue to maintain and improve Caltrain has actually increased compared to where it was a year ago. Voters clearly understand how important Caltrain is to regional economic recovery, managing traffic congestion, and enhancing mobility. We cannot let this opportunity to secure Caltrain's future go by. This is an opportunity to save Caltrain, and at the same time create revenue to improve it, tripling ridership and making the system more affordable and accessible for everyone.

Improving Caltrain was always dependent on dedicated funding, but now the system's survival depends on it. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase

their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious. Opportunities to create new funding for transit operations are incredibly limited. With so much at stake, we cannot let this one pass us by.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John McCloskey". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

John McCloskey
General Chairman

Cc: San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors



Transportation Communications Union/IAM

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers



God Bless America

William DeCarlo
National Vice President
National Legislative Director

Dave Arouca
Asst. National Legislative Director

July 8, 2020

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax ballot measure

Dear Chair Pine:

Thank you for everything the Caltrain Board is doing to keep the system operating in the face of truly unprecedented challenges. Transportation Communications Union/IAM was pleased to support the allocation of Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We understand that in the absence of significant ridership gains, those funds are likely to run out before the end of the year. We also understand that identifying new external revenues will be critical to maintaining service and personnel during the remainder of the fiscal year and through FY 22. Given the urgent need to identify new funding, we urge you to take the actions needed to place a 1/8-cent sales tax on the November 2020 ballot.

Caltrain provides a vital link in the region's transit network. Thousands of essential workers and transit dependent riders continue to use the service. Former riders have indicated that they are prepared to return to the system when allowed to do so, and as the regional economy continues to struggle, we will likely see a growing number of transit dependent riders throughout the Bay Area. Allowing Caltrain to fail will leave all of these riders without a transit option. We owe it to the communities we serve to do everything we can to prevent that from happening.

We were excited to learn that Caltrain's recent poll revealed that support for new revenue to maintain and improve Caltrain has actually increased compared to where it was a year ago. Voters clearly understand how important Caltrain is to regional economic recovery, managing traffic congestion, and enhancing mobility. We cannot let this opportunity to secure Caltrain's future go by. This is an opportunity to save Caltrain, and at the same time create revenue to improve it, tripling ridership and making the system more affordable and accessible for everyone.

◆ 3 Research Place ◆ Rockville, Maryland 20850-3279 ◆
Phone—301-840-8704 ◆ FAX—301-330-7673 ◆ Website—www.tcunion.org



Improving Caltrain was always dependent on dedicated funding, but now the system's survival depends on it. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious. Opportunities to create new funding for transit operations are incredibly limited. With so much at stake, we cannot let this one pass us by.

Sincerely,



William DeCarlo
National Vice President/Legislative Director
Transportation Communications Union/IAM

Cc: San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors



July 8, 2020

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax ballot measure

Dear Chair Pine:

Thank you for everything the Caltrain Board is doing to keep the system operating in the face of truly unprecedented challenges. The National Conference of Fireman & Oilers SEIU was pleased to support the allocation of Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We understand that in the absence of significant ridership gains, those funds are likely to run out before the end of the year. We also understand that identifying new external revenues will be critical to maintaining service and personnel during the remainder of the fiscal year and through FY 22. Given the urgent need to identify new funding, we urge you to take the actions needed to place a 1/8-cent sales tax on the November 2020 ballot.

Caltrain provides a vital link in the region's transit network. Thousands of essential workers and transit dependent riders continue to use the service. Former riders have indicated that they are prepared to return to the system when allowed to do so, and as the regional economy continues to struggle, we will likely see a growing number of transit dependent riders throughout the Bay Area. Allowing Caltrain to fail will leave all of these riders without a transit option. We owe it to the communities we serve to do everything we can to prevent that from happening.

We were excited to learn that Caltrain's recent poll revealed that support for new revenue to maintain and improve Caltrain has actually increased compared to where it was a year ago. Voters clearly understand how important Caltrain is to regional economic recovery, managing traffic congestion, and enhancing mobility. We cannot let this opportunity to secure Caltrain's future go by. This is an opportunity to save Caltrain, and at the same time create revenue to improve it, tripling ridership and making the system more affordable and accessible for everyone.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
FIREMEN & OILERS,
32BJ/SEIU

JOHN R. THACKER
NCFO DISTRICT PRESIDENT

DEAN DEVITA
NCFO DISTRICT SECRETARY-TREASURER

EXECUTIVE BOARD

RICHARD EDMONDS
JIM LARREAU
ROBERT SMITH

1212 BATH AVENUE
FLOOR F&O
ASHLAND, KY 41101

TEL: 606.324.3445
FAX: 606.326.7039
WWW.NCFO.ORG



Improving Caltrain was always dependent on dedicated funding, but now the system's survival depends on it. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious. Opportunities to create new funding for transit operations are incredibly limited. With so much at stake, we cannot let this one pass us by.

Sincerely,



Michael Pistone
General Chairman
NCFO

Cc: San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors



Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen

917 Shenandoah Shores Road
Front Royal, VA 22630

Phone: (540) 622-6522
Fax: (540) 622-6532

Jerry C. Boles
President

Michael S. Baldwin
Secretary-Treasurer

July 8, 2020

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent Sales Tax Ballot Measure

Dear Chair Pine:

Thank you for everything the Caltrain Board is doing to keep the system operating in the face of truly unprecedented challenges. The Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen was pleased to support the allocation of Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We understand that in the absence of significant ridership gains, those funds are likely to run out before the end of the year. We also understand that identifying new external revenues will be critical to maintaining service and personnel during the remainder of the fiscal year 2020 through fiscal year 2022. Given the urgent need to identify new funding, we urge you to take the actions needed to place a 1/8-cent sales tax on the November 2020 Ballot.

Caltrain provides a vital link in the region's transit network. Thousands of essential workers and transit dependent riders continue to use the service. Former riders have indicated that they are prepared to return to the system when allowed to do so, and as the regional economy continues to struggle, we will likely see a growing number of transit dependent riders throughout the Bay Area. Allowing Caltrain to fail will leave all of these riders without a transit option. We owe it to the communities we serve to do everything we can to prevent that from happening.

We were excited to learn that Caltrain's recent poll revealed that support for new revenue to maintain and improve Caltrain has actually increased compared to where it was a year ago. Voters clearly understand how important Caltrain is to regional economic recovery, managing traffic congestion, and enhancing mobility. We cannot let this opportunity to secure Caltrain's future go by. This is an opportunity to save Caltrain, and at the same time create revenue to improve it, tripling ridership and making the system more affordable and accessible for everyone.

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
Re: RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent Sales Tax Ballot Measure
July 8, 2020
Page 2

Improving Caltrain was always dependent on dedicated funding, but now the system's survival depends on it. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious. Opportunities to create new funding for transit operations are incredibly limited. With so much at stake, we cannot let this one pass us by.

For the Organization,



Jerry C. Boles
President

cc: San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors

Rick Pauli
General Chairperson

John F. Vessels
Vice General Chairperson

DeVar Thompson
Secretary

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)
TRANSIT AMERICA SERVICES, INC. (TASI/CALTRAIN)
KEOLIS RAIL SERVICES VIRGINIA (KRSV/VRE)
KEOLIS COMMUTER SERVICES (KCS)
HERZOG, INC. (TRI-RAIL/NMRX)
CONRAIL SAA



July 8, 2020

San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

RE: Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax ballot measure

Dear Chair Pine:

Thank you for everything the Caltrain Board is doing to keep the system operating in the face of truly unprecedented challenges. [YOUR ORGANIZATION] was pleased to support the allocation of Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We understand that in the absence of significant ridership gains, those funds are likely to run out before the end of the year. We also understand that identifying new external revenues will be critical to maintaining service and personnel during the remainder of the fiscal year and through FY 22. Given the urgent need to identify new funding, we urge you to take the actions needed to place a 1/8-cent sales tax on the November 2020 ballot.

Caltrain provides a vital link in the region's transit network. Thousands of essential workers and transit dependent riders continue to use the service. Former riders have indicated that they are prepared to return to the system when allowed to do so, and as the regional economy continues to struggle, we will likely see a growing number of transit dependent riders throughout the Bay Area. Allowing Caltrain to fail will leave all of these riders without a transit option. We owe it to the communities we serve to do everything we can to prevent that from happening.

We were excited to learn that Caltrain's recent poll revealed that support for new revenue to maintain and improve Caltrain has actually increased compared to where it was a year ago. Voters clearly understand how important Caltrain is to regional economic recovery, managing traffic congestion, and enhancing mobility. We cannot let this opportunity to secure Caltrain's future go by. This is an opportunity to save Caltrain, and at the same time create revenue to improve it, tripling ridership and making the system more affordable and accessible for everyone.

July 8, 2020
Page Two

Improving Caltrain was always dependent on dedicated funding , but now the system's survival depends on it. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious. Opportunities to create new funding for transit operations are incredibly limited. With so much at stake, we cannot let this one pass us by.

Sincerely,



Rick Pauli
General Chairman

cc: San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Open letter to Larry Ellison and Safra Catz
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:02:00 PM

From: Francisco G Delgadillo <francisco@gestudia.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:42 PM

To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>

Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Open letter to Larry Ellison and Safra Catz

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

Dear Mayor Breed, Supervisor Madelman, and Board of Supervisors,
I hope this message finds you all energized to continue carrying out your leadership in this pandemic of health inequities, racial injustice, and economic disparities.

I'm sharing an open letter to Larry Ellison and Safra Catz I published on LinkedIn to bring your attention to the lack of engagement, let alone support, from Oracle to address their employees of color's lack of opportunity and wealth equality.

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/letter-larry-ellison-safra-catz-francisco-g-delgadillo/>

I urge you to leverage your position to partner with tech companies like Oracle, that headquarter or do business in and with San Francisco, to establish robust policies that can address their systemic barriers for black and brown employees to join and advance within their ranks.

Sincerely,

Francisco Delgadillo

Home owner and resident in San Francisco's Castro district



BLACK AND BROWN EMPLOYEES MATTER

Letter to Larry Ellison and Safra Catz



Francisco G Delgadillo | Follow
Free Agent

47 7 0

Larry Ellison, Chairman of the Board and Chief Technology Officer, Oracle
Safra Catz, Chief Executive Officer, Oracle

Dear Larry and Safra,

Black and brown employees matter. Corporate America needs to listen and take transformative action. And you two can play a leading role.

From its onset, the COVID-19 pandemic exposed a flawed healthcare system and wealth disparities in the U.S. that disproportionately affect workers of color.

After his final 8 minutes and 46 seconds under the weight of an unjust police system, George Floyd's death exposed deeply rooted police brutality and racial prejudices in the U.S.

In a matter of weeks, the convergence of these two tragic events led to an unprecedented awareness of the critical contributions workers of color make in the service of their communities and of multi-national companies. These devastating events also shed light onto the long-perpetuated systemic social oppression and structural economic inequality of black and brown people.

This new wave of awareness and demonstrative pain has led to protests across the nation and around the world. People are calling for leaders to make reforms that can yield political and corporate change toward a more harmonious and equitable future, for all.

Leaders of some of the largest U.S. technology corporations have added their voices to the national discourse: lots of them with disposable platitudes, many with statements of solidarity, some with tangible declarations against racism and inequality, and very few with measurable commitments to greater opportunity and inclusion for current and future black and brown employees.

Microsoft, Amazon, Salesforce, Google, Workday—all leading cloud companies—have issued different responses to the surge of calls for better opportunities for black and brown employees. Their executive leaders have also made different funding commitments to nurture the next negotiation of black and brown employees.

Many critics are skeptical of these companies' support for social justice reform. Many question the levels of funding allocated to their pledges for educational opportunity and economic equality.

These pledges thus far range from single- to triple-digit million dollars, over multiple years, around the world—grossly disproportionate to their corporate and personal net worth and to their booming financial recovery during the pandemic.

But at least this critical discourse has entered their c-suite and corporate boardrooms which historically have been fearful of alienating their investors and customers, most often letting the burden of change fall onto the government, educational institutions, and society at large.

Larry, a titan in the tech world, you have been remarkably absent from this public discourse and so have you Safra, a break-through executive in your own right.

Oracle so far has not issued a public statement supporting or pledging funds to Black Lives Matter. I learned from Oracle employees that you issued a "we stand in solidarity" statement internally, "against racism, hatred, discrimination and bigotry," asking all employees to recommit to a culture of inclusion, fairness, and opportunity.

A quick search of Oracle's social media postings in the last month for "Black Lives Matter/BLM/educational opportunity/economy equality" yielded zero results.

Larry, you've been very conservative when it comes to social media and rarely issue personal statements on social platforms. Evidence of this is the one and only tweet you posted in 2012 when



And most recently in mid-April, you posted a YouTube video as part of a well-orchestrated virtual sales pitch praising Zoom. It worked. By the end of April, Zoom had selected Oracle Cloud for its online meeting service infrastructure.

What struck me about your video—delivered in the middle of a devastating pandemic, on the day when the number of COVID-19 positive cases in the U.S. had just surpassed 500K, with a toll of more than 23K deaths—was that you Larry, an influential leader in the tech world, chose to make a rare personal statement to support a sales pitch rather than publicly thank the more than 135K Oracle employees around the world for helping you keep the company running, for helping the company deliver critical technology access to its customers while corporate America went to work from home. The only fruitful search on Oracle’s corporate web site leads to your Diversity and Inclusion page with a bit of legacy content related to Oracle’s Employee Resource Groups and your latest “Diversity Data 2019”, showing a dismal 3.7 percent Black and 6.5 percent Hispanic in your U.S. workforce. See screens below.

Employee Resource Groups Your Voice Matters

Our Employee Resource Groups are a vital part of our culture. Connect with the diverse and communities that make up who we are as a company.



**African-American
Business Leadership for
Excellence**

Generations of Leaders
Organization

Milita
Empl



African-American

We’re a community that v
focus on:

- Recruiting and retaining
- Mentoring and develop
- Engaging the wider cor



Transparency Is the Key to Progress

Creating the future calls for people with different backgrounds, experiences, and ways of thinking. We believe achieving real diversity like this is a journey—not a once-off destination.

That's why we continue to improve our diversity programs and work on our hiring strategies. Every day we are making these numbers more representative of the world around us.

During Oracle's latest FY20Q4 earnings call with investors and financial analysts on June 16 neither of you raised a single mention during your prepared remarks about the social unrest and wealth disparities affecting the company's HQ region and many cities and countries in which the company operates. And not a single question about these topics was raised by analysts during the Q&A portion of the call.

Moreover, Larry, you took great pride in commenting on the Zoom, 8x8, and other cloud wins during the call. And Safra, citing multiple examples, you said, "how proud I am of our employees and customers as we are all actively engaged in the ongoing fight against COVID-19". But neither of you presented a single proposal to remediate the lack of diversity and inclusion as shown in your own employment data, nor a single investment to enhance talent incubation and recruitment, to improve retention and promotion of Oracle black and brown employees—to fight against educational and economic inequality.

I can understand why you would want to play it safe during such tumultuous time. There is a lot at stake after all. Oracle closed its 2020 fiscal year in May with total revenue of \$39.1 billion and more than \$43 billion in cash and liquid assets. Yet Oracle is in deep fight mode as it continues to face off Microsoft, Amazon, Salesforce, Google, and SAP for a top spot in the highly competitive cloud market.

It was just last year for example when Oracle was competing to secure a 10-billion dollar, multi-year cloud contract—Project Jedi—with the Department of Defense (DoD). After initially losing the bid to Amazon, Oracle lost the contract to Microsoft. Notably, both Amazon and Microsoft have made public commitments to Black Lives Matter initiatives.

The DoD is but one of many government agencies to which you sell Oracle technology. In fact, Oracle has a long heritage of partnering with the U.S. government, going all the way back to the company's founding as a CIA project back in 1977.

So, it's understandable that you and your institutional investors would want to stay clear of anything that could hurt your profits or compromise your chances of winning government contracts or sever your ties with the Trump administration—it's understandable but shows a lack of leadership in this hour of reckoning.

I write this letter not as an accusation but rather to highlight some awesome opportunities for you to show great leadership commensurate to your power and prowess.

As a twice-former Oracle employee most recently of 11 years, and currently, albeit tiny, an Oracle investor, I believe the two of you could be both effective fiduciary agents to the company's investors and inspiring leaders to your employees and the tech industry at large.

Success in today's corporate America requires diversity of ideas to deliver greater innovation.

Diversity fuels innovation. Homogeneity fuels disparity.



all your employees and investors.

Only then will Oracle become a relevant partner to its customers. As you both well know, relevance in the tech world greatly matters to the bottom line, and now more than any other time in your life time as a corporate leader, relevance in leadership matters.

From my experience working for you, I know you are both calculated leaders and you are driven by data.

Larry, you personally have driven Oracle through more than 40 years of success, and last year you crafted Oracle's latest mission statement, "our mission is to help people see data in new ways, discover insights, unlock endless possibilities."

So dig deep across all data at your disposal, across all job categories, all salaries, to detect and address patterns of structural racism, of unequal investment, unequal recruitment, unequal pay, unequal opportunity, unequal advancement for black and brown employees.

Safra, aside from your stellar stewardship of the company's finances, you have also shown great moral leadership when for example you called on Oracle employees to donate to Romania's disaster relief after the birthplace of your father was hit by natural disaster or when you spoke as an ally to customers and partners at the first ever Oracle Diversity & LGBT Leadership Summit at OpenWorld.

What do you think corporate America's responsibility is in this moment? And how could Oracle and you lead the charge?

I believe you both are in a unique position to embody Oracle's mission and forge structural change that is good for your customers, your bottom line and to help your present and future black and brown employees achieve educational and economic equality.

Larry, will you be discussing any of these topics during your upcoming live virtual event on July 8? Below, I offer but a few baseline ideas to encourage you and the incredibly smart executives and employees that surround you at Oracle to share your own ideas for progressive action:

1. Establish an endowment to support equitable policies and reforms of early education systems that can provide the foundation for a fruitful life of learning and better opportunities in high paying jobs for black and brown students

- Key words are "policies" and "early", so the impact can be systematic, lasting beyond help for a single organization or small groups of students
- Oracle's Market value is \$167 billion. Larry, your net worth is \$68.9 billion. Safra, yours is \$1.1 billion. Different endowment models could be explored

2. Expand the historic investment Oracle and the Oracle Education Foundation made in 2018 in the construction of d.tech at Oracle, the first public high school on a corporate campus

- Increase the land investment on and off corporate campuses for additional schools that can deliver d.tech's and other schools' progressive and inclusive curriculum
- Adjust the admissions criteria to ensure equitable representation of black and brown students

3. Expand your current university partnerships and recruitment strategy to include year-round engagement and support of HBCUs and black and brown student bodies at schools other than ivy league universities

- Year-round and deep engagement with these schools should be the norm not just during recruitment periods around graduation
- This may require reassessing Oracle's H-1B recruitment strategy because without broadly investing in a well-educated black and brown work force in the U.S., the need to import talent will be perpetuated

4. Expand the investment Oracle is already making in the Oracle for Startups program, to proactively recruit, nurture, and grow black- and brown-owned small business


- Key word is "proactively" because the company currently lacks knowledge and relationships with these underrepresented business communities
- Program benefits must go beyond free limited access to Oracle Cloud, and provide comprehensive business incubation and development support

5. Establish robust promotion policies and programs for current and future black and brown employees, with measurable goals for their advancement into management, senior management, and executive positions in the company

- Management skills training, exposure to higher-level projects, and direct access to mentors should all be included in a system of targeted development
- Accountability on the part of executive and manager sponsors for meeting program goals should be a key requirement and factor in their compensation

Sincerely,
Francisco G Delgadillo

Published By

 **Francisco G Delgadillo**
Free Agent

Follow

isco G

Delgadillo
#LarryEllison #SafraCatz #Oracle #OracleCloud #cloud #BLM #BlackLivesMatter #BlackBrownEmployeesMatter #diversityandinclusion #educationalopportunity #economicquality #leadership #investment #amazon #microsoft #google #workday #SAP

7 comments

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: re Hong Kong
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:52:00 PM

From: sfrobink@aol.com <sfrobink@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 4:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: re Hong Kong

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

Hi - just writing to you all to express concern about the Hong Kong situation. Perhaps the board could consider passing a resolution condemning the crackdown? Also, whatever SF could do to cut economic ties with the Chinese government in Beijing, and any other ideas.

Thx - Robin Krop

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: T-MOBILE REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE/Landuse Issue/ Land use and Transportation Committee/SF Board of Supervisors
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 1:48:00 PM

From: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:24 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: T-MOBILE REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE/Landuse Issue/ Land use and Transportation Committee/SF Board of Supervisors

cpages

ERICA MAJOR

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

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

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

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:** John Lee <[johnqpublicaffairs@gmail.com](mailto:johnqpublicaffairs@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2020 10:01 AM  
**To:** Major, Erica (BOS) <[erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org)>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <[lee.hepner@sfgov.org](mailto:lee.hepner@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** Re: T-MOBILE REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE/Landuse Issue/ Land use and Transportation Committee/SF Board of Supervisors

Thank you Erica. My intention is to address the full board at tomorrow's meeting at 1pm during open comment for non-agenda items.

Lee, is it possible that I may chat with you prior to? You and I met in 2019 when I came to your office.

At that time I was seeking your assistance with regard to my client's (T-Mobile) wireless plans for the City.

Regards,

John Q. Lee, President & CEO

JOHNQ Public Affairs, LLC  
2658 Griffith Park Blvd, Suite #278  
Los Angeles CA 90039  
Mobile: (323) 401-1819  
[JohnQPublicAffairs@Gmail.com](mailto:JohnQPublicAffairs@Gmail.com)

On Jul 6, 2020, at 9:08 AM, Major, Erica (BOS) <[erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org)> wrote:

Greetings John,

Thank you for your email, sending you along to the contacts for the Land Use and Transportation Committee.

**ERICA MAJOR**

**Assistant Clerk**

Board of Supervisors

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

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

[Erica.Major@sfgov.org](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

**(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS)** To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

*Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.*

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: John Lee <johnqpublicaffairs@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, July 5, 2020 9:06 PM

To: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>

Subject: T-MOBILE REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE/Landuse Issue/ Land use and Transportation Committee/SF Board of Supervisors

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

Hello Ms. Major. Thank you again for taking my calls this past Thursday.

As I Indicated my name is John Q. Lee. I am president and owner of **John Q Public**, a Los Angeles-based statewide government affairs and political advocacy firm. My client which precipitated my call to your office is T-Mobile.

Prior to, I worked for Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles Metro for 20 years serving in several executive (Assistant Deputy Mayor LA Mayor Richard J. Riordan) and legislative (Deputy Chief of Staff to LA City Council President Alex Padilla now California Secretary of State) positions.

I am reaching out to the Land Use and Transportation Committee for the San Francisco Board Of Supervisors on behalf of my client T-Mobile to request assistance in facilitating a discussion (public or otherwise) to address the City's review and approval process for wireless applications to upgrade its existing sites in the City.

DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUE

RUN UP TO 5G—T-Mobile has been deploying its 2020 build plan for gearing up San Francisco for 5G which entails a significant amount of applications (Over 200 sites before end of 2020) for modifications existing previously approved sites that need modifications.

COVID-19—The need to upgrade and modify its existing sites is even more crucial because—the very State and county orders for “stay at home, work from home school from home” have impacted the coverage and capacity needs of the network—because there are more people going online in a more concentrated location than ever before. It is these two factors that have upped the stakes for getting the build done on time.

BLUE BEAM ONLINE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM—

This past March, the City’s DBI and planning departments deployed Blue Beam which is a new online permit review and approval system.

The goal was to help expedite the review and approval process for all developers alike.

After nearly four months it has proven to be challenging (See attached below for a sample of sites that have been in the cue since April)

To alleviate the backlog caused by the system, the City announced a “curbside service” for dropping off plans and making appointments for review. While it may help as a stop gap, there needs to be a real solution and strategy.

T-Mobile (and it’s fellow wireless carrier colleague companies) believe that we have a solution. Now, we need someone to listen and hear our feedback. To date, that has not happened nor has the opportunity been presented.

CONCLUSION

We are living in unprecedented times. Technology is even more crucial for all of us. As a consequence of this pandemic and the needed State and county orders to require residents and business to “work from home, stay at home and school at home”—the impacts to the network have been massive.

We need to modify the technology to our existing sites in your City—to address these changing needs. And we are stuck without your help.

NEXT STEPS

Based on the foregoing, T-Mobile and other carriers stand ready to meet with members of the Land use and Transportation or their staffs and all city departments involved in the review and approval process. We have some specific ideas and solutions that we would like to offer—all request to the City have been to no avail.

Regards,

John Q. Lee, President & CEO

JOHNQ Public Affairs, LLC
2658 Griffith Park Blvd, Suite #278
Los Angeles CA 90039
Mobile: (323) 401-1819
JohnQPublicAffairs@Gmail.com

<image001.png>

<image002.jpg>