FILE NO. 260413

Petitions and Communications received from April 9, 2026, through April 16, 2026, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on April 21, 2026.

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

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), making an appointment to the following body. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.134, to the Small Business Commission:
    - Robyn Sue Fisher – term ending January 6, 2030

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Chyanne Chen at the February 24, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting. (2)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting an agenda for the April 15, 2026, Visual Arts Committee meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) meeting minutes for the April 9, 2026, meeting, and agenda for the April 23, 2026, meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), pursuant to Ordinance No. 22-25, submitting a Progress Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting a cancellation notice for the Executive Committee meeting on April 22, 2026; and a cancellation notice for the Civic Design Review Committee meeting on April 20, 2026. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (TTX), pursuant to California Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Monthly Pooled Investment Report for the month of March 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), submitting a Charter Reform Working Group Summary and Analysis report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance 1) temporarily excluding certain sites from the provisions of California Senate Bill No. 79 (SB 79) that

require local jurisdictions to allow residential uses at various densities, heights, and floor area ratios on sites within one-half mile of a transit-oriented development stop; 2) permanently excluding from those provisions of SB 79 sites located in industrial employment hubs, including certain sites zoned M (Industrial), SALI (Service/Arts/Light Industrial), PDR (Production, Distribution, Repair), WMUG (WSoMa Mixed Use-General), and P (Public), and sites with a walking path of more than one mile to the closest transit development stop; 3) amending the Planning Code to permit additional density and height for residential projects on certain parcels within one-half mile of a transit-oriented development stop; 4) adopting an Alternative Plan to SB 79, including making findings that the Alternative Plan provides equivalent development capacity; 5) making findings that these exemptions and the City's residential capacity meet the requirements of SB 79; and 6) directing the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to transmit a copy of this Ordinance to the California Department of Housing and Community Development. File No. 260132. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard. 9 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing ("PSH") that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents ("Drug-Free PSH") to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone ("Drug-Tolerant PSH"), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH's strategies to meet PSH residents' demands. File No. 251003. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Lisa Tatsuno, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Health Code - Spaying, Neutering, and Sterilizing of Dogs. File No. 251162. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From John Nulty, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Public Works Code to allow development projects to satisfy street tree planting requirements through payment of an in lieu fee or providing alternative landscaping; exempt accessory dwelling units from street tree planting requirements; eliminate appeals to the Board of Appeals for tree removals undertaken by City departments and commissions; and update in lieu fee reporting requirements; amending the Administrative Code to create a separate account within the Adopt-A-Tree Fund to receive in lieu fees for street tree requirements; and amending the Planning Code to update street tree applicability requirements. File No. 251211. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From members of the public, regarding the Hearing - Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force Recommendations, Final Report, and Charter Amendment; Various Codes - Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies; and Calling from Committee - Committee of the Whole - Hearing - Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force Recommendations, Final Report, and Charter Amendment - March 17, 2026. File Nos. 260147 and 260225 (Motion No. M26-23). 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to, for transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2026: halve the real property transfer tax rate from 5.5% to 2.75% when the consideration or value of the property conveyed equals or exceeds $10,000,000 but is less than $25,000,000, and from 6% to 3% when the consideration or value equals or exceeds $25,000,000; exempt from these reductions the transfer of single-family residences; and reduce the penalties for delinquent real property transfer taxes. File No. 260178. 23 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council to evaluate and advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Fire Department, on the criteria and types of evidence the Fire Marshal should consider in determining whether to waive, modify, or delay certain compliance requirements under the Fire Code that certain existing high-rise residential buildings have sprinkler systems; and to set forth the membership and duties of the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council. File No. 260216. 159 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. File No. 260216. 15 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From members of the public, regarding the Balboa Skate Park. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco Budget. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields. 18 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20).

From Magick Altman, regarding the San Francisco ecosystem. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Environment Code to update the City’s climate action goals and planning process, and to update City Departments’ roles and

responsibilities regarding the City's climate action goals. File No. 260177. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From a member of the public, regarding the Resolution urging the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to develop and implement a comprehensive enforcement and intervention plan to address drug use or suspected drug activity especially within 250 feet of parks, playgrounds, schools, and youth centers including issuing citations, conducting assessments, and removing individuals for processing or detoxification services. File No. 250991. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Neo Veavea, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Pacific Islander Cultural District in and around the Visitacion Valley and Sunnydale neighborhoods; to require the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to submit written reports and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor describing the cultural attributes of the District and proposing strategies to acknowledge and preserve the cultural legacy of the District; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 260179. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Laurie J. Mullins, regarding the treatment of Angel Herrera. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Julia Pérez, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; and eliminating exceptions allowing indoor smoking in bars with no employees, bars with historically compliant semi-enclosed smoking rooms, and hotel rooms, to conform to provisions of California law. File No. 260361. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Lea McGeever, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From John Taylor, regarding the Great Highway/Sunset Dunes. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From Fiora Watts, regarding various Ordinances: Zoning Map – Family Zoning Plan; Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes – Family Zoning Plan; Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes – Family Zoning Plan; General Plan Amendments – Housing Element 2022 Update; Local Coastal Program Amendment – Family Zoning Plan; General Plam Amendments – Family Zoning Plan. File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

Item 1

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 14, 2026

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Appointments - Small Business Commission

On April 10, 2026, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). This appointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (May 10, 2026).

Appointment to the Small Business Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.134:

- **Robyn Sue Fisher** - term ending January 6, 2030

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

If you wish to hold a hearing on this appointment, please let me know in writing by Friday, April 17, 2026.

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

April 10, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Sections 3.100(18) of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby submit the following:

Appointment of Robyn Sue Fisher (replacing Rachel Herbert, resigned) to the Small Business Commission for a full-term ending January 6, 2030.

I am confident that she will serve our community with distinction. Attached are her qualifications, which demonstrate how her appointment reflects the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

All my best,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

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

Item 2

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: SFMTA Response to District 11 LOI re: Parking
Date:	Thursday, April 9, 2026 1:40:03 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-aosyuwtz.png Outlook-zcsr03vy.png Outlook-r4e1z22m.png Outlook-2orgr1l0.png Outlook-5v5c44bq.png SFMTA 26.0408 D11_Parking LOI.pdf Clerk"s Memo.pdf Supervisor Chen Letter of Inquiry Opportunities to Increase Parking Availability in District 11.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Chen at the February 24, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

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

From: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2026 12:38 PM
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>
Cc: Wise, Viktoriya (MTA) <Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com>; Sciammas, Charlie (BOS) <charlie.sciammas@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Adkins, Joe (BOS) <joe.adkins@sfgov.org>; Martinsen, Janet (MTA) <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: SFMTA Response to District 11 LOI re: Parking

Dear Supervisor Chen,

Thank you for your patience and for your overall ongoing interest in transportation challenges in San Francisco, particularly in District 11 with regard to parking.

Please find the attached letter as our formal response to your Letter of Inquiry, and please let us know how you would like to proceed.

Again, we thank you for your partnership in this challenging work, and we look forward to collaborating with you and the community to address community interest in addressing parking challenges in District 11, along with any other transportation matters you would like to address.

Please respond with dates and times for when you may be available to meet with Director Wise or let me know how we may be of assistance in any other way.

Sincerely,

Joél T. Ramos
Local Government Affairs Manager
SFMTA
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
joel.ramos@sfmta.com
415-646-2067
SFMTA.com

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Janet Tarlov, Chair
Stephanie Cajina, Vice Chair
Mike Chen, Director
Alfonso Felder, Director
Steve Heminger, Director
Dominica Henderson, Director
Fiona Hinze, Director

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transportation

April 8, 2026

District 11 Supervisor Chyanne Chen
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244

Honorable Supervisor Chen,

Thank you for your letter of inquiry to the SFMTA requesting a district-wide evaluation of potential opportunities to increase parking availability in District 11. We understand that limited parking access is a common concern in the District, as well as in many other San Francisco neighborhoods.

Below we provide a summary of various considerations for increasing parking supply and managing parking availability. We look forward to working with you to consider changing parking configuration on residential streets as well as collaborating with merchants to identify locations for the best commercial corridor curb use. We would appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with merchants to identify locations to optimize commercial corridor curb use, to discuss our analysis and to further partner on identifying practical solutions that address resident and merchant concerns.

Street Configuration Assessment

Generally, the most practical streets to convert parallel parking to perpendicular parking are 50 feet wide curb-to-curb or wider, which can accommodate perpendicular parking on one side and parallel parking on the other. In 2017, then-District 11 Supervisor Safai asked the SFMTA to explore converting parallel parking to perpendicular or angled parking in the Excelsior. Our analysis at that time indicated that there were not any streets suitable for such a parking change. Indeed, few residential streets in District 11 are wide enough to accommodate such parking configurations.

In addition, some streets are unfavorable for perpendicular or angled parking because they have school loading zones, Muni routes, or existing or future bicycle routes along them. These streets include Ocean and San Jose Avenues and other residential streets in the Oceanview neighborhood due to the streetcar rail lines, Mission Street, Geneva Avenue and other streets due to Muni routes, and Holloway Avenue, Alemany Boulevard and other streets due to existing bicycle facilities. Changed parking configurations can delay transit, bicyclists, and school loading by introducing slower parking maneuvers and less travel lane width for safe passing. Because angled parking occupies more roadway width compared to parallel parking, there may be some concerns from the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) regarding potential impacts to their

operations and emergency response. For example, depending on the building heights adjacent to each street, SFFD may require 20 to 26 feet of clear width in the roadway for ladder operations. Each block requires review of any proposed changes by SFFD and there may be more factors involved during their review.

Even when feasible on wider streets, converting parallel parking to angled parking requires careful consideration and outreach. Angled parking can make driveway ingress and egress more difficult because of impaired sight lines. Historically, residents have opposed angled parking because it may be considered unsightly, reduce sidewalk space due to vehicle overhangs, and increase headlight glare into bedrooms and living rooms. Residents often do not want the streets in front of their houses to look like a parking lot, with reduced visibility between the sidewalk and street due to the higher density of parked vehicles. Because of these tradeoffs, the SFMTA requires a petition signed by a majority of the residents on a block in support of the proposal before we begin the legislation process. This avoids proceeding forward with proposals that may not count on consensus and avoids disputes among neighbors at required public hearings.

Alternative Curb Management Approaches

Most streets suitable for angled parking conversion tend to be situated on residential streets and benefit residents more as long-term parking, as opposed to short-term parking for merchants and their customers. For commercial areas, it would be more beneficial to review the curb management to generate increased short-term parking availability and provide better utilization of the existing parking spaces. Generally, curb management strategies include parking meter installations, color curb additions and adjustments, and Residential Permit Parking area establishment.

On residential streets, Residential Permit Parking (RPP) is SFMTA's primary tool to create more parking availability. An RPP Area sets a parking time limit for visitors, while those with a valid permit are exempt from time limits. The RPP program is purposely resident-driven, and requires a petition by a majority of residents on a sufficient number of blocks to initiate the legislative process. District 11 has very few existing RPP Areas.

Sometime ago, the Excelsior neighborhood has expressed interest in RPP to help manage parking availability. Surveys and engagement in 2018-2020 stalled during COVID due to many residents expressing lack of support. The community reinitiated the effort in 2024 and proposed new boundaries for extending RPP Area V. The SFMTA released a new petition in 2025 to collect the required signatures for the extension. A total of 301 petitions have been completed to date, with 154 in support and 147 in opposition. Only one block so far has passed the 50% threshold requirement to extend RPP.

On commercial streets, as noted above, parking meters and various loading zones help ensure space for customer parking, customer loading, and loading of goods for merchants. The Curb Management team would be happy to do walk-throughs on commercial corridors with merchant group representatives and a representative of the D11 office to assess existing regulations and consider potential changes (including the types of changes listed in the Letter of Inquiry).

With respect to process, establishing parking meters to replace existing parking time limits, and establishing/extending Residential Permit Parking areas requires approval by the SFMTA Board of Directors. The legislative process begins with an inter-departmental review, followed by a public hearing, then followed by review by the SFMTA Board. The timeline from inter-departmental review to SFMTA Board is approximately three months.

Other minor changes such as converting existing metered parking spaces to various loading zones do not require approval by the SFMTA Board and therefore have a shorter approval timeline. Such changes only require a public comment period followed by approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The approval timeline for these types of minor changes is approximately one month. Following approvals, the Agency needs a few months to implement the changes.

With any parking regulations, a public process is required to legislate the change. Depending on response from the community, the outreach and engagement followed by the legislative process may take six (6) months, depending on whether SFMTA Board approval is required. Depending on scope, installation, could take several months post-approval.

We look forward to working with your office on identifying practical solutions that support residents and merchants and balance the overall needs of the transportation system.

Sincerely,

Viktoriya Wise

Viktoriya Wise
Director, Streets Division


SFMTA


SFMTA

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

Phone: (415) 554-5184
Email: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org

February 25, 2026

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transportation
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103
Via Email: Julie.Kirschbaum@SFMTA.com

Dear Director Kirschbaum,

At the February 24, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Chyanne Chen issued the attached inquiry to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests information regarding opportunities to increase parking capacity in District 11, while maintaining public safety, accessibility, and operational integrity.

Please contact Charlie Sciammas, Charlie.Sciammas@sfgov.org, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Chen, for any questions related to this request, and copy BOS@sfgov.org on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than March 24, 2026.

For questions pertaining to the administration of this inquiry, do not hesitate to contact me in the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (415) 554-5184.

Very Truly Yours,

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/JA

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Janet Martinsen, SFMTA, Janet.Martinsen@SFMTA.com
Joel Ramos, SFMTA, Joel.Ramos@SFMTA.com
Viktoriya Wise, SFMTA, Viktoriya.A.Wise@SFMTA.com,
Christine Silva, SFMTA, Christine.Silva@SFMTA.com

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 11

City and County of San Francisco

CHYANNE CHEN

February 24, 2026

Julie Kirschbaum
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Letter of Inquiry Regarding Opportunities to Increase Parking Availability in District 11

Dear Director Kirshbaum,

Thank you for your continued partnership in addressing transportation and neighborhood concerns in District 11. Limited parking access is one of the most consistent concerns I hear from residents in my district. I am submitting this Letter of Inquiry to request the SFMTA provide an assessment of District 11 streets to evaluate whether, and under what circumstances, parking capacity could be increased while maintaining public safety, accessibility, and operational integrity. Specifically, I request information on the following:

1. Street Configuration Assessment: Identification of locations in District 11 where parallel parking could feasibly be converted to angled or perpendicular parking, including evaluation of roadway width, traffic circulation, emergency vehicle access, pedestrian safety, and compliance with state and local design standards.

2. Alternative Approaches: Assessment of additional designs or operational strategies that could expand on-street parking availability, including curb space reconfiguration and selective adjustments to red zones, loading zones, or other curb allocations.

3. Existing Studies and Plans: A summary of any past or currently planned studies, analyses, or reports related to parking availability, curb management, or street configuration in District 11.

4. Process and Timeline: An outline of the engineering requirements, community engagement steps, and expected timelines that would be required to complete an evaluation and implement any recommended changes.

5. Safety and Accessibility Considerations: Information on how proposed changes would be evaluated against public safety requirements, ADA accessibility standards, and Vision Zero goals.

I respectfully request a written response by March 24th, 2026. Thank you for your attention to this request. Please direct any questions related to this inquiry to my legislative aide, Charlie Sciammas, at Charlie.Sciammas@sfgov.org.

Regards,

Chyanne Chen
San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 11

Item 3

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: April 15, 2026 Visual Arts Committee Agenda
Date:	Thursday, April 9, 2026 4:20:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png April 15 2026 VAC Agenda.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission, submitting an agenda for the April 15, 2026, Visual Arts Committee meeting.

Sincerely,

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

From: Peterson, Tara (ART) <tara.peterson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2026 4:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>; Limcaco, Veronica (ART) <veronica.limcaco@sfgov.org>
Subject: April 15, 2026 Visual Arts Committee Agenda

SAN FRANCISCO ARTS COMMISSION
VISUAL ARTS COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 15, 2026
2:00 p.m.

Please see link and attached agenda.
https://www.sf.gov/meeting--april-15-2026--visual-arts-committee-meeting

Thank you,
Tara

Tara Peterson

Registrar, Civic Art Collection & Public Art Program
Pronouns: She/Her

Email: tara.peterson@sfgov.org
Office: 415-252-2219
Mobile: 415-819-5016

San Francisco Arts Commission
401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org | https://www.sfartscommission.org/experience-art/public-art

Newsletter | Flickr | LinkedIn | Facebook | Instagram | TikTok | Twitter | YouTube

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone. We affirm the sovereign rights of their community as First Peoples and are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community and uplifting contemporary indigenous voices and culture.

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the Sunshine Ordinance and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.

City and County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Agenda for Visual Arts Committee, April 15, 2026

sfac san francisco arts commission

Commissioners

- Chair Suzie Ferras, JD Beltran, J. Riccardo Benavides, Nabiel Musleh, Al Perez, Debra Walker.

Date and Time
Wednesday, April 15, 2026
2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Location
City Hall, Room 416,
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place.

Members of the committee will attend this meeting in-person at the location listed above. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in person at the physical meeting location listed above or remotely online.

Members of the public attending the meeting in-person will have an opportunity to provide up to three minutes of public comment on every agenda item.

- Watch on SFGovTV (captioned) Live Stream – Visual Arts Committee Meeting

Agenda items

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Changes, Land Acknowledgment**
    1. Call to order
    2. Roll call / Confirmation of quorum
    3. Agenda Changes
    4. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples. As a department dedicated to promoting a diverse and equitable Arts and Culture environment in San Francisco, we are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community.

2. General Public Comment
Discussion

(This item is to allow members of the public to comment generally on matters within the Commission's purview as well as to suggest new agenda items for the Commission's consideration.)

3. Consent Calendar
Discussion and possible action

1. Motion to approve the final Construction Documents deliverables for *Those Who Carry Water*, an architecturally integrated glass artwork by Walter Kitundu (Kitundu LLC), for the SFPUC Water Division Campus (formerly San Francisco Water Department at 2000 Marin), located at 2000 Marin Street in the Bayview neighborhood.

2. Motion to approve the final Construction Documents deliverables for *Joy Personified*, a series of 7 figurative, human-scaled sculptures, by Kristine Mays for SF Recreation and Park's India Basin Waterfront Park Project, located at Hunters Point Blvd. and Hawes St.

3. Motion to approve *Looking Back/Looking Forward*, a mural design by Olivia Perry. The mural will be painted on the SFMTA Utility Box on the southeast corner of Gough and Turk Street, measuring H75 in. by W36 in. by D17 in. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be maintained by the Millennium School.

Presentation time: Approximately 3 minutes
Explanatory Document: Mural Packet & Construction Documents

4. Big Art Loop: Panhandle, Lake Merced, Marina Green & McLaren Park
Discussion and possible action

A) Panhandle
Discussion and possible action to approve the temporary installation of *An Attempted Murder*, 2016 by Jack Champion, a pair of two sculptures that measure approximately H6 ft. by W3 ft. by L12 ft., fabricated from bronze and steel, located at Ashbury Street and Oak Street in The Panhandle. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be maintained by Big Art Loop and will be installed for a period of one year, from date of installation.

Discussion and possible action to approve the temporary installation of *Seed of Self*, 2023 by Kate Raudenbush, that measures H7 ft. by W7 ft. by L7.1 ft., fabricated from brass and steel, located at the west entrance of The Panhandle by Oak Street and Fell Street. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be maintained by Big Art Loop and will be installed for a period of one year, from date of installation.

B) Lake Merced
Discussion and possible action to approve the temporary installation of *V le B*, 2025 by Valeria Theberge, that measures H10 ft. by W3.5 ft. fabricated from foam, fiberglass, mortar, grout, glass and steel, located at the Lake Merced Meadow. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be maintained by Big Art Loop and will be installed for a period of one year, from date of installation.

Discussion and possible action to approve the temporary installation of *Penny the Goose,* 2015 by Lisa & Robert Ferguson, that measures H16 ft. by W19 ft. by D4 ft. fabricated from steel, concrete, pennies and epoxy, located at the Lake Merced Boulevard Parking Lot. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be

maintained by Big Art Loop and will be installed for a period of one year, from date of installation.

C) Marina Green
Discussion and possible action to approve the temporary installation of *Launch Intention*, 2020 by Griffin Loop, that measures H10 ft. by W14 ft. by L25 ft. fabricated from steel and reclaimed and recycled material, located at Marina Green. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be maintained by Big Art Loop and will be installed for a period of one year, from date of installation.

D) McLaren Park
Discussion and possible action to approve the temporary installation of *The Pushers,* 2021 by George Mubanga, two sculptures that measure H6.5 ft. by W5 ft. by L16 ft. fabricated from stainless steel, located at McLaren Park Overlook near Wilde Overlook Tower Lawn. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection. The artwork will be maintained by Big Art Loop, and will be installed for a period of one year, from date of installation.

Presenter: Program Associate Paris Cotz with Building 180
Presentation time: Approximately 12 minutes
Explanatory Document: Temporary Art Packet

5. SF Recreation and Park Department: Buchannan Street Mall
Discussion and possible action

Discussion and possible action to approve the installation of the following artworks at Buchanan Street Mall, which will not become part of the Civic Art Collection and will be owned and maintained by San Francisco Recreation and Park Department:

- Lewis Watts, *Healing & Remembrance,* 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 24 total panels, H73 in. by W45 in. (each panel area filled with various sized prints), Buchanan Street Mall between Grove Street and Fulton Street, and Buchanan Street Mall between Eddy Street and Turk Street
- CamishaFatimah Gentry, *Healing & Remembrance,* 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 4 total panels, H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between Grove Street and Fulton Street, and Buchanan Street Mall between Eddy Street and Turk Street
- D'Wana Stewart, *Local Artists & Performers*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 4 total panels, H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between Fulton Street and McAllister Street
- D'Wana Stewart, *Local Heroes & Cultural Icons*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 4 total panels, H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between Golden Gate Avenue and Turk Street
- Michael Reed Sr., *Local Artists & Performers*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 4 total panels, H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between Fulton Street and McAllister Street
- Michael Reed, Sr., *Local Heroes & Cultural Icons*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 4 total panels, H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between Golden Gate Avenue and Turk Street
- Cliffton Hyson, *Togetherness: by Cliffton*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 2 total panels, H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between McAllister Street and Golden Gate Avenue
- Aniyah Keith, *Togetherness: by Aniyah*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 2 total panels H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between McAllister Street and Golden Gate Avenue
- Queen Sheppard, *Togetherness: by Queen*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 2 total panels H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between McAllister Street and Golden Gate Avenue

- Dyavena Sumler, *Togetherness: by Day*, 2026, Digital print on aluminum, 2 total panels H48 in. by W18 in., Buchanan Street Mall between McAllister Street and Golden Gate Avenue
- Malik Seneferu, *Togetherness,* 2026, Laser cut aluminum, 12 panels total (visible front and back), H73 in., by W45 in., Buchanan Street Mall between McAllister Street and Golden Gate Avenue

Presenter: Lauren Chavez, Project Manager, Recreation & Parks Department
Presentation time: Approximately 12 minutes
Explanatory Document: Slideshow presentation

6. **Harvey Milk Plaza Improvements Project Public Art Project Plan**
   Discussion and possible action

Discussion and possible action to approve the Project Plan for the Harvey Milk Plaza Improvements Project Public Art Project.

Presenter: Project Manager Craig Corpora
Presentation time: Approximately 5 minutes
Explanatory Document: Public Art Project Plan

7. **11th and Natoma Park ("Rachele Sullivan Park") Public Art Project**
   Discussion and possible action

Discussion and possible action to approve the final fence design for the 11th and Natoma Park ("Rachele Sullivan Park") Public Art Project.

Presenter: Project Manager Craig Corpora
Presentation time: Approximately 7 minutes
Explanatory Document: Public Art Project Plan

8. **Staff Report**

Discussion

Presentation of Civic Art Collection and Public Art Program updates.

Presenter: Civic Art Collection & Public Art Program Director Mary Chou
Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

9. New Business and Announcements
Discussion

(This item is to allow the Commissioners to introduce without discussion new agenda items for consideration, to report on recent arts activities and to make announcements in accordance with Prop D.)

10. Adjournment
Action

Agenda posted 4/9/2026, 4:00pm, tp

Policies

Accessibility Meeting Policy
Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Program Associates Tara Peterson and Paris Cotz at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org or 415-539-6213, paris.cotz@sfgov.org. Late requests will be honored if possible. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible.

利便参與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料， 和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少 48 小時致電 415-252-2219 向 Tara Peterson, tara.peterson@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Tara Peterson, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gami t upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa.

Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon.

Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay

Tara Peterson sa 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org.
Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting.
Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin.
Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

Agenda Item Information/Materials Available
Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:
1) Department or Agency or report;
2) Public correspondence;
3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Program Associates Tara Peterson or Paris Cotz at tara.peterson@sfgov.org or paris.cotz@sfgov.org or 415-252-2219 or 415-539-6213. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Archives Available
A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting. View Visual Arts Committee Meeting Recordings

Cell Phone Or other Electronic Device Use at Hearings
Please silence all cell phones, pagers, and other sound-producing devices before the meeting begins.

If a device does go off during the meeting, please note that the Chair or President may ask the person responsible to step out of the room.

Disability Access
To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Tara Peterson or Paris Cotz at tara.peterson@sfgov.org or paris.cotz@sfgov.org or 415-252-2219 or 415-539-6213, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

- Wheelchair accessible entrance is at Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street.
- There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Lobbyist Ordinance
Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity.

For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, contact the Ethics Commission.

- 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 252-3100
- Ethics.Commission@sfgov.org

Meeting Procedures
1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.

2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for

the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.

3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.

5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. Written comments submitted to and received by Arts Commission staff via email to tara.petrson@sfgof.org or paris.cotz@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. before the date of the meeting will be brought to the attention of the commission and made part of the official record. Comments received afer the meeting may also be included in the record. The program associates will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Public Comment

Public comment in regard to specific agenda items will be taken before or during consideration of the item. Each speaker may speak for up to three minutes per agenda item, unless the Chair has announced a different length of time at the beginning of the meeting. Speakers may not transfer their time to another person. Any person speaking during a public comment period may

supply a written summary of their comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less.

NOTE: The San Francisco Arts Commission is discontinuing remote public 0.comment for all public meetings starting in December 2023. Public comment will be taken in-person, with remote access provided for those who require an ADA accommodation. Requests for accommodation must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 97.7. Late requests will be honored if possible. Please reach out to art-info@sfgov.org or by calling 415-252-2255 with any questions or to make an accommodation request

Sensitivity to chemical-based products
In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

Sunshine Ordinance
Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

Citizens interested in obtaining a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance can request a copy from by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine/

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- 1 Dr. Carlton b. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 554-7724
- By fax at 415-554 7854
- sotf@sfgov.org

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: 4/9/26 ISCOTT Meeting Minutes
Date:	Monday, April 13, 2026 12:22:30 PM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1613_Minutes.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) meeting minutes for the April 9, 2026, meeting.

Sincerely,

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

From: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2026 2:47 PM
Cc: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: 4/9/26 ISCOTT Meeting Minutes

Hello –

Attached are the minutes of the April 9, 2026 ISCOTT public hearing.
If you have any questions, please let us know.

Thank you,
Dianne Yee
Transportation Planner III, Special Events – Shared Spaces
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

ISCOTT MINUTES

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of April 9, 2026 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1613th Regular Meeting
Online Meeting

COMMITTEE	REPRESENTATIVE
SFMTA	Bryant Woo (Chair)
SFPD	Sgt. Eric Elias, Sgt. Dion McDonnell, Off. Ronald Quock, Off. Greg Burchard, Off. Jim Pandolfi, Off. Luis Ortiz
SFFD	Capt. Carol Wong
Public Health	Aron Wong, Kyle Chan
Public Works	Israel Graham
Entertainment Commission	May Liang
Planning	Absent

DEPARTMENTS	REPRESENTATIVE
SFMTA Special Events	Dianne Yee, Elizabeth Hsu
SFMTA Transit	Leslie Bienenfeld, Helen Kwan, Tony Chou, Kevin Keck
SFMTA Enforcement	James Sarracino
SFMTA Temporary Signs	Houston Forrester, Sean Muneno, Gary Chau
SFMTA Taxis	Scott Leon
Emergency Management	Leo Ishoda

GUESTS	ITEM	GUESTS	ITEM
Bahman Safari	T	Justin Appold	P
Kyle P		Amelia Gerolimatos	Q
John Camacho	W	Jonthan Sit	Q
Amanda Mitchell	L	Alma Castellanos, Kali A	V
Kelly Lentz		Rose (111 Minna Gallery)	F
Dylan Bermingham		Rodrigo Lopez	
Michael Peterson		Brittney Chew	M
Yo Ann Martinez	U	Derrick Ho	
Cal Callahan	S	Kim Morini	
Maurice Rivers	N	Selim Sardag	
Nik	J	Jonathan Schroder	G

Kim Morini		Barry Taranto	
Jeremy Besmer	O	Julian Viret	

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 26, 2026, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)
The Committee adopted the Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There was no public comment.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

A. 9th Avenue between Anza and Balboa streets
Sunday, May 3, 2026, 9 am to 3 pm
Block Party – 9th Avenue

B. Amethyst Way between Turquoise Way and Amber Drive
Saturday, July 4, 2026, 8 am to 3 pm
Block Party - 4th of July on Amethyst Way

C. 27th Street between Church and Sanchez streets
Sunday, September 20, 2026, 11 am to 5 pm
Block Party – 27th St. Block-Tober Fest

D. Lyon Street between Fulton and McAllister streets
Saturday, June 6, 2026, 9 am to 4 pm
NOPNA Block Party

E. 28th Avenue between Cabrillo and Fulton streets
Tuesday, May 5, 2026, 7 am to 2 pm
Lag B'Omer Community Celebration

F. Minna Street between 2nd and New Montgomery streets
Friday, April 10, 2026, 2 pm to 11 pm
111 Minna – Pangeaseed

G. Heron Street between 8th Street and Berwick Place
Saturday, June 27, 2026, 5 am to 9 pm
and
Saturday, July 25, 2026, 5 am to 9 pm
and
Friday, September 25, 2026, 5 am to
Saturday, September 26, 2026, 9 pm
Mr. S Geared Up Street Parties

H. Barneveld Avenue between Apparel Way and Apparel Way
Saturday, June 27, 2026, 12 noon to
Sunday, June 28, 2026, 8 am
AfterGlow Pride

I. Marin Street between Illinois and Easterly Terminus; Michigan Street between Cesar Chavez and Marin Street
Intersection closed: Michigan Street at Marin Street
(Local access allowed on Michigan Street via Cesar Chavez and Marin Street via Illinois.)
Friday, April 17, 2026, 4 pm to
Monday, April 20, 2026, 6 am
and
Friday, June 5, 2026, 4 pm to
Monday, June 8, 2026, 6 am
The Midway - Block Party Events as of 03/13/2026

J. Mint Plaza between 5th and Mint streets
Thursday, April 16, 2026, 8 am to 11:59 pm
and
Thursday, May 21, 2026, 8 am to 11:59 pm
Third Thursdays

K. Jane Warner Plaza area (17th Street between Castro and Hartford streets)
Friday, May 22, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm
Harvey Milk Day
and
Friday, June 12, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm
Pulse Nightclub Memorial
and
Monday, October 12, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm
Fleet Week
and
Monday, December 7, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm
Menorah Lighting
(Jane Warner Plaza Events)

APPROVED (6-0)

REGULAR CALENDAR

L. 10th Avenue between Balboa and Cabrillo streets
Saturday, June 6, 2026, 1 pm to 9 pm
Block Party - 10th Avenue

APPROVED (6-0)

M. Precita Avenue (westbound) between Alabama and Harrison streets
Saturday, May 9, 2026, 12 pm to 8 pm
Block Party - Precita Porchfest

APPROVED (6-0)

N. Lee Ave between Ocean and Holloway avenues
Saturday, May 30, 2026, 6 am to 3 pm
Ocean Avenue Car Show

APPROVED (6-0)

O. Lyon Street between McAllister and Fulton streets
Thursday, May 7, 2026, through
Tuesday, May 12, 2026
9 am to 6 pm, each day
Lyon St Mural Refresh

APPROVED (6-0)

P. Russ Street between Howard and Folsom streets
Thursday, April 16, 2026, 4 pm to 7 pm
Russ Street Community Gathering & Neighborhood Demonstration

APPROVED (6-0)

Q. Waverly Place between Sacramento and Washington streets
(Intersection of Waverly Place at Clay Street to remain open.)
Saturday, May 30, 2026, 9 am to 7 pm
Asian and Pacific Heritage Festival

APPROVED (6-0)

R. King Street between 7th and De Haro streets
Thursday, July 23, 2026, 6 am to 6 pm
Adobe San Francisco Street Food Festival

ON HOLD

S. Ringold Street between 8th and 9th streets
Sunday, June 7, 2026, 9 am to 5 pm
Ringold Street Anniversary Celebration

APPROVED (6-0)

T. 21st Street between Bryant and York streets
Sunday, June 28, 2026, 12 pm to 8 pm
Bar Bibi / El Chato Pride Party

APPROVED (6-0)

U. York Street between Mariposa and 18th streets
Friday, May 8, 2026, 12 pm to
Saturday, May 9, 2026, 11:59 pm
KQED Fest

APPROVED (6-0)

V. 23rd Street between Mission and Capp streets
Sunday, May 3, 2026, 7 am to 7 pm
Mother's Day Pop-Up Market

APPROVED (6-0)

W. Sansome Street between Sutter and Bush streets; Sutter Street between Sansome and Montgomery streets (southern curb lane and travel lane only)
Friday, April 24, 2026, 5 am to
Wednesday, April 29, 2026, 5 pm
What's Next 2026 (AWS)

APPROVED (6-0)

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

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

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

None

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)

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

None

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

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

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

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

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

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

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, April 23 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:44:20 AM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1614_Agenda.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see blow and attached from San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) agenda for the April 23, 2026, ISCOTT meeting.

Sincerely,

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

From: Chapman, Nick (MTA) <Nick.Chapman@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:37 AM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, April 23 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Good morning –

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, April 23.

If you have any questions, please email us.

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

Please consider the environment before using AI to respond to this email

ISCOTT AGENDA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of April 23, 2026 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1614th Regular Meeting

Online Participation	Please join Microsoft Teams Meeting at SFMTA.com/ISCOTTHearing Click on the Raise your hand icon. When you are prompted to unmute, click on the microphone icon to speak.
Phone Participation	Please dial +1 415-523-2709,,397937701# Find a local number Phone conference ID: 397 937 701# Dial *5 to be placed in the queue for public comment. When prompted dial *6 to unmute yourself.

Please ensure that you are in a quiet location, speak clearly, and turn off any TVs or radios around you.

Written Participation	Submit your written comments to SpecialEvents@SFMTA.com with "Public Hearing" in the subject line or by mail to SFMTA, 1 South Van Ness, 7th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Written comments must be received by 12 noon on the day prior to the hearing to be considered.

415.646.2414: For free interpretation services, please submit your request 48 hours in advance of meeting. / 如果需要免費口語翻譯，請於會議之前 48 小時提出要求 / Para servicios de interpretación gratuitos, por favor haga su petición 48 horas antes de la reunión./ Para sa libreng serbisyo sa interpretasyon, kailangan mag-request 48 oras bago ang miting.

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 9, 2026, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)
The Committee to adopt the Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Members of the public may address ISCOTT members on matters that are within ISCOTT purview and are not on today's agenda.

TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)
These proposed actions are an Approval Action as defined by S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31.

CONSENT CALENDAR
If there are no objections from the committee or the public, the following items will be voted on as a group.

A. 11th Avenue between Irving and Judah streets
Saturday, May 9, 2026, 10 am to 8 pm
Block Party – 11th Avenue

B. 6th Avenue between Kirkham and Judah streets
Saturday, August 22, 2026, 9 am to 9 pm
Block Party – 1400 Block of 6th Ave

C. Liberty Street between Castro and Noe streets
Saturday, June 13, 2026, 11 am to 5 pm
Block Party - Liberty Street

D. Mason Street between California and Sacramento streets
Saturday, May 2, 2026, 2 pm to 6 pm
Fairmont, Brand Shoot

E. Howard St from Beale to Fremont streets
Saturday, May 16, 2026, 7 pm to
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 11 am
Bay to Breakers 2026 (Addition)

F. Castro Street between 80-feet and 170-feet northerly of 18th Street (eastern parking lane only)
Saturday, June 6, 2026, 10 am to 7 pm
Cliff's 90th Anniversary Celebration

REGULAR CALENDAR

G. Shotwell Street between 18th and 24th streets
(Intersections to remain open.)
Saturday, October 31, 2026, 3 pm to 10 pm
Trick-or-Treat - Shotwell 2026

H. Harrison Street between Precita Avenue and Norwich Street
Saturday, May 9, 2026, 1 pm to 6 pm
Block Party – Harrison Street

I. De Haro Street between 23rd and 24th streets
Sunday, May 31, 2026, 12 pm to 8 pm
Block Party - De Haro Street - End of School Year

J. Mission Rock Street between 3rd Street and Terry A Francois Blvd
Friday, April 24, 2026, 7 am to 4 pm
Bring Your Child to Work Day

K. Capp Street between 20th and 21st streets
Sunday, May 31, 2026, 11 am to 6:30 pm
Field Day

L. Keith Street between Armstrong and Carroll avenues
Intersection closed: Keith Street at Bancroft Avenue
Saturday, June 13, 2026, 9 am to 7 pm
Coleman Advocates/Dooda Activities

M. Fern Street between Polk and Larkin streets
Saturday, June 27, 2026, 10 am to 6 pm
and
Saturday, July 11, 2026, 7 am to 6 pm
and
Saturday, July 25, 2026, 10 am to 6 pm
and
Saturday, August 29, 2026, 10 am to 6 pm
and
Saturday, September 19, 2026, 10 am to 6 pm
and
Saturday, December 5, 2026, 10 am to 6 pm
The Fern Alley Music Series

N. 4th Street between Nelson Rising Lane to 16th Street
Saturday, October 17, 2026, 8 am to 10 pm
UCSF Bay Area Science Festival

O. 12th Street between Market Street and South Van Ness Avenue
Wednesday, May 6, 2026, 12:01 am to
Thursday, May 7, 2026, 11:59 pm
NPU Event at SVN West

P. King Street between 7th and De Haro streets
Thursday, July 23, 2026, 6 am to 6 pm
Adobe San Francisco Street Food Festival

Q. Fillmore Street between Eddy and Jackson streets; Washington Street between Webster and Steiner streets; Wilmot Street between Webster and Steiner streets; Post Street between Webster and Steiner streets
Intersections closed: Fillmore at Washington, Wilmot, Post and O'Farrell streets
(Other intersections, including crosswalks, must remain completely unobstructed at all times.)
Friday, July 3, 2026, 9 pm to
Sunday, July 5, 2026,11:59 pm
Fillmore Jazz Festival

R. Hayes Street between Gough and Octavia streets
Saturday, June 6, 2026, through
Saturday, June 7, 2026
7 am to 3 pm, each Saturday
Hayes Valley Farmers Market

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

_____

Forrest Chamberlain Date
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

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

NONE

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)

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

NONE

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item 5

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: File No. 240982 Report to Board of Supervisors
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 11:13:41 AM
Attachments:	File No. 240982 - DBI Report to BoS.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), submitting a Progress Report, pursuant to Ordinance No. 22-25.

Sincerely,

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

From: Hanna, Tate (DBI) <tate.hanna@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 5:30 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Gasparac, Christine (DBI) <christine.gasparac@sfgov.org>
Subject: File No. 240982 Report to Board of Supervisors

Hi there,

Please see the attached report pursuant to File No. 240982 (Ordinance #022-25).

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Tate

Tate Hanna (he/him)
Legislative Affairs Manager
Department of Building Inspection
City & County of San Francisco
(628) 652-3536
Sfdbi.org
Sign up for our customer email list

City and County of San Francisco
Department of Building Inspection

Daniel Lurie, Mayor
David Kane, S.E., Interim Director

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From: David Kane, S.E., Interim Director, Department of Building Inspection

Date: April 17, 2026

Re: Board of Supervisors File No. 240982 – Progress Report

Board of Supervisors File No. 240982 (Enactment No. 022-25) requires the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to report to the Board of Supervisors twelve months from the effective date of the ordinance. This report details DBI's efforts to direct resources to strengthen its enforcement and awareness of disability access requirements for businesses serving the public. This memorandum serves as DBI's progress report on the requirements within File No. 240982.

Dedicated Certified Access Specialist

DBI assigned Senior Building Inspector Stephen Kwok to serve in a new role within the Building Inspection Division as its Certified Access Specialist Senior Building Inspector. In this role, Senior Inspector Kwok assists with site inspections, follows up on accessibility complaints, conducts accessibility trainings for colleagues, and leads education and outreach efforts regarding accessibility.

Senior Inspector Kwok previously worked in Plan Review Services. Because his experience spans both Plan Review Services and Inspection Services, he is well-positioned to assist customers and colleagues alike with his expertise in accessibility regulations.

Since the passage of File No. 240982, Senior Inspector Kwok has managed 120 complaints assigned to the Disabled Access Division. These complaints typically include physical access limitations, such as malfunctioning elevators, lack of automatic door operators, or insufficient space for wheelchair maneuverability. Senior Inspector Kwok's work on these complaints has resulted in two elevators and two lifts being repaired that had long been out of service. Additionally, in instances in which potential violations are more temporary in nature, such as debris blocking an access ramp, Senior Inspector Kwok informed building owners of the relevant requirements and ensured the issue was abated in a timely manner. In total, these complaints have resulted in three active Notices of Violation at the time of this report, as well as numerous other abated and closed cases where access issues are no longer present.

In addition to complaints, Senior Inspector Kwok also participated in 20 site inspections of active construction projects and assisted both the project sponsors and DBI staff with ensuring that the projects were built to meet accessibility standards.

Inspector Trainings

Senior Inspector Kwok has begun regular trainings with DBI staff to provide information and guidance on

accessibility requirements and to ensure that all district inspectors are enforcing accessibility requirements in the field. To date, Senior Inspector Kwok has conducted five separate trainings for DBI staff, including information on accessible paths of travel, protruding objects in commercial spaces, wheelchair clearance and maneuverability requirements, accessible signage, and utilization of the Disabled Access Upgrade Compliance Checklist, a required form that guides applicants through relevant accessibility requirements. He is currently developing future trainings, including a simulated site inspection, and role-playing interactions with customers unfamiliar with accessibility requirements.

Educational Materials & Outreach

DBI created numerous educational materials to support the implementation of File No. 240982. First, given that the Accessible Business Entrance (ABE) program was sunset by the ordinance, DBI established clear next steps for individuals who were in the process of seeking compliance with the program. DBI created a new webpage that details what ABE-related permit applicants and permit holders must do to either finish the authorized work or close out their permit and request a refund. This site also links to other materials that offer a breakdown of remaining accessibility requirements, including those outside of the jurisdiction of DBI. A notice with this information was also mailed directly to ABE participants.

Aside from ABE assistance, DBI created general accessibility educational materials, including a set of two social media videos highlighting accessibility features of buildings, as well as hand-outs for DBI staff to share with applicants, neighbors, and other interested parties.

The first video shows a Senior Building Inspector touring a new apartment building, walking viewers through accessibility features. The second video, created in partnership with the Office of Small Business (OSB) and the Office of Disability and Accessibility (ODA), highlights a local business in San Francisco that has implemented accessibility improvements. In the video, a DBI Certified Access Specialist highlights accessibility features at the business and provides examples to help other business owners understand how accessibility elements can be incorporated into their own spaces.

Additionally, Inspectors and Permit Technicians are encouraged to carry and share copies of the new accessibility card, which includes a QR code, linking back to the general accessibility website discussed below.

Website Updates

DBI, in coordination with the OSB and ODA, updated its webpage to combine all of the relevant accessibility information and materials into one location. This page serves as a landing site for San Franciscans and offers basics on accessibility, explaining the complex cross-jurisdictional nature of accessibility enforcement and common accessibility issues individuals or business owners may face. This landing page also connects to all relevant resources, including legal assistance, references to qualified Certified Access Specialists for hire, and financial support opportunities provided by the City. This page will be maintained and updated with new information and tools to further assist San Francisco in becoming a welcoming environment for all.

Future Progress

While there is still work to do to ensure San Francisco is accessible for all, DBI and our partner agencies have taken a series of positive steps to advance Citywide goals of equity and inclusion in all forms. DBI will continue to work on these efforts and will remain a steadfast partner in pursuing an accessible San Francisco.

Thank you,



David Kane, S.E.
Interim Director, Department of Building Inspection

Item 6

From: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART)
Subject: April 22, 2026 Executive Committee Meeting Notice of Cancellation
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 3:23:36 PM
Attachments: image001.png

Hello,

The cancellation notice for the Executive Committee meeting for April 22, 2026, is posted here:

Executive Committee Meeting | San Francisco (sf.gov)

Notice of Cancellation (PDF)

Thank you,
Manraj

Manraj Dhaliwal
Commission Secretary
Pronouns: he/him
Email: manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org
Phone: 415-252-2247
Mobile: 415-940-1803

San Francisco Arts Commission
401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org

Newsletter | Flickr | LinkedIn | Facebook | Instagram | TikTok | Twitter | YouTube

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone. We affirm the sovereign rights of their community as First Peoples and are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community and uplifting contemporary indigenous voices and culture.

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the Sunshine Ordinance and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.

From: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART)
Subject: April 20, 2026 Civic Design Review Committee Meeting Notice of Cancellation
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 3:19:27 PM
Attachments: image001.png

Hello,

The cancellation notice for the Civic Design Review Committee meeting for April 20, 2026, is posted here:

Civic Design Review Committee Meeting | San Francisco (sf.gov)

Notice of Cancellation (PDF)

Thank you,
Manraj

Manraj Dhaliwal
Commission Secretary
Pronouns: he/him
Email: manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org
Phone: 415-252-2247
Mobile: 415-940-1803

San Francisco Arts Commission
401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org

Newsletter | Flickr | LinkedIn | Facebook | Instagram | TikTok | Twitter | YouTube

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone. We affirm the sovereign rights of their community as First Peoples and are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community and uplifting contemporary indigenous voices and culture.

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the Sunshine Ordinance and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.

Item 7

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for March 2026
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:25:32 AM
Attachments:	image001.png CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for March 2026.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector (TTX), submitting the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of March, 2026, pursuant to CA State Government Code, Section 53646.

Sincerely,

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

From: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:18 AM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for March 2026

All-

Please find the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of March attached for your use.

Regards,

Ichieh C. Dion
Investment Settlement Operations/Reporting
Investments
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Office: 628.652.6404
San Francisco only, **call 311**
sftreasurer.org

Investment Report for the month of March 2026

April 15, 2026

The Honorable Daniel L. Lurie
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of March 31, 2026. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of March 2026 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Earnings Statistics

Description	Current Month Fiscal YTD	Current Month March 2026	Prior Month Fiscal YTD	Prior Month February 2026
Average Daily Balance *(in $ millions)*	17,374.7	17,902.4	17,307.4	17,643.6
Net Earnings *(in $ millions)*	490.9	55.6	435.3	52.2
Earned Income Return	3.76%	3.66%	3.78%	3.85%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics: March 31, 2026

Investment Type	% of Portfolio	Book Value (in $ millions)	Market Value (in $ millions)	Wtd. Avg. CPN	Wtd. Avg. YTM	WAM
U.S. Treasuries	30.9%	5,546	5,537	3.15%	3.34%	740
Federal Agencies	43.9%	7,872	7,863	3.45%	3.76%	692
Negotiable CDs	9.8%	1,755	1,755	4.11%	4.11%	90
Commercial Paper	5.5%	984	984	0.00%	4.02%	86
Medium Term Notes	0.9%	163	163	3.98%	4.20%	359
Money Market Funds	7.2%	1,297	1,297	3.58%	3.58%	1
Supranationals	0.8%	141	142	3.32%	4.10%	681
Secured Bank Deposit	0.9%	166	166	3.60%	3.60%	1
Totals	100.0%	17,924	17,908	3.25%	3.67%	555

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Respectfully,

José Cisneros
Treasurer

cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Kevin Kone, Brenda Kwee McNulty, Nancy Hom
Greg Wagner - Controller, Office of the Controller
Mark de la Rosa - Director of Audits, Office of the Controller
Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Francisco Public Library
San Francisco Health Service System

Portfolio Summary
Pooled Fund


Security Type	Par Value (in $ millions)	Book Value (in $ millions)	Market Value (in $ millions)	Market Price / Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	$ 5,549.0	$ 5,546.3	$ 5,536.9	99.83	30.94%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	7,881.9	7,871.7	7,863.2	99.89	43.92%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	-	-	-	-	0.00%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	1,755.0	1,755.0	1,755.5	100.03	9.79%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	993.0	983.8	983.7	99.98	5.49%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	162.8	162.6	162.8	100.13	0.91%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds	1,297.4	1,297.4	1,297.4	100.00	7.24%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	142.3	141.3	142.1	100.55	0.79%	30%	Yes
Secured Bank Deposit	166.2	166.2	166.2	100.00	0.93%	N/A	Yes
TOTAL	**$ 17,947.7**	**$ 17,924.4**	**$ 17,907.7**	**99.91**	**100.00%**	**-**	**Yes**


The City and County of San Francisco uses the following methodology to determine compliance: Compliance is pre-trade and calculated on a book value basis of the overall portfolio value. Cash balances are included in the City's compliance calculations.

Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution.
The full Investment Policy can be found at https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments


Totals may not add due to rounding.

Portfolio Analysis
Pooled Fund






Yield Curves



Source: Bloomberg



	2/27/26	3/31/26	Change
3 Month	3.656	3.672	0.0156
6 Month	3.616	3.689	0.0725
1 Year	3.475	3.655	0.1802
2 Year	3.375	3.793	0.4181
3 Year	3.377	3.816	0.4390
5 Year	3.502	3.943	0.4410

Source: Bloomberg

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	912797QD2	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/27/2026	4/16/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,879,500	24,962,344	24,960,468
U.S. Treasuries	912797TJ6	U.S. Treasury Bill	3/3/2026	4/21/2026	0.00	65,000,000	64,679,731	64,869,278	64,862,005
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/28/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,662,109	49,994,455	49,884,765
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,730,469	49,995,566	49,884,765
U.S. Treasuries	912797QN0	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/27/2026	5/14/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,810,438	24,892,748	24,891,288
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	7/23/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	52,203,125	50,055,172	49,867,190
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	8/27/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	51,890,625	50,048,309	49,867,190
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHB0	U.S. Treasury Note	10/16/2025	5/15/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,983,398	24,996,538	24,998,048
U.S. Treasuries	912797SW8	U.S. Treasury Bill	12/10/2025	5/28/2026	0.00	30,000,000	29,495,183	29,829,736	29,828,385
U.S. Treasuries	912797UA3	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/27/2026	6/16/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,728,787	24,810,897	24,812,365
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,931,641	49,996,627	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,070,313	50,003,492	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,345,703	50,017,247	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,328,125	50,016,370	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,406,250	50,020,437	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/10/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,240,234	50,012,113	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	9/24/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,937,500	49,996,767	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	10/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,593,750	49,978,743	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	1/4/2022	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,027,344	49,946,557	49,650,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKY6	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	6/30/2026	4.63	100,000,000	100,546,875	100,251,116	100,226,560
U.S. Treasuries	912797TX5	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/19/2026	8/20/2026	0.00	100,000,000	98,230,556	98,629,167	98,586,000
U.S. Treasuries	912797TY3	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/26/2026	8/27/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,554,226	24,637,503	24,636,960
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	U.S. Treasury Note	9/28/2021	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,953,438	49,388,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,968,911	49,294,920
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,967,151	49,294,920
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/19/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,931,346	49,294,920
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/3/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,009,633	49,185,545
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,015,655	49,185,545
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	49,584,056	49,185,545
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	49,543,978	49,087,890
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	U.S. Treasury Note	4/6/2022	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,951,563	24,700,195
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	6/26/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,199,219	50,080,864	50,468,850
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,292,969	50,120,361	50,468,850
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,906,250	50,406,888	50,468,850
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,603,516	50,348,945	50,468,850
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/8/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,667,969	50,415,709	50,468,850
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,654,297	50,407,777	50,468,850
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,632,813	50,403,533	50,468,850
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/21/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,203,125	49,316,406	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/3/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,113,281	49,274,339	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	9/26/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,683,594	49,857,036	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,398,438	49,611,758	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	11/12/2025	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,728,516	49,792,394	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	8/31/2027	3.63	50,000,000	50,035,156	50,028,006	49,867,190
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	U.S. Treasury Note	11/21/2025	8/31/2027	3.63	75,000,000	75,058,594	75,046,748	74,800,785
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	9/15/2027	3.38	50,000,000	49,785,156	49,894,071	49,677,735
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	10/15/2027	3.88	50,000,000	50,273,438	50,221,429	50,033,205

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	U.S. Treasury Note	11/18/2025	10/15/2027	3.88	75,000,000	75,363,281	75,293,339	75,049,808
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPE5	U.S. Treasury Note	11/18/2025	10/31/2027	3.50	75,000,000	74,835,938	74,866,814	74,566,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	2/12/2025	11/15/2027	4.13	61,000,000	60,692,617	60,818,809	61,264,490
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	11/12/2025	11/15/2027	4.13	70,000,000	70,738,281	70,597,273	70,303,513
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,839,837	50,121,800
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,712,891	49,836,500	50,121,800
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	50,425,781	50,359,921	50,121,800
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	U.S. Treasury Note	11/14/2025	2/15/2028	4.25	50,000,000	50,714,844	50,594,979	50,384,765
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	2/15/2028	4.25	90,000,000	91,321,875	91,108,304	90,692,577
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/20/2026	3/15/2028	3.88	40,000,000	40,018,750	40,018,440	40,045,312
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/20/2026	3/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,021,484	50,021,129	50,056,640
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/9/2024	5/15/2028	2.88	65,000,000	61,082,227	62,971,761	63,766,014
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	5/15/2028	3.75	70,000,000	69,485,938	69,636,498	69,909,763
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/21/2025	6/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,404,297	50,347,773	50,066,405
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/14/2026	6/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,375,000	50,342,299	50,066,405
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/5/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,974,609	49,987,274	50,210,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,963,489	50,210,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,904,297	49,951,648	50,210,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/6/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,677,734	49,835,255	50,210,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/27/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,636,806	50,210,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	48,939,453	49,422,989	50,210,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	12/12/2023	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,115,234	50,059,021	50,628,905
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/14/2025	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,550,781	50,403,602	50,628,905
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNY3	U.S. Treasury Note	12/19/2025	9/15/2028	3.38	55,000,000	54,817,383	54,836,174	54,430,662
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPK1	U.S. Treasury Note	1/27/2026	11/15/2028	3.50	62,000,000	61,752,969	61,768,423	61,501,092
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	1/27/2026	1/31/2029	4.00	55,000,000	55,524,219	55,493,719	55,253,517
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	1/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,927,344	59,944,612	60,276,564
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	1/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,266,602	65,175,253	65,299,611
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2024	2/15/2029	2.63	50,000,000	45,710,938	47,454,656	48,380,860
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	4/8/2024	2/28/2029	4.25	50,000,000	49,773,438	49,865,102	50,576,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	2/28/2029	4.25	75,000,000	75,568,359	75,436,002	75,864,255
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	50,000,000	51,171,875	50,799,490	51,134,765
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	12/20/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	51,000,000	51,448,242	51,316,754	52,157,460
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	U.S. Treasury Note	10/23/2024	5/31/2029	4.50	50,000,000	51,039,063	50,714,549	50,972,655
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	51,046,875	50,722,249	50,172,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	49,888,672	49,922,179	50,172,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/7/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,563,672	65,390,210	65,223,600
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	50,000,000	49,041,016	49,333,252	48,837,890
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/3/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	65,000,000	63,664,453	64,070,406	63,489,257
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/30/2025	10/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,988,281	59,990,502	60,250,782
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/25/2024	10/31/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,611,328	49,717,506	50,421,875
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	4/10/2025	2/28/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,942,147	50,201,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	12/10/2025	2/28/2030	4.00	75,000,000	75,785,156	75,728,091	75,301,755
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2025	4/30/2030	3.88	50,000,000	49,468,750	49,561,218	49,958,985
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	4/30/2030	3.88	60,000,000	60,478,125	60,444,144	59,950,782
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHF1	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	5/31/2030	3.75	65,000,000	65,192,969	65,179,514	64,621,681
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,267,578	50,249,740	49,867,250

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,257,813	50,240,625	49,867,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/10/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,251,953	50,235,295	49,867,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,367,188	50,344,130	49,867,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,343,750	50,322,164	49,867,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/22/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,160,156	50,145,863	49,396,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,097,656	50,089,040	49,396,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,054,688	50,049,862	49,396,485
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPD7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	10/31/2030	3.63	60,000,000	59,779,688	59,793,734	59,242,968
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/16/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	50,000,000	49,703,125	49,715,426	49,333,985
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/20/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	50,000,000	49,562,500	49,579,700	49,333,985
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/7/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	60,000,000	59,737,500	59,749,622	59,200,782
Subtotals					**3.15**	**5,549,000,000**	**5,537,315,608**	**5,546,348,286**	**5,536,867,617**
Federal Agencies	313385VE3	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	1/5/2026	4/6/2026	0.00	24,500,000	24,279,218	24,487,869	24,483,095
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/9/2021	4/6/2026	0.69	15,500,000	15,458,150	15,499,877	15,490,235
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	20,000,000	19,961,200	19,999,814	19,991,420
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	30,000,000	29,941,800	29,999,721	29,987,130
Federal Agencies	313385VP8	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	9/2/2025	4/15/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,403,125	24,962,861	24,960,275
Federal Agencies	313385WN2	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	10/16/2025	5/8/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,490,000	24,907,500	24,901,550
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	17,045,000	16,991,479	17,041,587	17,039,512
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	20,000,000	19,939,200	19,996,098	19,993,560
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	10,000,000	9,934,300	9,995,727	10,001,620
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,899,350	14,993,454	15,002,430
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2023	6/12/2026	4.75	50,000,000	49,856,000	49,990,292	50,080,600
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	13,485,000	13,505,093	13,486,998	13,510,001
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	20,000,000	20,030,400	20,003,023	20,037,080
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	32,000,000	32,051,200	32,005,092	32,059,328
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	20,000,000	19,969,200	19,997,892	20,013,780
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	24,700,000	24,640,226	24,695,910	24,717,018
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	30,000,000	29,951,400	29,996,674	30,020,670
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,998,997	25,030,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,998,997	25,030,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,997,993	50,061,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,999,213	10,024,560
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	19,000,000	18,984,800	18,998,559	19,046,664
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	21,000,000	20,982,780	20,998,368	21,051,576
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,805,900
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,805,900
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,805,900
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,805,900
Federal Agencies	313385ZG4	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	1/6/2026	7/13/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,729,358	14,851,723	14,841,150
Federal Agencies	313385ZS8	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	1/6/2026	7/23/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,715,375	14,837,563	14,826,000
Federal Agencies	313385ZT6	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	1/6/2026	7/24/2026	0.00	50,000,000	49,043,694	49,452,167	49,415,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,782,950
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,782,950
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,782,950
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,782,950

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	3,000,000	2,991,930	2,999,035	3,012,243
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	9,615,000	9,589,136	9,611,909	9,654,239
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	16,000,000	15,956,960	15,994,856	16,065,296
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	25,000,000	24,936,750	24,992,440	25,102,025
Federal Agencies	313385A97	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	1/13/2026	8/7/2026	0.00	10,000,000	9,800,867	9,876,267	9,870,700
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,753,800
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,753,800
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,753,800
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,753,800
Federal Agencies	313385B47	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	1/13/2026	8/10/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,495,642	24,683,872	24,669,250
Federal Agencies	313385B62	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	1/13/2026	8/12/2026	0.00	51,000,000	49,961,265	50,345,252	50,315,325
Federal Agencies	313385B88	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	2/17/2026	8/14/2026	0.00	22,900,000	22,500,872	22,597,291	22,588,010
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/14/2023	8/14/2026	4.50	50,000,000	49,885,000	49,985,835	50,097,300
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,734,875	14,786,427	14,780,700
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,558,125	24,644,045	24,634,500
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,558,125	24,644,045	24,634,500
Federal Agencies	313385D45	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	3/2/2026	8/26/2026	0.00	51,000,000	50,112,345	50,262,795	50,244,180
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,711,250
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,711,250
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,711,250
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,711,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	19,000,000	18,974,730	18,994,532	18,984,040
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,966,750	24,992,806	24,979,000
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,900,000	25,865,553	25,892,547	25,878,244
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	50,000,000	49,933,500	49,985,612	49,958,000
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/12/2023	9/10/2026	0.80	28,975,000	26,174,277	28,522,640	28,588,589
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/18/2023	9/11/2026	4.88	11,895,000	11,821,965	11,883,758	11,949,110
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	3/16/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	15,585,000	15,292,898	15,317,626	15,311,951
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,535,875	24,572,906	24,562,000
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	40,000,000	39,257,400	39,316,650	39,299,200
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	50,000,000	49,071,750	49,145,813	49,124,000
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,571,611	24,554,500
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,571,611	24,554,500
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Discount	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,571,611	24,554,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,996,850	14,999,174	15,015,330
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,998,623	25,025,550
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,998,623	25,025,550
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	50,000,000	49,989,500	49,997,245	50,051,100
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,671,800
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,671,800
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,671,800
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,671,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	14,000,000	13,904,940	13,982,480	14,074,634
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	30,000,000	29,834,100	29,969,424	30,159,930
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/29/2025	11/10/2026	4.00	12,600,000	12,581,352	12,592,154	12,604,939
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,656,450
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,656,450

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,656,450
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,656,450
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/17/2023	11/17/2026	4.63	50,000,000	49,911,500	49,981,428	50,256,350
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,621,600
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,621,600
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,621,600
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,621,600
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	15,000,000	14,993,850	14,995,535	14,967,435
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	37,000,000	36,984,830	36,988,986	36,919,673
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	45,000,000	44,981,550	44,986,605	44,902,305
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/8/2024	1/7/2027	3.50	12,500,000	12,373,750	12,456,789	12,464,950
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	12,000,000	11,973,000	11,992,788	12,029,160
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/9/2025	1/15/2027	4.13	20,000,000	20,101,800	20,073,185	20,048,600
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,984,976	25,060,750
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	29,350,000	29,283,963	29,332,362	29,421,321
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,887,500	49,969,951	50,121,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,992,850	4,998,049	5,012,865
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,986,600	9,996,344	10,025,730
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,968,500	24,991,406	25,064,325
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	35,000,000	34,955,900	34,987,969	35,090,055
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,933,000	49,981,722	50,128,650
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	2,000,000	1,997,860	1,999,053	2,006,626
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	25,000,000	24,974,250	24,988,607	25,082,825
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,967,600	29,985,664	30,099,390
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2024	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,983,500	29,993,516	30,099,390
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	15,000,000	14,980,050	14,988,117	14,992,665
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	25,000,000	24,967,500	24,980,642	24,987,775
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	35,000,000	34,950,650	34,970,606	34,982,885
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	40,000,000	39,946,800	39,968,313	39,980,440
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	10,000,000	9,993,800	9,996,827	10,004,320
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	45,000,000	44,972,100	44,985,724	45,019,440
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,665,125
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,665,125
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,665,125
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,665,125
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/16/2022	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	48,357,969	47,647,976
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/2/2024	3/26/2027	4.50	50,000,000	49,910,000	49,970,303	50,322,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	22,500,000	22,392,338	22,478,232	22,232,498
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	24,500,000	24,377,010	24,475,132	24,208,720
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	25,000,000	24,804,000	24,960,370	24,702,775
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	17,000,000	16,955,120	16,984,684	17,165,427
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	20,000,000	19,947,200	19,981,981	20,194,620
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	40,000,000	39,894,400	39,963,963	40,389,240
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	48,000,000	47,873,280	47,956,755	48,467,088
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/13/2024	5/6/2027	4.75	12,727,000	12,740,236	12,731,866	12,864,884
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	4,650,000	4,646,792	4,649,197	4,665,452
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,996,550	4,999,136	5,016,615

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,987,001	20,996,746	21,069,783
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,750	24,995,682	25,083,075
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	31,000,000	30,905,760	30,968,713	31,060,729
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	58,850,000	58,662,269	58,787,674	58,965,287
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	10,000,000	9,986,700	9,992,086	10,002,580
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	13,000,000	12,982,710	12,989,712	13,003,354
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	16,500,000	16,478,055	16,486,943	16,504,257
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	20,000,000	19,973,400	19,984,173	20,005,160
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	36,000,000	35,952,120	35,971,511	36,009,288
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	10,000,000	10,141,500	10,034,504	9,960,270
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	12,375,000	12,552,829	12,418,363	12,325,834
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/20/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	21,725,000	22,016,550	21,796,134	21,638,687
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/13/2024	6/11/2027	4.50	11,000,000	10,937,190	10,975,636	11,085,822
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2024	6/11/2027	4.63	20,700,000	20,795,634	20,739,115	20,873,218
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2027	4.13	28,940,000	28,911,928	28,931,546	29,038,280
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2022	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	27,923,355	27,644,393
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2024	6/28/2027	4.50	30,000,000	29,985,840	29,994,142	30,238,470
Federal Agencies	3133ERVR9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/30/2024	7/1/2027	3.50	55,000,000	54,925,200	54,966,027	54,774,555
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,033,250	25,014,072	25,202,100
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/10/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,025,500	25,010,802	25,202,100
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	10,000,000	9,996,500	9,998,472	10,056,270
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	15,000,000	14,994,750	14,997,708	15,084,405
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,950	4,993,158	4,984,930
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,750	4,993,022	4,984,930
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	7,000,000	6,985,930	6,990,421	6,978,902
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,991,940	10,042,220
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	20,000,000	19,959,400	19,969,144	19,912,680
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	25,000,000	24,949,250	24,961,430	24,890,850
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	41,000,000	40,916,770	40,936,745	40,820,994
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	50,000,000	49,898,500	49,922,860	49,781,700
Federal Agencies	3133ET6R3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/8/2026	10/8/2027	3.38	15,000,000	14,977,650	14,980,558	14,897,490
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	5,000,000	4,997,250	4,998,589	5,000,075
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	8,000,000	7,996,160	7,998,029	8,000,120
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/27/2025	10/27/2027	3.38	9,320,000	9,298,844	9,303,365	9,253,977
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/27/2025	10/27/2027	3.38	60,000,000	59,863,800	59,892,906	59,574,960
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	5,000,000	4,999,350	4,999,623	5,028,160
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	41,880,000	41,877,738	41,878,689	42,115,868
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	27,950,000	27,834,008	27,902,920	28,284,953
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	33,300,000	33,161,472	33,243,773	33,699,067
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,936,790	20,964,096	21,074,235
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	25,505,000	25,428,485	25,461,538	25,595,160
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	33,000,000	32,893,080	32,939,268	33,116,655
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	38,343,000	38,227,588	38,277,444	38,478,543
Federal Agencies	3133EN5N6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2025	1/6/2028	4.00	50,000,000	50,486,000	50,417,960	50,098,750
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	23,480,000	23,403,690	23,411,817	23,287,746
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/7/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	30,000,000	29,941,500	29,948,232	29,754,360
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/7/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	46,000,000	45,910,300	45,920,622	45,623,352

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2025	1/14/2028	4.25	29,750,000	29,575,963	29,646,213	29,885,660
Federal Agencies	3133ET2W6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/8/2025	1/20/2028	3.50	5,000,000	4,991,800	4,993,009	4,967,885
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/21/2026	1/21/2028	3.50	35,000,000	34,926,150	34,933,232	34,772,395
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/21/2026	1/21/2028	3.50	35,000,000	34,926,150	34,933,232	34,772,395
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	47,000,000	46,976,030	46,985,359	47,373,885
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	50,000,000	49,974,500	49,984,424	50,397,750
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	13,000,000	12,988,820	12,989,234	12,917,151
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	15,000,000	14,987,100	14,987,578	14,904,405
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	25,000,000	24,978,500	24,979,296	24,840,675
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	30,000,000	29,974,200	29,975,156	29,808,810
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	50,000,000	49,957,000	49,958,593	49,681,350
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2024	3/20/2028	4.25	4,971,000	4,916,667	4,943,890	5,003,953
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	2,000,000	1,998,040	1,998,053	2,002,160
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,978,500	24,978,647	25,027,000
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,976,500	24,976,661	25,027,000
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,975,500	24,975,668	25,027,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/11/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	7,370,000	7,342,584	7,349,978	7,346,291
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,957,250	24,968,952	24,919,575
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	14,934,000	14,962,076	14,949,537	15,118,315
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/7/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,994,600	14,997,051	15,185,130
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	20,000,000	20,037,600	20,020,808	20,246,840
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/14/2025	6/9/2028	4.00	10,000,000	9,996,600	9,997,576	10,028,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	22,500,000	22,424,175	22,442,784	22,455,495
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	25,000,000	24,904,000	24,927,494	24,950,550
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	50,000,000	49,829,500	49,871,344	49,901,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/7/2023	8/7/2028	4.25	19,500,000	19,412,250	19,458,743	19,660,212
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	10,000,000	9,979,100	9,989,933	10,124,240
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,962,800	14,982,082	15,186,360
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	25,000,000	24,943,500	24,972,786	25,310,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	33,000,000	32,904,960	32,954,223	33,409,992
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	9/22/2028	3.50	10,000,000	9,997,600	9,997,839	9,911,670
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	9/22/2028	3.50	20,000,000	19,995,200	19,995,678	19,823,340
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	5,000,000	4,972,100	4,983,556	5,034,980
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	38,000,000	37,785,300	37,873,459	38,265,848
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	5,000,000	4,977,650	4,980,299	4,939,270
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	25,000,000	24,890,000	24,903,039	24,696,350
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	30,000,000	29,865,900	29,881,795	29,635,620
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	12,000,000	11,984,040	11,991,640	12,195,060
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	20,000,000	19,971,600	19,985,124	20,325,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	55,000,000	54,922,285	54,959,292	55,894,025
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/28/2024	11/27/2028	4.00	47,025,000	46,940,355	46,969,876	47,065,159
Federal Agencies	3133ET2S5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/9/2025	11/28/2028	3.38	35,000,000	34,735,750	34,763,271	34,581,155
Federal Agencies	3133EJ5J4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/8/2026	1/16/2029	3.19	10,000,000	9,891,400	9,899,565	9,812,520
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/9/2024	3/9/2029	4.50	25,000,000	25,018,750	25,011,208	25,428,200
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2024	3/20/2029	4.13	51,660,000	51,008,309	51,269,058	51,952,086
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	21,700,000	21,649,005	21,649,238	21,718,011
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	25,000,000	24,947,250	24,947,491	25,020,750

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	50,000,000	49,882,500	49,883,036	50,041,500
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	27,892,000	28,191,755	28,077,492	28,590,974
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	30,000,000	30,317,400	30,196,411	30,751,800
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	63,085,000	63,763,795	63,505,046	64,665,910
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/31/2025	6/8/2029	4.63	9,705,000	9,943,355	9,902,049	9,915,919
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,979,122	10,098,890
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,979,122	10,098,890
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,979,122	10,098,890
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,935,200	19,958,243	20,197,780
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	29,000,000	28,923,730	28,950,852	29,286,781
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,754,050
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,754,050
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	64,360,530
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/12/2024	7/12/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,989,200	19,992,914	20,210,400
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/27/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,392,700	15,273,352	15,099,600
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,048,300	15,034,225	15,099,600
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,043,200	15,030,611	15,099,600
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/11/2025	9/14/2029	4.13	17,000,000	17,204,170	17,172,350	17,112,880
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	25,590,000	25,663,699	25,642,223	25,759,918
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,225
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,225
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,225
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,225
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,618,450
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	10,000,000	9,987,500	9,989,837	10,010,700
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,981,250	14,984,756	15,016,050
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,765,625
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,765,625
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,765,625
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,765,625
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,531,250
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,874	24,858,575
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,874	24,858,575
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,874	24,858,575
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,874	24,858,575
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	50,000,000	49,997,500	49,997,748	49,717,150
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,945,400	14,955,557	14,999,490
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	23,000,000	22,922,030	22,936,534	22,999,218
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,728,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,728,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,728,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,728,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,457,250
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	12,815,000	13,022,219	12,978,420	13,019,681
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	18,000,000	18,289,620	18,228,405	18,287,496
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	5,000,000	4,989,550	4,991,309	5,008,640
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	14,450,000	14,418,788	14,424,043	14,474,970

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,946,000	24,955,091	25,043,200
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	3/18/2030	4.00	8,695,000	8,671,610	8,676,229	8,678,749
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,993,700	14,994,937	15,070,065
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	32,260,000	32,243,870	32,247,037	32,410,686
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	43,020,000	42,904,276	42,926,950	43,220,946
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	46,750,000	46,732,703	46,736,099	46,968,369
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/15/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,527,500	49,619,027	50,233,550
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	9,750,000	9,746,100	9,746,677	9,765,902
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,978,200	10,016,310
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,998,650	14,998,850	15,024,465
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	20,000,000	19,945,000	19,953,886	20,032,620
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,965,000	24,970,444	25,040,775
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/9/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	12,515,000	12,579,452	12,569,933	12,596,010
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/23/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	16,000,000	16,063,200	16,053,391	16,103,568
Federal Agencies	3130AWMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/20/2025	6/14/2030	4.38	31,000,000	31,899,000	31,827,813	31,504,339
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	10,070,000	10,077,855	10,076,693	10,078,660
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	15,000,000	15,012,900	15,010,992	15,012,900
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	16,944,000	16,937,222	16,938,222	16,958,572
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	41,000,000	41,035,260	41,030,044	41,035,260
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,718,150
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,718,150
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,718,150
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,718,150
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,436,300
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,800,525
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,800,525
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,800,525
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,800,525
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,601,050
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/14/2025	7/8/2030	3.75	20,000,000	19,776,200	19,808,294	19,874,080
Federal Agencies	3133EWGC8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/6/2026	9/6/2030	3.50	36,750,000	36,529,500	36,532,985	36,056,160
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,759,825
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,759,825
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,759,825
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,759,825
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,519,650
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	22,762,410
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,741,750
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,741,750
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,741,750
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,483,500
Subtotals					**3.45**	**7,881,934,000**	**7,862,234,557**	**7,871,724,529**	**7,863,178,072**
Negotiable CDs	78015JJQ1	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	7/9/2025	4/7/2026	4.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,006,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NJE3	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	8/21/2025	4/20/2026	4.20	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,035,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NJK9	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	9/3/2025	4/23/2026	4.11	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,018,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JMC8	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	8/21/2025	4/23/2026	4.18	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,033,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AZZ4	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	5/15/2025	5/4/2026	4.35	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,065,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DRZ0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/5/2025	6/1/2026	4.17	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,040,000

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Negotiable CDs	06367DSQ9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/9/2025	6/9/2026	4.00	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,014,720
Negotiable CDs	06367DS97	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/18/2025	6/15/2026	4.20	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,051,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSR7	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/9/2025	6/15/2026	4.00	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,017,820
Negotiable CDs	89115DNV4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/5/2026	6/15/2026	3.78	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,977,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	6/20/2025	6/15/2026	4.32	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,071,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSV8	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/24/2025	6/17/2026	3.98	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,004,400
Negotiable CDs	89115DK96	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	12/11/2025	6/23/2026	3.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,993,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	7/24/2025	7/1/2026	4.27	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,088,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JL88	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	8/14/2025	7/1/2026	4.06	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,026,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DKD7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	12/11/2025	7/1/2026	3.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,991,500
Negotiable CDs	89115MA63	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	9/23/2026	4.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,005,790
Negotiable CDs	89115MAA4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	9/24/2026	4.05	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,011,162
Negotiable CDs	89115MAE6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	10/5/2026	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,005,791
Negotiable CDs	13606DUD2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/25/2026	10/23/2026	4.05	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,012,464
Negotiable CDs	78015J4M6	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	3/25/2026	10/23/2026	4.00	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,009,145
Negotiable CDs	89115MAJ5	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/26/2026	10/23/2026	4.07	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,023,531
Subtotals					**4.11**	**1,755,000,000**	**1,755,000,000**	**1,755,000,000**	**1,755,499,323**
Commercial Paper	62479MD67	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	7/28/2025	4/6/2026	0.00	110,000,000	106,712,100	109,934,764	109,921,130
Commercial Paper	62479MDN0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	9/3/2025	4/22/2026	0.00	51,000,000	49,668,093	50,878,918	50,880,711
Commercial Paper	89233HEL4	Toyota Motor Credit	9/9/2025	5/20/2026	0.00	55,000,000	53,488,676	54,707,293	54,704,100
Commercial Paper	89233HEN0	Toyota Motor Credit	8/27/2025	5/22/2026	0.00	100,000,000	96,970,111	99,423,417	99,440,500
Commercial Paper	62479MF16	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/1/2026	0.00	30,000,000	29,451,033	29,805,308	29,801,040
Commercial Paper	89233HF33	Toyota Motor Credit	9/9/2025	6/3/2026	0.00	60,000,000	58,264,500	59,590,500	59,586,360
Commercial Paper	62479MFF5	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	1/6/2026	6/15/2026	0.00	65,000,000	63,922,444	64,494,896	64,470,770
Commercial Paper	62479MFJ7	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/18/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,699,175	14,875,850	14,872,980
Commercial Paper	62479MFP3	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/23/2026	0.00	50,000,000	48,970,722	49,559,639	49,549,450
Commercial Paper	62479MFV0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/29/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,469,444	24,763,903	24,758,350
Commercial Paper	89233HG16	Toyota Motor Credit	10/27/2025	7/1/2026	0.00	70,000,000	68,184,550	69,331,150	69,301,820
Commercial Paper	89233HGE8	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/14/2026	0.00	75,000,000	73,359,375	74,187,500	74,146,425
Commercial Paper	89233HGQ1	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/24/2026	0.00	75,000,000	73,285,833	74,111,750	74,065,050
Commercial Paper	89233HGV0	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/29/2026	0.00	50,000,000	48,834,375	49,383,514	49,349,700
Commercial Paper	62479MJP9	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/25/2026	9/23/2026	0.00	100,000,000	97,987,889	98,065,278	98,099,200
Commercial Paper	62479MK77	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/30/2026	10/7/2026	0.00	51,000,000	49,931,196	49,942,387	49,951,058
Commercial Paper	62479MKF9	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/30/2026	10/15/2026	0.00	11,000,000	10,759,818	10,762,232	10,764,050
Subtotals					**0.00**	**993,000,000**	**968,959,336**	**983,818,298**	**983,662,694**
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	6,452,000	6,270,957	6,414,113	6,440,135
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	13,009,000	12,645,919	12,933,017	12,985,076
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	Caterpillar	9/18/2024	10/16/2026	4.45	18,385,000	18,600,288	18,441,236	18,423,204
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	Toyota Motors	1/9/2025	1/8/2027	4.60	40,000,000	39,978,000	39,991,490	40,156,320
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	Apple	9/18/2024	2/9/2027	3.35	50,000,000	49,586,000	49,851,263	49,738,500
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	John Deere	9/6/2024	7/15/2027	4.20	10,000,000	9,998,600	9,999,369	10,021,280
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	John Deere	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	4.25	25,000,000	24,977,750	24,983,840	25,061,125
Subtotals					**3.98**	**162,846,000**	**162,057,514**	**162,614,327**	**162,825,640**

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	3/31/2026	4/1/2026	3.55	14,738,340	14,738,340	14,738,340	14,738,340
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	3/31/2026	4/1/2026	3.58	506,189,669	506,189,669	506,189,669	506,189,669
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	3/31/2026	4/1/2026	3.59	467,096,180	467,096,180	467,096,180	467,096,180
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	3/31/2026	4/1/2026	3.54	15,333,433	15,333,433	15,333,433	15,333,433
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	3/31/2026	4/1/2026	3.58	265,932,833	265,932,833	265,932,833	265,932,833
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	3/31/2026	4/1/2026	3.57	28,139,071	28,139,071	28,139,071	28,139,071
Subtotals					**3.58**	**1,297,429,527**	**1,297,429,527**	**1,297,429,527**	**1,297,429,527**
Supranational	459058KC6	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	9/12/2025	11/16/2026	2.25	55,000,000	54,035,300	54,486,241	54,402,150
Supranational	459058KJ1	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	7/17/2024	6/15/2027	3.13	12,323,000	11,934,333	12,162,122	12,211,600
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	4/9/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	24,630,000	24,780,671	25,159,250
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	7/17/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,827,000	49,891,384	50,318,500
Subtotals					**3.32**	**142,323,000**	**140,426,633**	**141,320,418**	**142,091,500**
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	3/31/2026	4/1/2026	3.60	166,162,241	166,162,241	166,162,241	166,162,241
Subtotals					**3.60**	**166,162,241**	**166,162,241**	**166,162,241**	**166,162,241**
Grand Totals					**3.25**	**17,947,694,768**	**17,889,585,415**	**17,924,417,626**	**17,907,716,614**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	32,113	5,928	-	38,041
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	32,113	4,739	-	36,853
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	1,162	-	38,627
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-1,203	-	36,263
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-5,941	-	31,525
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-5,639	-	31,827
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	69,579	-38,871	-	30,707
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-7,040	-	30,426
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-4,172	-	33,293
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	69,579	-34,036	-	35,543
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	1,114	-	38,579
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	50,000,000	31,590	9,496	-	41,086
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,253	5,295	-	42,548
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,253	5,595	-	42,848
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	7,322	-	44,787
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,253	11,694	-	48,947
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	53,228	-1,229	-	51,999
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	53,228	-1,997	-	51,231
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	18,408	-	55,873
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	50,000,000	53,522	51,594	-	105,116
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	53,228	53,063	-	106,291
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	25,000,000	53,219	4,125	-	57,344
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	184,273	-2,072	-	182,201
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	481	-	171,751
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	1,379	-	172,649
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	1,826	-	173,096
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	6,221	-	177,491
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	13,714	-	184,984
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	46,575	-	185,732
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	49,441	-	188,598
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	50,000,000	179,008	3,930	-	182,938
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	T 2.875 05/15/2028	65,000,000	160,031	81,130	-	241,161
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	T 2.625 02/15/2029	50,000,000	112,396	75,077	-	187,473
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	21,787	-	193,058
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-5,697	-	191,246
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-8,480	-	188,464
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	9,740	-	148,898
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	50,000,000	131,624	16,562	-	148,185
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	171,271	-18,397	-	152,873
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	T 3.375 09/15/2027	50,000,000	143,218	6,173	-	149,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	65,000,000	171,111	23,091	-	194,202

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	65,000,000	222,652	-9,940	-	212,712
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	65,000,000	222,652	-5,244	-	217,408
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-28,667	-	168,277
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	T 4.500 05/31/2029	50,000,000	191,621	-19,162	-	172,459
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	171,271	1,982	-	173,253
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	50,000,000	198,032	-22,030	-	176,001
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	50,000,000	176,623	6,690	-	183,313
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	170,330	7,970	-	178,299
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	170,330	8,136	-	178,465
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	51,000,000	201,992	-8,728	-	193,264
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	61,000,000	215,480	9,472	-	224,952
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	50,000,000	168,478	1,255	-	169,733
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	60,000,000	205,525	1,657	-	207,182
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	75,000,000	268,512	-12,703	-	255,809
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	184,273	-14,169	-	170,104
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	T 3.750 05/15/2028	70,000,000	224,793	14,540	-	239,333
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-24,585	-	172,359
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	50,000,000	165,919	9,129	-	175,048
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	T 4.000 10/31/2029	60,000,000	205,525	225	-	205,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-29,289	-	167,655
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-28,730	-	168,214
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-28,431	-	168,513
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	26,452	-	165,609
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHB0	T 3.625 05/15/2026	25,000,000	77,607	2,439	-	80,046
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	154,334	-2,752	-	151,582
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	154,334	-1,680	-	152,654
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	154,334	-941	-	153,393
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	70,000,000	247,272	-31,223	-	216,049
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	14,145	-	153,302
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	T 4.250 02/15/2028	50,000,000	181,975	-26,926	-	155,049
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	T 3.875 10/15/2027	75,000,000	247,510	-16,181	-	231,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPE5	T 3.500 10/31/2027	75,000,000	224,793	7,143	-	231,936
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	T 3.875 10/15/2027	50,000,000	165,007	-12,214	-	152,793
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	50,000,000	152,683	-1,679	-	151,004
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	T 4.250 02/15/2028	90,000,000	327,555	-50,157	-	277,398
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	75,000,000	229,025	-2,803	-	226,222
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	50,000,000	165,007	-13,376	-	151,631
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPD7	T 3.625 10/31/2030	60,000,000	186,257	3,820	-	190,077
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHF1	T 3.750 05/31/2030	65,000,000	207,589	-3,659	-	203,931
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	60,000,000	199,102	-9,241	-	189,862
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	170,330	-17,909	-	152,420

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-4,894	-	161,025
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-4,715	-	161,203
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-4,611	-	161,308
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	75,000,000	252,717	-15,795	-	236,923
U.S. Treasuries	912797SW8	B 0.000 05/28/2026	30,000,000	-	92,600	-	92,600
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKY6	T 4.625 06/30/2026	100,000,000	396,064	-86,496	-	309,568
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-6,743	-	159,175
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-6,313	-	159,606
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNY3	T 3.375 09/15/2028	55,000,000	157,539	5,655	-	163,195
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	60,000,000	186,257	4,474	-	190,731
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	50,000,000	165,007	-13,165	-	151,842
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	50,000,000	155,214	5,085	-	160,299
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	50,000,000	155,214	7,510	-	162,724
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	55,000,000	188,398	-14,773	-	173,624
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPK1	T 3.500 11/15/2028	62,000,000	185,829	7,486	-	193,315
U.S. Treasuries	912797TX5	B 0.000 08/20/2026	100,000,000	-	301,389	-	301,389
U.S. Treasuries	912797TY3	B 0.000 08/27/2026	25,000,000	-	75,928	-	75,928
U.S. Treasuries	912797QD2	B 0.000 04/16/2026	25,000,000	-	77,823	-	77,823
U.S. Treasuries	912797SZ1	B 0.000 03/17/2026	-	-	40,139	-	40,139
U.S. Treasuries	912797QN0	B 0.000 05/14/2026	25,000,000	-	77,321	-	77,321
U.S. Treasuries	912797UA3	B 0.000 06/16/2026	25,000,000	-	77,134	-	77,134
U.S. Treasuries	912797TJ6	B 0.000 04/21/2026	65,000,000	-	189,547	-	189,547
U.S. Treasuries	912797TA5	B 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	181,750	-	181,750
U.S. Treasuries	912797TA5	B 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	49,272	-	49,272
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	40,000,000	50,543	-310	-	50,234
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	50,000,000	63,179	-355	-	62,824
Subtotals			**5,549,000,000**	**14,699,571**	**1,129,464**	**-**	**15,829,035**
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FFCB 0.690 04/06/2026	15,500,000	8,913	763	-	9,675
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	48,573,000	68,002	19,434	-	87,436
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	20,000,000	44,000	823	-	44,823
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	30,000,000	66,000	1,235	-	67,235
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	24,500,000	53,083	2,089	-	55,172
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	22,500,000	48,750	1,829	-	50,579
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	25,000,000	54,167	3,329	-	57,496
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	27,865,000	75,236	-3,993	-	71,242
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	12,375,000	36,094	-3,083	-	33,011
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	10,000,000	29,167	-2,453	-	26,713
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	21,725,000	63,365	-5,058	-	58,307
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	21,000,000	72,188	245	-	72,433
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	5,000,000	17,188	65	-	17,253
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	4,650,000	15,984	61	-	16,045
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	25,000,000	85,938	326	-	86,263
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	10,000,000	34,375	491	-	34,866
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	17,045,000	53,266	1,470	-	54,735
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	20,000,000	62,500	1,680	-	64,180
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	15,000,000	50,000	2,819	-	52,819
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	10,000,000	33,333	1,840	-	35,173
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	30,000,000	106,250	1,375	-	107,625
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	20,000,000	70,833	871	-	71,705

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	28,940,000	99,481	596	-	100,077
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	24,700,000	87,479	1,691	-	89,170
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	750	-	183,041
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375	-	91,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375	-	91,521
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	50,000,000	197,917	4,180	-	202,096
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	19,500,000	69,063	1,489	-	70,551
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	50,000,000	187,500	3,253	-	190,753
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	10,000,000	37,500	355	-	37,855
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	25,000,000	93,750	959	-	94,709
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	15,000,000	56,250	631	-	56,881
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	33,000,000	123,750	1,613	-	125,363
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	19,000,000	75,208	456	-	75,664
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	10,000,000	39,583	249	-	39,832
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	21,000,000	83,125	516	-	83,641
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026	11,895,000	48,323	2,138	-	50,461
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	30,000,000	121,875	4,692	-	126,567
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	14,000,000	56,875	2,689	-	59,564
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	25,000,000	104,167	1,953	-	106,120
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	3,000,000	12,500	249	-	12,749
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	9,615,000	40,063	799	-	40,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	16,000,000	66,667	1,329	-	67,996
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	-	16,250	642	-	16,892
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	-	16,250	686	-	16,936
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	-	16,250	686	-	16,936
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	27,950,000	107,724	2,461	-	110,185
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	33,300,000	128,344	2,939	-	131,283
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	12,000,000	46,250	271	-	46,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	20,000,000	77,083	482	-	77,565
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	55,000,000	211,979	1,319	-	213,298
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	FHLB 4.625 11/17/2026	50,000,000	192,708	2,503	-	195,212
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026	28,975,000	19,317	86,563	-	105,879
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	31,000,000	103,333	2,343	-	105,676
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	58,850,000	196,167	4,667	-	200,834
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	35,000,000	120,313	1,247	-	121,560
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	50,000,000	171,875	1,895	-	173,770
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	25,000,000	85,938	891	-	86,828
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	10,000,000	34,375	379	-	34,754
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	5,000,000	17,188	202	-	17,390
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	12,000,000	41,250	774	-	42,024
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	25,000,000	85,938	1,612	-	87,549

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	29,350,000	100,891	1,892	-	102,783
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	50,000,000	171,875	3,223	-	175,098
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027	50,000,000	187,500	2,564	-	190,064
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	-	59,686	-1,242	-	58,445
Federal Agencies	3133EP5K7	FFCB 4.500 03/13/2026	-	75,000	4,090	-	79,090
Federal Agencies	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	-	40,625	-912	-	39,713
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029	51,660,000	177,581	11,180	-	188,761
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028	4,971,000	17,606	1,169	-	18,774
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029	25,000,000	93,750	-324	-	93,426
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	20,000,000	79,167	1,498	-	80,664
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	17,000,000	67,292	1,273	-	68,565
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	48,000,000	190,000	3,594	-	193,594
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	40,000,000	158,333	2,995	-	161,328
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	63,085,000	249,711	-11,575	-	238,137
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	27,892,000	110,406	-5,111	-	105,294
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	30,000,000	118,750	-5,412	-	113,338
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	FFCB 4.750 05/06/2027	12,727,000	50,378	-377	-	50,001
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	FHLB 4.500 06/11/2027	11,000,000	41,250	1,732	-	42,982
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	15,000,000	56,250	115	-	56,365
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026	13,485,000	54,783	-860	-	53,922
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	32,000,000	130,000	-2,192	-	127,808
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	20,000,000	81,250	-1,302	-	79,948
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	38,000,000	134,583	4,204	-	138,788
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	5,000,000	17,708	546	-	18,255
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555	-	35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555	-	35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	20,000,000	70,833	1,109	-	71,943
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555	-	35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	29,000,000	102,708	1,306	-	104,014
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	20,000,000	75,000	-808	-	74,192
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	14,934,000	56,003	-604	-	55,399
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	FFCB 4.500 06/28/2027	30,000,000	112,500	401	-	112,901
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	-942	-	92,808
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	FHLB 4.625 06/11/2027	20,700,000	79,781	-2,781	-	77,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	-723	-	93,027
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	FFCB 4.250 07/12/2029	20,000,000	70,833	183	-	71,017
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	10,000,000	35,417	99	-	35,516
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	15,000,000	53,125	149	-	53,274
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,000,000	75,521	1,430	-	76,950
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	50,000,000	151,042	2,859	-	153,901
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	19,000,000	57,396	1,087	-	58,482

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,900,000	78,240	1,481	-	79,721
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-6,715	-	44,848
Federal Agencies	3133ERVR9	FFCB 3.500 07/01/2027	55,000,000	160,417	2,310	-	162,726
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	65,000,000	217,208	-	-	217,208
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	25,000,000	83,542	-	-	83,542
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	25,000,000	83,542	-	-	83,542
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	FFCB 3.500 01/07/2027	12,500,000	36,458	4,767	-	41,225
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	8,000,000	25,833	109	-	25,942
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	5,000,000	16,146	78	-	16,224
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	15,000,000	50,000	134	-	50,134
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	224	-	83,557
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	224	-	83,557
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	50,000,000	166,667	447	-	167,114
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	FHLB 4.000 11/27/2028	47,025,000	156,750	1,760	-	158,510
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-841	-	50,722
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-752	-	50,811
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	25,590,000	87,966	-1,283	-	86,683
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	622	-	106,872
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	38,343,000	131,804	3,288	-	135,092
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	25,505,000	87,673	2,180	-	89,854
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	21,000,000	72,188	1,801	-	73,989
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	33,000,000	113,438	3,046	-	116,484
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	FFCB 4.250 01/14/2028	29,750,000	105,365	4,927	-	110,292
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	50,000,000	177,083	724	-	177,807
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	47,000,000	166,458	680	-	167,139
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	41,880,000	148,325	70	-	148,395
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	5,000,000	17,708	20	-	17,728
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	1,376	-	107,626
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	25,000,000	88,542	1,093	-	89,635
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	2,000,000	7,083	91	-	7,174
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	12,815,000	48,056	-3,650	-	44,406
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	18,000,000	67,500	-5,101	-	62,399
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	32,260,000	107,533	275	-	107,808
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	46,750,000	155,833	295	-	156,128
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	15,000,000	50,000	107	-	50,107
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	43,020,000	143,400	1,974	-	145,374
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030	8,695,000	28,983	402	-	29,385
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	50,000,000	166,667	8,084	-	174,750
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	FHLB 4.000 06/09/2028	10,000,000	33,333	94	-	33,427
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	45,000,000	150,000	1,349	-	151,349
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	10,000,000	33,333	300	-	33,633

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	15,000,000	50,000	1,029	-	51,029
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	FFCB 4.000 11/10/2026	12,600,000	42,000	1,091	-	43,091
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	23,000,000	76,667	1,469	-	78,136
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	25,000,000	80,729	1,209	-	81,938
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	20,000,000	66,667	934	-	67,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	10,000,000	33,333	441	-	33,775
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	15,000,000	50,000	367	-	50,367
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	10,000,000	33,333	245	-	33,578
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	7,370,000	23,799	780	-	24,579
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	16,500,000	53,281	944	-	54,225
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	10,000,000	32,292	572	-	32,864
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	20,000,000	64,583	1,144	-	65,727
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	13,000,000	41,979	743	-	42,723
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	36,000,000	116,250	2,059	-	118,309
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	25,000,000	83,333	999	-	84,333
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	14,450,000	48,167	578	-	48,744
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	5,000,000	16,667	193	-	16,860
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	16,000,000	55,000	-1,078	-	53,922
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	25,000,000	83,333	598	-	83,932
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	50,000,000	156,250	4,840	-	161,090
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	22,500,000	70,313	2,153	-	72,465
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	41,000,000	136,667	-606	-	136,061
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	15,000,000	50,000	-222	-	49,778
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	10,070,000	33,567	-135	-	33,432
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	25,000,000	78,125	2,728	-	80,853
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	15,000,000	50,000	23	-	50,023
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	9,750,000	32,500	67	-	32,567
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	16,944,000	56,480	116	-	56,596
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	12,515,000	43,020	-1,109	-	41,911
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	FFCB 3.750 07/08/2030	20,000,000	62,500	3,812	-	66,312
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029	9,705,000	37,405	-5,248	-	32,157
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	7,000,000	21,146	597	-	21,743
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	427	-	15,531
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	435	-	15,539
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	17,000,000	58,438	-4,234	-	54,204
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	40,000,000	125,000	3,004	-	128,004
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	25,000,000	78,125	1,835	-	79,960
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	15,000,000	46,875	1,127	-	48,002
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	35,000,000	109,375	2,787	-	112,162
Federal Agencies	313385VP8	FHDN 0.000 04/15/2026	25,000,000	-	82,236	-	82,236
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	50,000,000	167,917	-	-	167,917
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	50,000,000	170,000	-	-	170,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	25,000,000	85,000	-	-	85,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	25,000,000	85,000	-	-	85,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	25,000,000	85,000	-	-	85,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	25,000,000	85,000	-	-	85,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	50,000,000	166,667	-	-	166,667
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	41,000,000	119,583	3,559	-	123,142
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	50,000,000	145,833	4,340	-	150,173
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	25,000,000	72,917	2,170	-	75,087
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	20,000,000	58,333	1,736	-	60,069
Federal Agencies	313385WN2	FHDN 0.000 05/08/2026	25,000,000	-	77,500	-	77,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027	9,320,000	26,213	898	-	27,111
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027	60,000,000	168,750	5,784	-	174,534
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	50,000,000	168,750	53	-	168,803
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3130AWMP2	FHLB 4.375 06/14/2030	31,000,000	113,021	-16,718	-	96,303
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	5,000,000	14,063	652	-	14,714
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	25,000,000	70,313	3,208	-	73,520
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	30,000,000	84,375	3,911	-	88,286
Federal Agencies	3133ET2W6	FFCB 3.500 01/20/2028	5,000,000	14,583	329	-	14,912
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	20,000,000	68,750	-7,850	-	60,900
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	50,000,000	173,958	-	-	173,958
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	25,000,000	86,979	-	-	86,979
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	25,000,000	86,979	-	-	86,979
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	25,000,000	86,979	-	-	86,979
Federal Agencies	3133ET2S5	FFCB 3.375 11/28/2028	35,000,000	98,438	7,550	-	105,988
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	23,000,000	80,021	-	-	80,021
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	45,000,000	131,250	1,567	-	132,817
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	37,000,000	107,917	1,288	-	109,205
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	15,000,000	43,750	522	-	44,272

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EN5N6	FFCB 4.000 01/06/2028	50,000,000	166,667	-20,088	-	146,579
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	50,000,000	168,125	-	-	168,125
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028	10,000,000	29,167	74	-	29,241
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028	20,000,000	58,333	148	-	58,481
Federal Agencies	313385VE3	FHDN 0.000 04/06/2026	24,500,000	-	75,212	-	75,212
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	46,000,000	129,375	3,809	-	133,184
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	30,000,000	84,375	2,484	-	86,859
Federal Agencies	3133ET6R3	FFCB 3.375 10/08/2027	15,000,000	42,188	1,086	-	43,273
Federal Agencies	313385ZG4	FHDN 0.000 07/13/2026	15,000,000	-	44,627	-	44,627
Federal Agencies	313385ZS8	FHDN 0.000 07/23/2026	15,000,000	-	44,563	-	44,563
Federal Agencies	313385ZT6	FHDN 0.000 07/24/2026	50,000,000	-	148,972	-	148,972
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	50,000,000	171,250	-	-	171,250
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3133EJ5J4	FFCB 3.190 01/16/2029	10,000,000	26,583	3,049	-	29,633
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	50,000,000	169,167	-	-	169,167
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	313385B47	FHDN 0.000 08/10/2026	25,000,000	-	74,809	-	74,809
Federal Agencies	313385B62	FHDN 0.000 08/12/2026	51,000,000	-	152,610	-	152,610
Federal Agencies	313385A97	FHDN 0.000 08/07/2026	10,000,000	-	29,967	-	29,967
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	23,480,000	66,038	3,272	-	69,309
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028	35,000,000	102,083	3,136	-	105,219
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028	35,000,000	102,083	3,136	-	105,219
Federal Agencies	313385B88	FHDN 0.000 08/14/2026	22,900,000	-	69,511	-	69,511
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	25,000,000	-	76,101	-	76,101
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	25,000,000	-	76,101	-	76,101
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	15,000,000	-	45,660	-	45,660
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	75,455	-	75,455
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	75,455	-	75,455
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	75,455	-	75,455
Federal Agencies	313385D45	FHDN 0.000 08/26/2026	51,000,000	-	150,450	-	150,450
Federal Agencies	3133EWGC8	FFCB 3.500 09/06/2030	36,750,000	89,323	3,485	-	92,808

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	15,000,000	37,917	478	-	38,394
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	50,000,000	126,389	1,593	-	127,981
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	30,000,000	75,833	956	-	76,789
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	25,000,000	63,194	796	-	63,991
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	13,000,000	32,861	414	-	33,275
Federal Agencies	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	28,210	-	28,210
Federal Agencies	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	50,000,000	-	74,063	-	74,063
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	25,000,000	-	37,031	-	37,031
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	15,585,000	-	24,728	-	24,728
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	40,000,000	-	59,250	-	59,250
Federal Agencies	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
Federal Agencies	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	-	-	5,014	-	5,014
Federal Agencies	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	-	-	5,014	-	5,014
Federal Agencies	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	-	-	5,014	-	5,014
Federal Agencies	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	-	-	5,014	-	5,014
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	10,764	147	-	10,911
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	10,764	161	-	10,925
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	10,764	168	-	10,931
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	2,000,000	861	13	-	875
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	25,000,000	10,764	241	-	11,005
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	21,700,000	9,343	233	-	9,576
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	50,000,000	21,528	536	-	22,064
Subtotals			**7,881,934,000**	**22,270,846**	**1,938,407**	**-**	**24,209,252**
Negotiable CDs	96130AZZ4	WSTNY 4.350 05/04/2026	125,000,000	468,229	-	-	468,229
Negotiable CDs	96130AA24	WSTNY 4.350 03/16/2026	-	181,250	-	-	181,250
Negotiable CDs	96130AA65	WSTNY 4.380 03/23/2026	-	374,733	-	-	374,733
Negotiable CDs	89115DEG7	TDNY 4.410 03/11/2026	-	61,250	-	-	61,250
Negotiable CDs	78015JGQ4	RY 4.380 03/06/2026	-	30,417	-	-	30,417
Negotiable CDs	89115DHC3	TDNY 4.400 03/16/2026	-	110,000	-	-	110,000

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026	100,000,000	372,000	-	-	372,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DRH0	BMOCHG 4.330 03/24/2026	-	138,319	-	-	138,319
Negotiable CDs	06367DRJ6	BMOCHG 4.330 03/25/2026	-	144,333	-	-	144,333
Negotiable CDs	78015JJ81	RY 4.290 03/16/2026	-	178,750	-	-	178,750
Negotiable CDs	78015JJQ1	RY 4.330 04/07/2026	50,000,000	186,431	-	-	186,431
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	BNSHOU 4.270 07/01/2026	100,000,000	367,694	-	-	367,694
Negotiable CDs	06367DRZ0	BMOCHG 4.170 06/01/2026	100,000,000	359,083	-	-	359,083
Negotiable CDs	78015JL88	RY 4.060 07/01/2026	100,000,000	349,611	-	-	349,611
Negotiable CDs	06367DS97	BMOCHG 4.200 06/15/2026	100,000,000	361,667	-	-	361,667
Negotiable CDs	78015JMC8	RY 4.180 04/23/2026	100,000,000	359,944	-	-	359,944
Negotiable CDs	06418NJE3	BNSHOU 4.200 04/20/2026	125,000,000	452,083	-	-	452,083
Negotiable CDs	06418NJK9	BNSHOU 4.110 04/23/2026	100,000,000	353,917	-	-	353,917
Negotiable CDs	06367DSQ9	BMOCHG 4.000 06/09/2026	46,000,000	158,444	-	-	158,444
Negotiable CDs	06367DSR7	BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026	54,000,000	186,000	-	-	186,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSV8	BMOCHG 3.980 06/17/2026	55,000,000	188,497	-	-	188,497
Negotiable CDs	89115DK96	TDNY 3.850 06/23/2026	50,000,000	165,764	-	-	165,764
Negotiable CDs	89115DKD7	TDNY 3.850 07/01/2026	50,000,000	165,764	-	-	165,764
Negotiable CDs	89115DNV4	TDNY 3.780 06/15/2026	100,000,000	325,500	-	-	325,500
Negotiable CDs	78015J4M6	RY 4.000 10/23/2026	100,000,000	77,778	-	-	77,778
Negotiable CDs	13606DUD2	CIBCNY 4.050 10/23/2026	100,000,000	78,750	-	-	78,750
Negotiable CDs	89115MA63	TDNY 4.050 09/23/2026	25,000,000	19,688	-	-	19,688
Negotiable CDs	89115MAA4	TDNY 4.050 09/24/2026	50,000,000	39,375	-	-	39,375
Negotiable CDs	89115MAE6	TDNY 4.060 10/05/2026	25,000,000	19,736	-	-	19,736
Negotiable CDs	89115MAJ5	TDNY 4.070 10/23/2026	100,000,000	67,833	-	-	67,833
Subtotals			**1,755,000,000**	**6,342,842**	**-**	**-**	**6,342,842**
Commercial Paper	62479MC92	MUFGBK 0.000 03/09/2026	-	-	124,511	-	124,511
Commercial Paper	62479MCQ4	MUFGBK 0.000 03/24/2026	-	-	271,528	-	271,528
Commercial Paper	62479MD67	MUFGBK 0.000 04/06/2026	110,000,000	-	404,464	-	404,464
Commercial Paper	89233HEN0	TOYCC 0.000 05/22/2026	100,000,000	-	350,472	-	350,472
Commercial Paper	62479MDN0	MUFGBK 0.000 04/22/2026	51,000,000	-	178,741	-	178,741
Commercial Paper	89233HEL4	TOYCC 0.000 05/20/2026	55,000,000	-	185,182	-	185,182
Commercial Paper	89233HF33	TOYCC 0.000 06/03/2026	60,000,000	-	201,500	-	201,500
Commercial Paper	89233HG16	TOYCC 0.000 07/01/2026	70,000,000	-	227,850	-	227,850
Commercial Paper	62479MFP3	MUFGBK 0.000 06/23/2026	50,000,000	-	164,472	-	164,472
Commercial Paper	62479MFV0	MUFGBK 0.000 06/29/2026	25,000,000	-	82,236	-	82,236
Commercial Paper	62479MF16	MUFGBK 0.000 06/01/2026	30,000,000	-	98,942	-	98,942
Commercial Paper	62479MFJ7	MUFGBK 0.000 06/18/2026	15,000,000	-	49,342	-	49,342
Commercial Paper	89233HGE8	TOYCC 0.000 07/14/2026	75,000,000	-	242,188	-	242,188
Commercial Paper	89233HGQ1	TOYCC 0.000 07/24/2026	75,000,000	-	241,542	-	241,542
Commercial Paper	89233HGV0	TOYCC 0.000 07/29/2026	50,000,000	-	160,597	-	160,597

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Commercial Paper	62479MFF5	MUFGBK 0.000 06/15/2026	65,000,000	-	208,776	-	208,776
Commercial Paper	62479MJP9	MUFGBK 0.000 09/23/2026	100,000,000	-	77,389	-	77,389
Commercial Paper	62479MK77	MUFGBK 0.000 10/07/2026	51,000,000	-	11,192	-	11,192
Commercial Paper	62479MKF9	MUFGBK 0.000 10/15/2026	11,000,000	-	2,414	-	2,414
Subtotals			**993,000,000**	**-**	**3,283,337**	**-**	**3,283,337**
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	6,452,000	18,281	7,033	-	25,314
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	13,009,000	36,859	14,105	-	50,963
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	DE 4.200 07/15/2027	10,000,000	35,000	42	-	35,042
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	CAT 4.450 10/16/2026	18,385,000	68,178	-8,805	-	59,373
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	AAPL 3.350 02/09/2027	50,000,000	139,583	14,684	-	154,268
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	TOYOTA 4.600 01/08/2027	40,000,000	153,333	936	-	154,269
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	DE 4.250 06/05/2028	25,000,000	88,542	629	-	89,171
Subtotals			**162,846,000**	**539,776**	**28,624**	**-**	**568,399**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	14,738,340	44,203	-	-	44,203
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	506,189,669	1,365,642	-	-	1,365,642
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	467,096,180	775,850	-	-	775,850
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	15,333,433	45,905	-	-	45,905
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	265,932,833	1,797,307	-	-	1,797,307
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	28,139,071	356,414	-	-	356,414
Subtotals			**1,297,429,527**	**4,385,322**	**-**	**-**	**4,385,322**
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	6,469	-	92,407
Supranationals	459058KJ1	IBRD 3.125 06/15/2027	12,323,000	32,091	11,335	-	43,426
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	50,000,000	171,875	3,204	-	175,079
Supranationals	459058KC6	IBRD 0.700 11/16/2026	55,000,000	103,125	69,548	-	172,673
Subtotals			**142,323,000**	**393,029**	**90,556**	**-**	**483,584**
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	166,162,241	506,498	-	-	506,498
Subtotals			**166,162,241**	**506,498**	**-**	**-**	**506,498**
Grand Totals			**17,947,694,768**	**49,137,883**	**6,470,387**	**-**	**55,608,270**

Investment Transactions
Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58996	Buy	313385D45	FHDN 0.000 08/26/2026	98.25950	03/02/2026	03/02/2026	51,000,000	50,112,345	-	50,112,345
58997	Buy	912797TJ6	B 0.000 04/21/2026	99.50728	03/03/2026	03/03/2026	65,000,000	64,679,731	-	64,679,731
58999	Buy	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	99.91400	03/05/2026	03/05/2026	15,000,000	14,987,100	-	14,987,100
59000	Buy	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	99.91400	03/05/2026	03/05/2026	50,000,000	49,957,000	-	49,957,000
59001	Buy	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	99.91400	03/05/2026	03/05/2026	30,000,000	29,974,200	-	29,974,200
59002	Buy	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	99.91400	03/05/2026	03/05/2026	25,000,000	24,978,500	-	24,978,500
59003	Buy	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	99.91400	03/05/2026	03/05/2026	13,000,000	12,988,820	-	12,988,820
58998	Buy	3133EWGC8	FFCB 3.500 09/06/2030	99.40000	03/06/2026	03/06/2026	36,750,000	36,529,500	-	36,529,500
59004	Buy	912797TA5	B 0.000 03/24/2026	99.81825	03/06/2026	03/06/2026	100,000,000	99,818,250	-	99,818,250
59005	Buy	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	99.81800	03/06/2026	03/06/2026	15,500,000	15,471,790	-	15,471,790
59006	Buy	912797TA5	B 0.000 03/24/2026	99.85922	03/10/2026	03/10/2026	35,000,000	34,950,728	-	34,950,728
59007	Buy	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	99.99000	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59008	Buy	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	99.99000	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59009	Buy	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	99.99000	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59010	Buy	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	99.99000	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59013	Buy	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	98.12575	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	15,585,000	15,292,898	-	15,292,898
59011	Buy	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	98.14350	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	50,000,000	49,071,750	-	49,071,750
59012	Buy	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	98.14350	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	25,000,000	24,535,875	-	24,535,875
59014	Buy	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	98.14350	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	40,000,000	39,257,400	-	39,257,400
59015	Buy	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	99.99000	03/19/2026	03/19/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59016	Buy	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	99.99000	03/19/2026	03/19/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59017	Buy	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	99.99000	03/19/2026	03/19/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59018	Buy	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	99.99000	03/19/2026	03/19/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59019	Buy	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	100.04688	03/20/2026	03/20/2026	40,000,000	40,018,750	21,060	40,039,810
59020	Buy	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	100.04297	03/20/2026	03/20/2026	50,000,000	50,021,484	26,325	50,047,809
59021	Buy	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	99.99000	03/23/2026	03/23/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59022	Buy	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	99.99000	03/23/2026	03/23/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59023	Buy	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	99.99000	03/23/2026	03/23/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59024	Buy	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	99.99000	03/23/2026	03/23/2026	50,000,000	49,995,000	-	49,995,000
59025	Buy	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	99.98997	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	49,994,986	-	49,994,986
59026	Buy	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	99.98997	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	49,994,986	-	49,994,986
59027	Buy	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	99.98997	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	49,994,986	-	49,994,986
59028	Buy	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	99.98997	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	49,994,986	-	49,994,986
59033	Buy	62479MJP9	MUFGBK 0.000 09/23/2026	97.98789	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	100,000,000	97,987,889	-	97,987,889
59034	Buy	78015J4M6	RY 4.000 10/23/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59035	Buy	13606DUD2	CIBCNY 4.050 10/23/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59036	Buy	89115MA63	TDNY 4.050 09/23/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
59037	Buy	89115MAA4	TDNY 4.050 09/24/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59038	Buy	89115MAE6	TDNY 4.060 10/05/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
59039	Buy	89115MAJ5	TDNY 4.070 10/23/2026	100.00000	03/26/2026	03/26/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59029	Buy	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	99.91400	03/27/2026	03/27/2026	25,000,000	24,978,500	-	24,978,500
59030	Buy	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	99.90600	03/27/2026	03/27/2026	25,000,000	24,976,500	-	24,976,500
59031	Buy	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	99.90200	03/27/2026	03/27/2026	25,000,000	24,975,500	-	24,975,500
59032	Buy	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	99.90200	03/27/2026	03/27/2026	2,000,000	1,998,040	-	1,998,040
59040	Buy	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	99.78900	03/27/2026	03/27/2026	25,000,000	24,947,250	-	24,947,250
59041	Buy	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	99.76500	03/27/2026	03/27/2026	21,700,000	21,649,005	-	21,649,005
59042	Buy	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	99.76500	03/27/2026	03/27/2026	50,000,000	49,882,500	-	49,882,500
59043	Buy	62479MK77	MUFGBK 0.000 10/07/2026	97.90431	03/30/2026	03/30/2026	51,000,000	49,931,196	-	49,931,196
59044	Buy	62479MKF9	MUFGBK 0.000 10/15/2026	97.81653	03/30/2026	03/30/2026	11,000,000	10,759,818	-	10,759,818
Activity Total							**2,192,535,000**	**2,184,652,263**	**47,385**	**2,184,699,648**

Investment Transactions
Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58697	Maturity	78015JGQ4	RY 4.380 03/06/2026	100.00000	03/06/2026	03/06/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58724	Maturity	62479MC92	MUFGBK 0.000 03/09/2026	100.00000	03/09/2026	03/09/2026	130,000,000	130,000,000	-	130,000,000
58696	Maturity	89115DEG7	TDNY 4.410 03/11/2026	100.00000	03/11/2026	03/11/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57789	Maturity	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	100.00000	03/13/2026	03/13/2026	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	10,000,000
57790	Maturity	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	100.00000	03/13/2026	03/13/2026	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	10,000,000
57791	Maturity	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	100.00000	03/13/2026	03/13/2026	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	10,000,000
57890	Maturity	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	100.00000	03/13/2026	03/13/2026	36,730,000	36,730,000	-	36,730,000
57900	Maturity	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	100.00000	03/13/2026	03/13/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
57891	Maturity	3133EP5K7	FFCB 4.500 03/13/2026	100.00000	03/13/2026	03/13/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58731	Maturity	78015JJ81	RY 4.290 03/16/2026	100.00000	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
58725	Maturity	89115DHC3	TDNY 4.400 03/16/2026	100.00000	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	60,000,000	60,000,000	-	60,000,000
58680	Maturity	96130AA24	WSTNY 4.350 03/16/2026	100.00000	03/16/2026	03/16/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59007	Maturity	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	100.00000	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59008	Maturity	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	100.00000	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59009	Maturity	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	100.00000	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59010	Maturity	313385UJ3	FHDN 0.000 03/17/2026	100.00000	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58993	Maturity	912797SZ1	B 0.000 03/17/2026	100.00000	03/17/2026	03/17/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
59015	Maturity	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	100.00000	03/20/2026	03/20/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59016	Maturity	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	100.00000	03/20/2026	03/20/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59017	Maturity	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	100.00000	03/20/2026	03/20/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59018	Maturity	313385UM6	FHDN 0.000 03/20/2026	100.00000	03/20/2026	03/20/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58688	Maturity	96130AA65	WSTNY 4.380 03/23/2026	100.00000	03/23/2026	03/23/2026	140,000,000	140,000,000	-	140,000,000
58729	Maturity	06367DRH0	BMOCHG 4.330 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59005	Maturity	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	15,500,000	15,500,000	-	15,500,000
59021	Maturity	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59022	Maturity	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59023	Maturity	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59024	Maturity	313385UR5	FHDN 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58736	Maturity	62479MCQ4	MUFGBK 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59004	Maturity	912797TA5	B 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59006	Maturity	912797TA5	B 0.000 03/24/2026	100.00000	03/24/2026	03/24/2026	35,000,000	35,000,000	-	35,000,000
58730	Maturity	06367DRJ6	BMOCHG 4.330 03/25/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59025	Maturity	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59026	Maturity	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59027	Maturity	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59028	Maturity	313385US3	FHDN 0.000 03/25/2026	100.00000	03/25/2026	03/25/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
Activity Total							**1,947,230,000**	**1,947,230,000**	**-**	**1,947,230,000**

Interest Received
Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
58618	Interest Income	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	03/02/2026	1,000,000	0	1,000,000
58670	Interest Income	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	03/02/2026	1,593,750	0	1,593,750
58671	Interest Income	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	03/02/2026	1,093,750	0	1,093,750
58891	Interest Income	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	03/02/2026	906,250	405,559	500,691
58894	Interest Income	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	03/02/2026	1,359,375	615,849	743,526
58914	Interest Income	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	03/02/2026	1,500,000	837,017	662,983
47166	Interest Income	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	03/02/2026	187,500	0	187,500
57729	Interest Income	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	03/02/2026	225,000	0	225,000
57730	Interest Income	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	03/02/2026	562,500	0	562,500
57731	Interest Income	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	03/02/2026	337,500	0	337,500
57732	Interest Income	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	03/02/2026	742,500	0	742,500
57814	Interest Income	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	03/02/2026	1,093,750	0	1,093,750
57903	Interest Income	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	03/02/2026	1,062,500	0	1,062,500
58399	Interest Income	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	03/02/2026	781,250	0	781,250
58402	Interest Income	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	03/02/2026	1,015,625	0	1,015,625
47168	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	03/03/2026	134,375	0	134,375
47169	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	03/03/2026	134,375	0	134,375
47170	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	03/03/2026	134,375	0	134,375
47171	Interest Income	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	03/03/2026	134,375	0	134,375
58357	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	03/04/2026	453,125	0	453,125
58358	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	03/04/2026	906,250	0	906,250
58359	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	03/04/2026	344,375	0	344,375
58360	Interest Income	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	03/04/2026	469,438	0	469,438
58697	Interest Income	78015JGQ4	RY 4.380 03/06/2026	03/06/2026	1,709,417	0	1,709,417
47314	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	03/09/2026	293,750	0	293,750
47315	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	03/09/2026	293,750	0	293,750
47316	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	03/09/2026	293,750	0	293,750
47317	Interest Income	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	03/09/2026	293,750	0	293,750
57906	Interest Income	3130AVBD3	FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029	03/09/2026	562,500	0	562,500
47321	Interest Income	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	03/10/2026	408,013	0	408,013
57815	Interest Income	3133EM4X7	FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026	03/10/2026	115,900	0	115,900
58696	Interest Income	89115DEG7	TDNY 4.410 03/11/2026	03/11/2026	1,751,750	0	1,751,750
57760	Interest Income	3130AXCP1	FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026	03/11/2026	289,941	0	289,941
47160	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	03/13/2026	131,250	0	131,250
47161	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	03/13/2026	131,250	0	131,250
47162	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	03/13/2026	131,250	0	131,250
47163	Interest Income	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	03/13/2026	131,250	0	131,250
57789	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	03/13/2026	243,750	0	243,750

Interest Received
Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
57790	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	03/13/2026	243,750	0	243,750
57791	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	03/13/2026	243,750	0	243,750
57890	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	03/13/2026	895,294	0	895,294
57891	Interest Income	3133EP5K7	FFCB 4.500 03/13/2026	03/13/2026	1,125,000	0	1,125,000
57900	Interest Income	3130AXB31	FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026	03/13/2026	609,375	0	609,375
58680	Interest Income	96130AA24	WSTNY 4.350 03/16/2026	03/16/2026	3,625,000	0	3,625,000
58725	Interest Income	89115DHC3	TDNY 4.400 03/16/2026	03/16/2026	1,972,667	0	1,972,667
58731	Interest Income	78015JJ81	RY 4.290 03/16/2026	03/16/2026	3,146,000	0	3,146,000
58770	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	03/16/2026	350,625	0	350,625
58944	Interest Income	91282CNY3	T 3.375 09/15/2028	03/16/2026	928,125	487,137	440,988
58064	Interest Income	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	03/16/2026	109,684	0	109,684
58065	Interest Income	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	03/16/2026	221,153	0	221,153
58392	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	03/16/2026	309,375	0	309,375
58401	Interest Income	91282CLL3	T 3.375 09/15/2027	03/16/2026	843,750	0	843,750
58434	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	03/16/2026	309,375	0	309,375
58435	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	03/16/2026	309,375	0	309,375
58436	Interest Income	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	03/16/2026	527,794	0	527,794
58617	Interest Income	3133ER7L9	FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030	03/18/2026	173,900	0	173,900
57901	Interest Income	3133EP5U5	FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029	03/20/2026	1,065,488	0	1,065,488
57905	Interest Income	3133EP5S0	FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028	03/20/2026	105,634	0	105,634
58688	Interest Income	96130AA65	WSTNY 4.380 03/23/2026	03/23/2026	5,092,967	0	5,092,967
58942	Interest Income	3133ET4Y0	FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028	03/23/2026	87,500	0	87,500
58943	Interest Income	3133ET4Y0	FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028	03/23/2026	175,000	0	175,000
58729	Interest Income	06367DRH0	BMOCHG 4.330 03/24/2026	03/24/2026	1,635,778	0	1,635,778
58730	Interest Income	06367DRJ6	BMOCHG 4.330 03/25/2026	03/25/2026	1,641,792	0	1,641,792
57889	Interest Income	3133EP6K6	FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027	03/26/2026	1,125,000	0	1,125,000
58820	Interest Income	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	03/30/2026	503,750	0	503,750
58821	Interest Income	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	03/30/2026	503,750	0	503,750
58822	Interest Income	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	03/30/2026	503,750	0	503,750
58823	Interest Income	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	03/30/2026	503,750	0	503,750
58824	Interest Income	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	03/30/2026	1,007,500	0	1,007,500
58864	Interest Income	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	03/31/2026	906,250	109,547	796,703
58868	Interest Income	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	03/31/2026	906,250	119,505	786,745
58871	Interest Income	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	03/31/2026	906,250	119,505	786,745
47172	Interest Income	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	03/31/2026	218,750	0	218,750
47173	Interest Income	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	03/31/2026	218,750	0	218,750
47176	Interest Income	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	03/31/2026	218,750	0	218,750
47342	Interest Income	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	03/31/2026	312,500	0	312,500
Activity Total					**56,536,356**	**2,694,121**	**53,842,236**

Cash Activity
Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Description	Activity Date	Transaction	Amount
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/02/2026	Withdrawal	-30,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	03/02/2026	Deposit	25,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/03/2026	Deposit	80,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/04/2026	Deposit	70,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	03/05/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	03/06/2026	Withdrawal	-95,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/09/2026	Deposit	15,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/10/2026	Withdrawal	-15,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/11/2026	Withdrawal	-20,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	03/12/2026	Withdrawal	-15,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/13/2026	Deposit	135,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/16/2026	Deposit	80,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/17/2026	Deposit	155,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/19/2026	Withdrawal	-85,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/19/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/20/2026	Deposit	130,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/23/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	03/23/2026	Withdrawal	-80,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/24/2026	Deposit	135,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/24/2026	Deposit	100,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/25/2026	Withdrawal	-80,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/25/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/26/2026	Withdrawal	-95,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/26/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/27/2026	Withdrawal	-145,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/30/2026	Deposit	55,000,000
09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	03/31/2026	Interest Received	44,203
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	03/31/2026	Interest Received	1,365,642
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/31/2026	Deposit	25,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	03/31/2026	Interest Received	775,850
262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	03/31/2026	Interest Received	45,905
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/31/2026	Deposit	30,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	03/31/2026	Interest Received	1,797,307
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	03/31/2026	Interest Received	356,414
0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	03/31/2026	Interest Received	506,498
Activity Total				**-120,108,180**

Item 8

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Issued: Charter Reform Working Group Summary and Analysis Report
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 3:29:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below Controllers Report regarding the Charter Reform Working Group.

Thank you,

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

From: Reports, Controller (CON) <controller.reports@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 3:18 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Issued: Charter Reform Working Group Summary and Analysis Report

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

The City Performance division in the Controller's Office is providing the Charter Reform Working Group Summary and Analysis report as general information.

This report summarizes the research, analysis, and Working Group feedback to inform potential Charter reforms for the November 2026 ballot and beyond.

Please refer to the distribution email below.

Office of the Controller
City & County of San Francisco



The Controller’s Office has published the Charter Reform Working Group Summary and Analysis Report. Mayor Daniel Lurie and Board of Supervisors President Rafael Mandelman requested that the Controller's Office convene and facilitate a working group of San Francisco stakeholders. The goal was to assemble a diverse group of San Franciscans to provide feedback on potential charter reform ideas to enable the City to more efficiently and effectively deliver government services. The group met four times with the purpose of providing early input to help policymakers evaluate potential changes for the November 2026 ballot. The focus was on a select list of long-standing issues that have broad impacts across City government.

View the full report

This report summarizes background research and the Working Group’s discussion in four key policy areas:

1) Policymaking: San Francisco places more than twice as many measures on the ballot as peer cities, which can lead to voter fatigue and limit policymakers’ ability to respond effectively to emerging issues. The report outlines options to improve measure quality, adjust thresholds to access the ballot, and allow amendments to outdated voter approved legislation.

2) Operational Efficiency: The City’s decentralized structure can create redundancies and slow service delivery. Options focus on modernizing the City Administrator’s role and streamlining procurement rules to save time and money.

3) City Organization: San Francisco’s Charter is unusually detailed and prescriptive compared to peer cities. With 90% of departments established in the Charter, even small organizational improvements require voter approval. Options explore shifting operational details to the Municipal Codes and creating more flexibility for the Mayor to

organize government functions.

4) Resource Management: Nearly 30 separate funding mandates restrict budget flexibility. While each supports important services, many overlap and together they limit the City's ability to respond to new needs. The report outlines options to simplify and standardize requirements and improve long-term fiscal flexibility.

Thank you to all Working Group members who contributed their time and expertise to this effort.

Visit the Charter Reform Working Group website

Image



Sign up to receive news and updates

Search all Controller's Office reports

This is a send-only e-mail address.

For press queries, please contact the Controller's Office at controller@sfgov.org.

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place | San Francisco, CA 94102 US

This email was sent to controller.reports@sfgov.org.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

Item 9

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 260132 CA SB-79 Transit-Oriented Development - 2 Letters
Date:	Monday, April 13, 2026 9:07:37 AM
Attachments:	260132 - SB 79 Transit-Oriented Development.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from members of the public regarding:

> **File No. 260132:** Ordinance 1) temporarily excluding certain sites from the provisions of California Senate Bill No. 79 (SB 79) that require local jurisdictions to allow residential uses at various densities, heights, and floor area ratios on sites within one-half mile of a transit-oriented development stop; 2) permanently excluding from those provisions of SB 79 sites located in industrial employment hubs, including certain sites zoned M (Industrial), SALI (Service/Arts/Light Industrial), PDR (Production, Distribution, Repair), WMUG (WSoMa Mixed Use-General), and P (Public), and sites with a walking path of more than one mile to the closest transit development stop; 3) amending the Planning Code to permit additional density and height for residential projects on certain parcels within one-half mile of a transit-oriented development stop; 4) adopting an Alternative Plan to SB 79, including making findings that the Alternative Plan provides equivalent development capacity; 5) making findings that these exemptions and the City's residential capacity meet the requirements of SB 79; and 6) directing the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to transmit a copy of this Ordinance to the California Department of Housing and Community Development; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Sincerely,

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

CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP

CAL HDF

Apr 10, 2026

City of San Francisco
49 S Van Ness Ave Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

By Email: ChanStaff@sfgov.org; ChanStaff@sfgov.org; DorseyStaff@sfgov.org; Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org; MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org; MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org; MelgarStaff@sfgov.org; SauterStaff@sfgov.org; SherrillStaff@sfgov.org; Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org;

CC: cityattorney@sfcityatty.org; sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org;

Re: Illegal Prohibition on Use of State Density Bonus Law

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Planning Department,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") and Californians for Homeownership submit this letter as a public comment regarding item 3, file number 260132, for the Board of Supervisors, Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of April 13, 2025, an amendment to the City's zoning code to implement the provisions of SB 79.

The proposed code amendment violates state law, as it prohibits the use of State Density Bonus Law (DBL).

The proposed ordinance seeks to implement an alternative plan pursuant to Government Code section 65912.161, subdivision (a). As part of this plan, the ordinance will upzone certain parcels to 50% of the density allowed by Government Code section 65912.157.

However, proposed code section 207.11(b)(5) forbids applicants who use this increased zoning capacity from invoking the benefits of the DBL: "Is not seeking a density bonus pursuant to Section 206.6."

This provision is illegal, as discussed below.

Background

State law contains many provisions that grant rights and protections to proposed housing developments and applications for proposed housing developments. These include the DBL,

codified at Government Code section 65915 et seq. The DBL furthers pro-housing policies by, among other things, allowing proposed housing developments that include affordable units to reduce or avoid local zoning and other land use restrictions, as well as to receive increased density. The DBL calculates density bonuses using a "base density," defined as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance, specific plan, or land use element of the general plan." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (o)(6).)

The proposed ordinance upzones certain parcels so that the City can avoid the primary provisions of SB 79 by implementing an alternative plan. The aforementioned state laws then further expand the allowed range of housing projects on these parcels, providing for even greater density and even more forgiving standards for projects.

However, proposed code section 207.11(b)(5) attempts to defeat the DBL entirely. If not for this provision, housing project applicants would be able to propose projects under this upzoning and then provide further affordable housing (and market rate units) under the DBL. Thus, the critical question is: does proposed section 207.11(b)(5) have any legal effect? As explained below, the answer is no. Developers may use both this upzoning and the DBL.

The City Cannot Forgo the Application of State Law

State law preempts local law. (Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7.) This is a foundational constitutional principle, and it is no less true in the land use context than anywhere else. As a corollary to this principle, local governments "cannot choose to forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature." (*Ailanto Properties*, *supra*, 142 Cal.App.4th at 595.) Proposed section 207.11(b)(5), however, attempts to do exactly that: it states, in effect, that state land use laws do not apply to projects proceeding under the proposed upzoning. Code section 207.11(b)(5)'s intended purpose is unmistakably to "forgo application of land use policies imposed by the Legislature," as caselaw and the California constitution forbid. (*Ibid.*)

The DBL does not allow local governments to circumvent or opt out of these rules. The attempt to do so, in section 207.11(b)(5) of the proposed SB 79 ordinance, does not pass legal muster, and project applicants will be entitled to ignore it.

Project Applicants Cannot Waive State Law Protections to Which They Are Entitled

Just as the City cannot waive the application state land use and housing laws, neither can developers. "[A] law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement." (Civ. Code, § 3513.) In other words, if a law is designed to accomplish a public benefit (possibly in addition to private benefits), the law's provisions cannot be waived. (See, e.g., *County of Riverside v. Superior Court* (2000) 86 Cal.App.4th 211, 220 [holding employment protections for public safety officers, although they benefitted individual officers, also served a broader public purpose and could not be waived].) The legislature has made clear

that pro-housing laws serve the broader public interest.[1] (See, e.g., Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (u); 65913.4, subd. (u); 65582.1; Stats. 2024, ch. 294, § 1; Stats. 2023, ch. 783, § 1.) The legislative history for these laws, moreover, confirms they are intended to serve the public by expanding the supply of housing and affordable housing. (See *Doskocz v. ALS Lien Services* (2024) 102 Cal.App.5th 107, 115-116 [legislative history is relevant in deciding whether law serves a public purpose and hence cannot be waived].) Hence, project applicants have no authority to disclaim the application of the DBL, as the City's proposed SB 79 ordinance would have them do.

Two additional reasons prevent project applicants from waiving their right to pursue state law protections.

First, as with all legal waivers, such a waiver must be voluntary. (*Harvey v. County of Kern* (1930) 107 Cal.App. 590, 597.) As currently framed, the SB 79 ordinance does not ask project applicants to voluntarily waive their state law rights. It instead makes waiver *mandatory* for any project applicant. No waiver can occur through such an ultimatum; to the extent that the issue is unclear, moreover, the ambiguity resolves against the existence of a waiver. (See *Perini v. Perini* (1964), 225 Cal.App.2d 399.)

Second, waiver requires "an abandonment of a right that could be enforced or a privilege that could be exercised." (*Estate of Goyette* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 224, 232 [internal citations omitted].) Thus, for an applicant to be able to waive the application of state law to a project, it must be the case that the applicant could, absent the waiver, enforce the application of the relevant state law. And it must be the case, from there, that the applicant could choose *not* to waive their rights and instead apply state law protections and bonuses to their project. In this way, the City faces a catch-22, and however it resolves the dilemma, developers will be able to use both the SB 79 upzoning and state law.

Even if the City Can Prohibit the Application of State Law, the Density Bonus Law Gives Project Applicants the Legal Right to Circumvent the City's Prohibition

Even if the above legal rules do not neutralize the City's attempt to avoid state law, any project eligible for the DBL will be able to defeat the application of proposed section 207.11(b)(5) . The DBL states: "In no case may a city, county, or city and county apply any development standard that will have the effect of physically precluding the construction of a development meeting the criteria of subdivision (b) at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by this section." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e)(1).) If a proposed project complies with the proposed upzoning except for section 207.11(b)(5) – because it seeks

[1] On one occasion, California courts found that a law establishing time limits for housing permit application processing primarily benefitted project applicants and not the general public, and hence project applicants could waive them. (*Bickel v. City of Piedmont* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1040, 1049-1052.) The legislature immediately rebuked the Courts and overturned the *Bickel* holding through legislation. (See *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428, 1439.)

benefits under the DBL – and the application of section 207.11(b)(5) would physically preclude the project by eliminating its eligibility for the density available under the upzoning, then the City cannot apply that section to the project. To the extent the City doubts or intends to contest this, CalHDF and Californians for Homeownership remind the City that the DBL, by its terms, "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (*Id.* at subd. (r).) Flouting the law on this point also carries severe penalties, including mandatory payment of attorney's fees to a project applicant who challenges the City in court. (*Id.* at subd. (e)(1).)

Similarly, the DBL defines the "base density" on which an applicant may seek benefits under the DBL, as "the greatest number of units allowed under the zoning ordinance ... or, if a range of density is permitted ... the greatest number of units allowed by the specific zoning range ..." The City's proposed SB 79 ordinance, regardless of whether it includes language to prevent projects from using the DBL, increases the "base density" for DBL purposes. Thus, project applicants can avail themselves of the DBL's benefits using the newly zoned density. Language to the contrary in the City's ordinance is so much useless ink.

Sincerely,





Matthew Gelfand
Californians for Homeownership

Dylan Casey
CalHDF

From:	James Lloyd
To:	ChanStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Cityattorney; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	public comment re item 3, file number 260132, for the BOS Land Use committee meeting of April 13, 2025
Date:	Friday, April 10, 2026 3:14:00 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco - SB 79 - 10 Apr 2026.pdf

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Planning Department,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") and Californians for Homeownership submit the attached letter as a public comment regarding item 3, file number 260132, for the Board of Supervisors, Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting of April 13, 2025, an amendment to the City's zoning code to implement the provisions of SB 79.

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - https://calhdf.org/donate/

San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #260132)
April 10, 2026

We write to oppose Section 3 of board file #260132, which would permanently exclude several transit-rich parts of San Francisco from SB 79.

SB 79 recognizes that San Francisco is in dire need of new housing, especially near public transit. It thus allows dense mixed-income housing near rail stations and rapid bus lines citywide. With rents skyrocketing and our public transit systems in peril, it is critical to embrace state laws like SB 79 that allow more housing near transit in San Francisco.

We know that you agree: in July 2025, a supermajority of the Board voted against efforts to oppose SB 79, and many Board members have affirmatively endorsed it.

The Planning Department's proposal seeks to accomplish two distinct objectives. The first is to temporarily exclude parts of the city from SB 79 — largely on the North and West side — where the city does or will allow sufficient density, thanks in part to the Family Zoning Plan. We recognize that the city crafted the Family Zoning Plan in part to provide a local alternative to SB 79 in these areas. We are not writing to oppose this first objective.

However, Section 3 of the proposed ordinance pursues a second, entirely distinct objective. This section **permanently** exempts several transit-rich areas of the city from SB 79 (visualized in Figure 6 in The Planning Commission's staff report), meaning **mixed-income housing will be illegal to build there**. We **strongly oppose** this effort to permanently exclude transit-rich areas of the city from mixed-income housing, and recommend that the Board remove this section from the proposed ordinance. We also encourage the Board to adopt findings affirming that the parts of these areas where SB 79 applies are suitable for mixed-income housing.

When a supermajority of the Board blocked efforts to oppose SB 79 last July, SB 79's provision allowing for these permanent exclusions was not present. We encourage the Board to allow the version of SB 79 that they reviewed in July 2025 to come into effect, and thus to oppose this ordinance unless it is amended.

Kenneth Russell
Volunteer Lead, SF YIMBY

Sachin Agarwal
GrowSF

From:	Kenneth Russell
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	david.broockman@gmail.com; sachin@growsf.org; steven@growsf.org; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (CPC); afryman@spur.org; laura@yimbyaction.org
Subject:	Letter from SF YIMBY & GrowSF re: file 260132_1
Date:	Friday, April 10, 2026 5:42:10 PM
Attachments:	YIMBY _ Grow SB 79 Letter.pdf

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

Please see attached for our letter. Thank you!

Item 10

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	15 Marina Boulevard - 9 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 11:36:25 AM
Attachments:	PC 2 - 15 Marina Blvd - 9 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached for 9 Letters from members of the public, regarding the proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard.

Sincerely,

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

From: CLEMENTS
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 10:32:38 AM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	ALMA
Last Name	CLEMENTS
Email Address	almaclements@sbcglobal.net
Street Address	2 Toledo Way San Francisco
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Orth
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 10:35:27 AM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Christina
Last Name	Orth
Email Address	cmorth.90@gmail.com
Street Address	2047 Broadway Street
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Worthington
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 6:06:41 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Alison
Last Name	Worthington
Email Address	alison.m.worthington@outlook.com
Street Address	227 Cervantes Blvd
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Geraldi
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 4:45:38 PM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Rita
Last Name	Geraldi
Email Address	ritageraldi@msn.com
Street Address	851 North Point Street
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Decca
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 3:00:38 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Roman
Last Name	Decca
Email Address	rtdecca@live.com
Street Address	98 Cervantes Blvd
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From:	L Ferrante
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Subject: Request for Supervisorial Oversight and Intervention Regarding Legal and Seismic Deficiencies in the Proposed M
Date:	Sunday, April 12, 2026 9:52:33 AM

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

President Mandelman and Members of the Board,

I am writing to request that the Board of Supervisors exercise its oversight authority regarding the proposed 20- and 25-story towers at the Marina Safeway site. This project raises substantial concerns under CEQA, the General Plan, the Planning Code, and the City's seismic-safety obligations — and it directly conflicts with the Neighborhood Family Zoning Plan adopted by the Board in December 2025, which strengthened protections for RH-1 and RH-2 districts citywide.

1. Direct Conflict With the December 2025 Neighborhood Family Zoning Plan

In December 2025, the Board adopted the Neighborhood Family Zoning Plan, which reaffirmed and strengthened the City's commitment to preserving:

• low-density, family-oriented residential districts (RH-1 and RH-2)
• neighborhood scale and character
• sunlight access and privacy
• predictable transitions between low-rise and higher-density areas

The Safeway proposal places 20- and 25-story towers immediately adjacent to RH-1/RH-2 family districts, in direct conflict with the Plan's newly adopted policies requiring:

• height transitions that respect adjacent family-zoned blocks,
• protection of neighborhood character, and
• avoidance of abrupt massing adjacent to RH-1/RH-2 districts.

The December 2025 Plan explicitly states that high-intensity development must not "overwhelm or destabilize" adjacent family-zoned neighborhoods. The proposed towers do exactly that.

2. Seismic and Liquefaction Hazards — Lessons From the 1989 Marina Destruction

The project site sits on artificial fill and documented liquefaction zones, the same conditions that caused catastrophic failures in the Marina during the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. Entire blocks collapsed, fires erupted, and emergency access routes were compromised.

Under CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(a) and Public Resources Code § 21083.1, the City must fully analyze and mitigate foreseeable seismic hazards. High-rise towers on liquefaction-prone soils present a significant, predictable risk that cannot be deferred to later engineering.

3. General Plan and Waterfront Policy Conflicts

The proposed height and massing are inconsistent with:

• the Urban Design Element,
• the North Waterfront Plan,
• the City's policies protecting view corridors and human-scale waterfront development, and
• the December 2025 Neighborhood Family Zoning Plan, which requires compatibility with adjacent RH-1/RH-2 districts.

Under Gov. Code § 65300.5, internal consistency is mandatory. A 25-story tower in a low-rise waterfront district — next to protected family-zoned blocks — raises clear General Plan inconsistency issues.

4. Shadow Impacts on Fort Mason — Potential Violation of Planning Code § 295

Fort Mason is a heavily used public recreation area. The proposed towers would cast new shadows on this open space. Planning Code § 295 prohibits new shadows on protected parks unless the impact is determined to be insignificant. The City cannot lawfully approve a project that creates new, non-de minimis shadows on a public recreational resource.

5. Demolition of a Potential Historic Resource — CEQA Requires Full Evaluation

The existing 1959 Marina Safeway building, designed by Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons, is a recognized example of mid-century Marina-style architecture. Under CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5, demolition of a structure that may qualify as a historic resource constitutes a significant environmental impact requiring full evaluation.

6. Loss of Essential Neighborhood-Serving Retail

Eliminating the only full-service grocery store in the Marina for years constitutes a significant impact on neighborhood-serving retail, which CEQA requires the City to analyze when it affects access to essential goods.

7. Misuse of SB 330, the Density Bonus Law, and AB 2011

The developer's attempt to lock in entitlements under SB 330, Gov. Code § 65915, and AB 2011 raises serious procedural concerns. These statutes:

• do not eliminate CEQA,
• do not override seismic-safety obligations,
• do not permit approval of a project inconsistent with objective General Plan standards, and
• do not supersede the December 2025 Neighborhood Family Zoning Plan.

The Board has authority to ensure that state-law streamlining is not misapplied to override fundamental safety and planning requirements.

Request for Supervisorial Action

I respectfully request that the Board:

1. Assert its oversight authority to ensure that a full Environmental Impact Report is required.
2. Direct the Planning Department to conduct full seismic, shadow, historic-resource, and General Plan consistency analyses, including impacts on adjacent Neighborhood Family Zoning Plan districts.
3. Ensure that no ministerial or streamlined pathway is used to bypass CEQA or neighborhood-protection policies.
4. Advocate for an alternative that is seismically appropriate, legally compliant, and consistent with the character and constraints of the northern waterfront and surrounding RH-1/RH-2 family neighborhoods.

The Marina's experience in 1989 demonstrated the consequences of ignoring seismic realities. The City cannot allow high-rise construction on liquefaction-prone fill, adjacent to protected family-zoned neighborhoods, without full legal and environmental scrutiny.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your continued commitment to lawful, safe, and responsible development in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ferrante
1335 Union St
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Bellm
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Saturday, April 11, 2026 9:44:33 AM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Lisa
Last Name	Bellm
Email Address	lbellm@mac.com
Street Address	62 Avila Street
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Uram
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 6:22:31 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Robert
Last Name	Uram
Email Address	ruram@sbcglobal.net
Street Address	1070 Green Street
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Karen Breslin
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 11:02:16 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email	kbsmail@sbcglobal.net
From your constituent	Karen Breslin
Subject	Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.

2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Karen Breslin

Item 11

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	251003 Permanent Supportive Housing - 5 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 12:58:10 PM
Attachments:	PC 3 - 251003 PSH.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached for 5 Letters from members of the public regarding:

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

Sincerely,

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

April 15, 2026

RE: Ordinance #25103: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing

Dear Supervisor Dorsey and Supervisors -

We are a community that shares the values of centering the needs and stabilization of the most vulnerable and holding one another close so that no one is left behind. When our most vulnerable are in distress, our community suffers as a whole. We are writing because we are deeply concerned with this proposed legislation and the harmful impacts it could bring to our community and the City as a whole.

We are also a community that learns from our shared experiences, science and data, which drives our concern for the following aspects of this proposed ordinance.

Changing the Definition of Site-Based Permanent Support Housing

> Changing the definition of Site-Based Permanent Support Housing (PSH) to a model that bars the City from funding new Site-Based PSH that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone is in direct conflict with our current model of varying scattered site options that overcome barriers hindering individuals from seeking the support they need, and prioritize people in recovery from substance use disorder while prohibiting eviction.
>
> Sober housing sites are an important part of our current model, including two recent sites opened in partnership with the Salvation Army and another new site in our own community opened by Friendship House. We support sober living as a valuable option for people experiencing substance use disorder, while also recognizing that it cannot be the only approach. A range of models are needed, including those that are low-barrier and those that incorporate cultural and holistic practices - to meet the needs of a diverse population.
>
> Standard language in all PSH leases already contains the prohibition of illegal activity on premises and the prohibition of illegal drug use, smoking and the consumption of alcohol in common areas. PSH itself is designed to be a low-barrier, so that all unhoused people who need additional support due to health and behavioral health issues have the basic dignity of a home and the stability they need to to repair their health, recover and thrive. The diversity in PSH offerings was not created arbitrarily, but over time as our communities and the City have learned from experience and the overwhelming data and studies that supports the evolution of PSH options we see today.

Negative Impacts to Desperately Needed Homeless Housing

> Changing the definition of PSH to prohibit models other than those that evict tenants for substance use outside of these sites, is in direct conflict with the housing first commitment

of California Interagency Council on Homelessness guidance and would negatively impact the pipeline and ability to backfill federal funding losses. No PSH site is built from a single source of funds, but rather from various state, federal and local sources, therefore unlikely this form of housing will be created. In a time when we are facing the potential loss of HUD and other housing resources, it is critical that we maintain flexibility needed to backfill those losses.

Increased Evictions into Street Homelessness

This legislation calls for evictions under sober housing without any funding for recovery housing or details on how this would work. Without alternative recovery housing, tenants would be driven from their homes and stability, increasing street homelessness and increasing acuity related to addiction disorders.

This legislation also conflates all substance use with addictive disorders and omits alcoholism, ignoring the fact that many substance users are casual users who do not suffer from addiction and the fact that alcoholism is the most common form of addiction. Strong recovery programs are comprehensive in their approach, looking at all forms of harm associated with substance use but also underlying issues driving the addiction.

We urge you to abandon the change in definition of PSH and to instead focus the legislation on the creation and funding of the pilot program for both Recovery-Oriented Supportive Housing. We must focus on ways to move forward proactive desperately needed housing solutions for the thousands of households that are on the wait list for PSH housing of every category, while we also address the systemic disparity of treatment beds - including beds for Spanish speakers and beds that offer healing through a cultural and holistic lens.

Every single day, our community suffers deeply from the collective experience of having members of our community living in street homelessness, awaiting PSH placements and awaiting treatment beds that never seem to come.

Sincerely,

San Francisco Latino Task Force
San Francisco Latino Parity and Equity Coalition
Chicano/Latino/Indigena Health Equity Coalition
United to Save the Mission

cc: Board of Supervisors

From:	factory 1 design
To:	Dorsey, Matt (BOS)
Cc:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	LTF, SFLPEC, CLI, USM Letter : Ordinance #25103: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 4:03:03 PM
Attachments:	PSH Letter - Ordinance 25103.pdf

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

Hello Supervisor Dorsey and Supervisors-

Please find the attached letter from the SF Latino Task Force, the SF Latino Parity and Equity Coalition, the Chicano/Latino/Indigena Health Equity Coalition, and United to Save the Mission regarding Ordinance #25103: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing.

Sincerely,
Larisa Pedroncelli
Chair, LTF Street Needs Committee

From: Justice Dumlao
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Subject: Public Comment: Please Improve File #251003 Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 5:39:43 PM
Attachments: image001.png
ToD & SI Opposition Letter_Dorsey Ordinance.docx

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®

Hi Monique and Board of Supervisors,

If you could please submit this letter on behalf of the Treatment on Demand Coalition and the Safer Inside Coalition that would be greatly appreciated. Supervisors please also let me know if you have any questions about the actions we are requesting in the attached letter.

Thank you kindly,

Justice Dumlao (they/him)
Community Mobilization Manager
SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION
940 Howard St. San Francisco, CA 94103
jdumlao@sfaf.org

SHOW UP, SPEAK OUT, FIGHT BACK!
Join the HIV Advocacy Network (linked here)





This message was secured by Zix®.

From: Karen Breslin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 11:00:39 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent: Karen Breslin

Email: kbsmail@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Karen Breslin

From: Stephanie Holbrook
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 5:53:35 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent: Stephanie Holbrook

Email: fifiholbrook@gmail.com

Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Stephanie Holbrook

From: Angela Tickler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 3:27:31 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent Angela Tickler

Email tickl1home@yahoo.com

Subject Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Angela Tickler

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: opposition to the potential of the bill of mandatory spay/neuter of dogs and paying a fee , File No. 251162
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:16:53 AM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Lisa Tatsuno regarding:

> **File No. 251162:** Ordinance amending the Health Code to require that every dog in San Francisco, with certain exceptions, be spayed, neutered, or chemically sterilized, rather than requiring such procedures only for pit bulls; to establish a process and fee for applying for an unaltered dog permit, and a process for granting, denying, or revoking such permit, with a hearing following a denial or revocation; to regulate the transfer, sale, and breeding of unaltered dogs; and to establish penalties and conditions of impoundment for violations of the mandatory spay, neuter, or chemical sterilization requirements.

Sincerely,

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

From: hatatsuno <hatatsuno@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2026 12:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; Lisa Tatsuno <hatatsuno@gmail.com>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: opposition to the potential of the bill of mandatory spay/neuter of dogs and paying a fee , File No. 251162

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 Lisa Tatsuno. I am a current resident of Daly City, CA and a former

long-time resident of San Francisco, CA. I received the email for San Francisco County considering a mandatory spay/neuter for nearly all dogs. As a 25 year dog fancier of purebred Shetland Sheepdogs with the American Kennel Club, this bill is a grave mistake. It is not the AKC purebred dogs and breeders, who responsibly, genetically test and screen potential puppy buyers, who are the problem. It is the breeders of designer mutts such as labradoodles, cavapoos, who claim they are "real breeders" to these naive, new puppy buyers who are genetic mutts. These designer dogs/mutts have no predictability in their genetic makeups and cannot be relied upon to produce dogs that are healthy in mind and body. Many of these dogs have temperament problems such as dog bites and attacks. As a registered nurse, where I work at UCSF Medical Center, I have had to as a primary nurse treat patients with dog attacks for sepsis due to these designer dogs' poor temperaments. The breeders of these designer dogs have no true direction in their breeding programs. Their goal is to make money only. These breeders of designer mutts will lie to and manipulate potential puppy buyers that they are getting a truly, healthy, sound dog. These lies for profits have resulted in lawsuits by puppy buyers towards these designer mutt breeders.

San Francisco county, animal rights groups, etc need to understand it is a very grave error to generalize all breeders and all dog owners are irresponsible, only out to make profits with these dogs. It is the bad apples such as the designer dog breeders who need to be abolished. The American Kennel Club has parent clubs for all of its purebred dog breeds, who hold strict policies on health, registration, contracts, etc. For decades, us responsible American Kennel Club breeders have genetically tested our dogs and posted results through OFA for genetic transparency to the breed and puppy buyers. Us responsible breeders are instructed to spay/neuter a dog if it is found to be unfit for breeding and showing and to sell puppies on AKC limited registration who are found to not be suitable for breeding. With limited registration, AKC puppy buyers are not allowed to breed, register puppies from litters, or enter dogs in AKC conformation dog shows on limited registration. Only performance events such as herding, agility, obedience and rally can spayed/neutered dogs be exhibited. Besides limited registration, breeders such as myself will spay before selling an older champion show dog into a retirement home so that the new owners cannot breed the dog. We take every measure to ensure our AKC puppies only go to and are bred by responsible, honest people.

If you have any further questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Lisa Tatsuno
408-510-4859

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Strong Opposition to File No. 251211
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 9:26:48 AM
Attachments:	WESTERN ADDITION and Hayes Valley Survey April 2026.docx Tenderloin Tree Survey March 25, 2026.docx

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from John Nulty with the Tenderloin Tree Campaign, regarding:

> **File No. 251211:** Ordinance amending the Public Works Code to allow development projects to satisfy street tree planting requirements through payment of an in lieu fee or providing alternative landscaping; exempt accessory dwelling units from street tree planting requirements; eliminate appeals to the Board of Appeals for tree removals undertaken by City departments and commissions; and update in lieu fee reporting requirements; amending the Administrative Code to create a separate account within the Adopt-A-Tree Fund to receive in lieu fees for street tree requirements; amending the Planning Code to update street tree applicability requirements; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Sincerely,

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

From: tenderloin treecampaign <tenderlointreecampaign@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2026 5:01 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Strong Opposition to File No. 251211

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

Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: clerk.boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Strong Opposition to File No. 251211

Ordinance Amending Public Works, Administrative, and Planning Codes Regarding Street Trees (Eliminating Public Appeals for City-Initiated Tree Removals and Related Changes)

Submitted by: [Tenderloin Tree Campaign/ Advocate, Board of Supervisors District 5 (Tenderloin, Hayes Valley and Western Addition)

Date: April 9, 2026

(Tenderlion Tree Campaign attach your District 5 Empty Street Tree Plot List as supporting documentation)

The message calls on San Franciscans to act now to safeguard the city's urban forest. It opposes upcoming legislation that would let developers pay a fee instead of planting trees, weaken public appeals of "hazard" tree removals, and shorten the time window for citizens to contest city-initiated tree cuts. The key concerns are:

Developer incentives: Allowing a cash-in-lieu option will likely lead to fewer trees, as developers view planting as a hassle.
Hazard-tree transparency: Removing the public's right to appeal "hazard" designations could be abused without strong oversight and clear, consistent criteria.
Public participation: Compressing appeal timelines for city-driven removals limits residents' ability to gather information and mount effective defenses for trees.

The overall plea is to preserve tree planting requirements, maintain robust public oversight, and ensure that San Francisco's dwindling canopy is protected—especially given the city's climate-emergency commitments.

Tenderloin/North of Market Tree Survey

March 26, 2026

(2) 101 Polk on Dr. Tom Weddell Place side property with stumps

(1) 99 Grove empty plot

(3) 300 Van Ness & Grove tree plot bed total 6 trees missing

(3) 300 Van Ness & McAllister tree plot bed total 6 trees missing

(1) 525 Golden Gate empty plot

(1) 590 Van Ness empty plot

(1) 555 Polk empty plot

(1) 650 Turk Street empty plot

(2) 750 Van Ness empty plots

(1) 747 Eddy empty plot

(1) 700 Eddy empty plot

(1) 640 Polk empty plot

(1) 620 Polk empty plot

(1) 610 Polk empty plot

(1) 691 Eddy empty plot

(1) 665 Eddy empty plot

(2) Eddy 1 empty plot

1 with stump in plot

(1) 700 Eddy on Polk side of property empty plot

(2) 731 Polk on Willow side of property empty plots

(1) 726 Polk on Ellis side of property empty plot

(1) 759-763 Ellis plot with stump

(1) 741Ellis empty plot

(1) 707 Ellis empty plot

(1) 869 Ellis empty plot

(1) 840 Van Ness empty plot

(2) 818 Van Ness empty plots on Willow side of property

(4) 750 Eddy on Willow side of property four empty plots

(3) 1000 Van Ness 1 empty plot

2 empty plots on Myrtle side of property

(1) 1040 Geary empty plot with stump

(2) 1029 Geary empty plots

(2) 999 Geary empty plots on Myrtle side of property

(3) 990 Geary 3 empty plots on Myrtle side of property

(1) 825 Larkin empty plot

(1) 909 Geary empty plot on Larkin side of property

(1) 925 Geary empty plot

(2) 965 Geary 2 empty plots

(1) 750 O'Farrell empty plot

(2) 730 Larkin 2 empty plots

(1) 655 Ellis empty plot

(1) 835 Larkin empty plot

(1) 909 Geary empty plot on Larkin side of property

(1) 925 Geary empty plot

(2) 965 Geary empty plots

(1) 677 Ellis empty plot

(1) 664 Larkin empty plot

(1) 556 Larkin with stump

(4) 555 Larkin (3) on Larkin side of the property

(1) on Turk side of the property

(1) 447-451 Turk empty plot

(1) 358 Golden Gate empty plot

(2) 250 McAllister 2 empty plots

(7) 200 Larkin 2 empty plots on McAllister side of property

5 empty plots on Fulton side of property

(1) 100 Larkin 1 empty plot on Grove side property next to Hyde

(1) 248 Golden Gate empty plot

(1) 101 Hyde empty plot

(2) 155 Hyde empty plots

(5) 50 UN Plaza 5 empty plots in plaza next to Hyde street

(1) 381 Turk empty plot

(2) 259 Hyde 2 empty plots on Eddy side of property

(1) 455 Eddy with stump

(1) 555 Ellis empty plot

(1) 570 Ellis empty plot

(1) 707 O'Farrell empty plot

(1) 656 O'Farrell empty plot

(1) 626 O'Farrell with stump

(1) 825 Geary empty plot

(2) 765 Geary 1 dying tree in plot

(1) 747 Geary 1 dying tree in plot

(1) 735 Geary 1 dying tree in plot

(1) 667-669 Geary empty plot

(1) 550 Leavenworth empty plot

(1) 540 O'Farrell empty plot

(1) 525 O'Farrell empty plot

(2) 545 O'Farrell 1 empty plot

1 with stump

(1) 434 Leavenworth empty plot

(3) 480 Ellis (2) empty plots on Ellis

(1) empty plot on Leavenworth side of property

(1) 391 Leavenworth empty plot

(2) 345 Leavenworth empty plots

(1) 335 Leavenworth empty plot

(1) 240 Leavenworth empty plot with 3 poles and bag

(1) 222 Leavenworth empty plot

(1) 237 Leavenworth tree cut in half

(1) 294 Turk on Leavenworth side of property with stump

(1) 240 Turk empty plot

(5) 201 Turk Five empty plots

(1) 275 Turk empty plot

(1) 191 Golden Gate on Leavenworth side of property with 3 poles

(1) 86 Mc Allister plot with stump

(1) 50 Jones empty plot

(2) 121 Golden Gate on Jones side of property empty plots

(1) 180 Jones no tree 4 poles, 4 braces and screen in plot

(1) 265 Eddy empty plot

(4) 246 Eddy 1 empty plot on Eddy

2. stumps on Jones side of property

(1) empty plot on Ellis side of property

(1) 230 Eddy on Jones side of property with stump

(1) 345 Jones empty plot with pole

(1) 387 Ellis with 2 foot wide stump

(1) 201 Ellis with 2 poles

(1) 424 Jones empty plot

(3) 450 Jones 3 empty plots

(2) 516 O'Farrell 1 empty plot

1 with two poles & bag

(1) 520 Jones 1 planter box empty

(1) 532 Jones empty plot with 2 poles

(1) 540 Jones empty plot with 1 pole

(1) 545 Jones empty plot

(1) 634 Geary empty plot

(2) 333 Taylor pot with 3 poles, braces and screen

1 plot with stump

(1) 231 Ellis empty plot

(1) 222 Taylor empty plot with stump & 3 poles

(1) 960 Market on Turk side of property with stump, 3 poles & braces

(1) 55 Mason empty plot

(2) 1129 Market empty plots

(1) 1236 Market empty plot

(1) 1240 Market empty plot

Total trees survey 168 in 117 different locations

North of Market is Van Ness to Geary to Market

Total of 70 square blocks covered

THE ABOVE SURVEY IS THE PROPERTY OF:

TENDERLOIN TREE COMMITTEE

WESTERN ADDITION & HAYES VALLEY

APRIL 2026

(1) 58 Octavia empty plot

(1) 188 Octavia two + empty planting area

(6) 55 Page 6 boxes no trees

(1) 20 Page empty plot

(1) 10 Page empty plot

(2) 129-150 Oak on Lily side of property one with stump

(1) 129-150 Oak empty plot

(2) 96 Franklin two empty plots on Oak side of the property

(3) 50 Oak three empty plots on Hickory side of the property

(1) 141 Fell empty plot

(1) 141-155 Fell empty plot

+ 100 Van Ness empty planting beds

35 Van Ness 8 empty beds

One empty plot on Fell side of the property

One empty plot on Van Ness

(3) 401 Van Ness three empty plots on Hayes side of the property

(2) 333 Franklin one empty plot and one on Linden side of the property

(1) 201 Hayes plot with stump on Linden side of the property

(1) 250 Hayes empty plot

(2) 280 Fell empty plots on the Linden side of the property

(5+) 300-321 Linden five empty beds one empty tree plot

(2) 400 Octavia two empty plots

(1) 377-385 Hayes plot with stump

(1) 364 Hayes empty plot

(1) 233 Franklin empty plot on Hayes side of the property

4+ 201 Van Ness one empty plot and three empty planting beds

(1) 301 Van Ness missing tree

(2) 461 Van Ness two missing trees

(4) 555 Franklin empty plot and three empty plots on Fulton side of the property

(1)365 Fulton empty plot

(1) 520 Grove empty plot

(1) 363-365 Grove empty plot

(1) 467 Grove empty plot

(1) 425 Grove with stump

(1) 450 Fulton empty plot

(1) 742 McAllister with stump

(2) 756 McAllister missing trees on each side of the walkway entrance

(2) 768 McAllister missing trees on each side of the walkway entrance

(1) 785 McAllister empty plot

(2) 808 McAllister missing trees on each side of the walkway entrance

(1) 860 McAllister with stump

(1) 870 McAllister empty plot

(1) 900 McAllister on Laguna side of the property empty plot

(1) 887 McAllister across the street with stump

(5) 500 Van Ness five empty planting beds

(2) 701 Van Ness empty plot and empty plot on Turk side of the property

(1) 745 Franklin empty plot

(2) 801 Turk empty plot and empty plot on Elm side of the property

(1) 835 Turk empty plot

+ 900 Turk no trees next to fence and empty plot next to the soccer field

(24) 1040 Eddy empty plots inside field

(1) 1010 Eddy empty plot on Gough side of the property

(2) 990 Eddy two empty plots on Gough side of the property

(1) 920 Eddy plot with stump

(1) 923 Eddy empty plot

(3) 909 Franklin one with stump

Two on Eddy side of the property 1 with stump

(6) 885 Franklin six empty plots

(3) 807 Franklin three empty plots

(4) 799 Van Ness three empty plots on Larch side of the property

Stump on Van Ness

(1) 819 Van Ness empty plot

(1) 851 Van Ness empty plot

(1) 939 Ellis empty plot on Willow side of the property

(2) 950 Franklin on Willow side of the property one with stump

(1) 860 Eddy empty plot

(5) 1000 Franklin five empty plots

(1) 231 Olive empty plot

(2) 999 Van Ness two empty plots on Olive side of the property

(3) 1031 Franklin three empty plots

(2) 1100 Gough empty plot and Ellis side of the property empty plot

(1) 1100 Ellis on Gough side of the property empty plot

(1) 1250 Laguna empty plot on the Ellis side of the property

(10) 45-85 Cleary 7 Stumps in planting areas and 1 empty plot

Two empty plots on Ellis side of the property

(2) 1335 Laguna two empty plots

(1) 1315 Laguna empty plot

(3) 1355 Laguna three empty plots

(1) Quick stop Lane empty plot

(2) 621 Willow empty plot and one across the street

(1) 651-655 Willow empty plot

(1) 1398 Buchanan empty plot

(1) 1300 Buchanan with stump

(1) 1295 Eddy empty plot

(2) 1258-1288 Buchanan empty plot and empty plot on Eddy side of the property

(1) 1355 Eddy empty plot

(3) 1170 Webster three empty plots on Eddy side of the property

(3) 1280 Webster two empty plots and one on Ellis side of the property

(1) 1519-1523 O'Farrell stump in plot

(1) Zump Lane on Geary empty plot

(1) Lottie Bernnice on Geary empty plot

(1) 1465 Laguna empty plot

(1) 1435 Laguna empty plot

(1) 1450 Laguna empty plot

(1) 1570 Post with stump

(1) 1776 Sutter loop of trunk

(1) 1750 Sutter empty plot

(1) 1729-1731 Sutter empty plot

(2) 1691 Laguna two empty plots

(2) 1649-1653 Laguna two empty plots

(1) 1700 Laguna on Sutter side of the property empty plot

(1) 1755 Sutter with stump

(1) 1700 Sutter empty plot

(1) 1825 Post empty plot on Webster side of the property

(2) 1881 Post on Fillmore side of the property one with stump

(1) 1637 Fillmore with stump

+ 1600 Webster medium missing trees

(1) 1747 Buchanan on Sutter side of the property empty plot

(1) 1826 Buchanan empty plot

(2) 1868 Buchanan two empty plots on Bush side of the property

(1) 1825 Bush empty plot

(1) 1615 Sutter empty plot

(1) 1719 Bush empty plot

(1) 1760 Bush empty plot

(1) 1715 Octavia empty plot

(1) 195301957 Pine with stump

(1) 1861-1863 Laguna empty plot on Pine side of the property

(1) 2003 Pine empty plot

(1) 2158 Pine empty plot

(1) 2189 Pine empty plot

(2) 2205 Pine two empty plots

(2) 2109-2111 Bush two empty plots

(1) 1899 Fillmore on Bush side of the property empty plot

(2) 1880 Fillmore two empty plots on Bush side of the property

(1) 1856 Fillmore empty plot

(2) 1669 Fillmore one plot with stump

(1) 1560 Fillmore on Geary side of the property empty plot

(1) 1555 Fillmore empty plot

(10+) 1330 Fillmore on Ellis side of the property empty tree beds

(2) 1310 Fillmore two empty plots

(1) 1260 Fillmore empty plot

(1) 1240 Fillmore empty plot

(1) 1201 Fillmore empty plot

(2) 1150 Fillmore two empty plots

(1) 1125 Fillmore empty plot

(4) 1100 Fillmore empty plot

Three empty plots on Golden Gate side of the property

(1) 1117 Fillmore empty plot

(2) 1540 McAllister two empty plots

(1) 1025 Fillmore with stump

(1) 889 Fulton empty plot

(1) 875 Fulton empty plot

(2) on Friendship Alley on either side of the Alley front empty plots

(1) 805 Webster empty plot

+ Webster between Fulton and Grove medium need more trees and stump

(1) 600 Webster plot need tree

(3) 645 Hayes empty plot two empty plots on Buchanan side of the property

(4) 602-618 Buchanan four empty planter beds

(1) 477 Hickory empty plot

(1) 471 Hickory empty plot

(1) 500 Buchanan on Oak side of the property empty plot

(1) 501 Oak with stump

(2) 370 Page two empty plots

(2) 364 Page two empty plots

(1) 300 Buchanan empty plot

(1) 295 Buchanan empty plot on Haight side of the property

(2) 200 Buchanan two empty plots

(2) 2175 Market one with stump

1 empty plot with 2 poles

(1) 2109 Market in medium stump of palm tree

(1) 2101 Market on Church side of the property empty plot

(1) 2059 Market on 14th Street side of the property empty plot

(1) 2027 Market empty plot

(1) 1800 Market on Waller side of the property 1 brunt dead tree

(1) 80 Octavia on Market street side of the property empty plot

(1) 1844 Market Street empty plot

(2) 52 Waller two stumps

(1) 60 Waller one stump

(1) 74 Waller empty plot

(1) 86 Waller with stump

(1) 41 Waller empty plot

(1) 67 Waller empty plot

(1) 155 Haight empty plot

(3) 100 Laguna three dead trees

(1) 137 Haight empty plot

(1) 115 Haight empty plot

(3) 180-188 Haight three beds without trees

(1) 214 Haight empty plot

(1) 218 Haight empty plot

(1) 333 Haight empty plot

(2) 379-381 Haight empty plot

(1) 325 Haight empty plot

(1) 358-360 Haight empty plot

(1) 135 Webster empty plot

+ 222 Webster on side of the property no trees

(1) 430-432 Page 1 dead tree

(1) 507 Haight empty plot

(1) 535 Haight empty plot

(3) 237 Luaussat three empty plots

(1) 59-61 Germania empty plot

(3) 47 Germania three empty barrels

(1) 119 Fillmore on Germania side of the property with stump

(1) 115 Germania empty plot

(1) 212 Steiner empty plot

(1) 728 Page 1 dead tree with 3 poles, 3 braces and bag

(1) 267 Pierce no tree

(1) 627 Waller not tree

(3) 100 Scott three no trees

(1) 254 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 272 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 286 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 955 Page with stump

(1) 949 Page with stump

(1) 940 Page empty plot

(1) 301 Scott empty plot

(2) 799 Oak two empty plots on Scott side of the property

(1) 987 Oak empty plot

(1) 1001 Oak with stump

(1) 1025 Oak empty plot

(1) 44 Divisadero with stump

(1) 1175 Fell on Divisadero side of the property with stump

(1) 1129 Fell empty plot

(1) 486 Scott on Fillmore side of the property with stump

(1) 465 Scott empty plot

(1) 460 Scott empty plot on Fell side of the property

(1) 520 Scott empty plot

(3) 556-560 Hayes three plots no trees

(1) 1250 Hayes empty plot

(1) 1282 Hayes two empty plots

(1) 650 Divisadero on Grove side of the property loop of stem

(1) 1250 Grove empty plot

(1) 1234 Grove no tree in plot

(1) 701 Scott on Grove side of the property empty plot

(1) 1280 Fulton empty plot

(1) 810 Divisadero empty plot

+ between Fell and McAllister on medium on Divisadero missing trees

(1) 1451 McAllister empty plot

(1) 1592 McAllister empty plot

(1) 1111 Scott on Turk side of the property with stump

(1) 2 Seymour St empty plot

(1) 1042 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 1012 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 1101 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 1207 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 1828 Eddy empty plot

(1) 1865-1875 Eddy empty plot

(1) 1171 Scott with stump

(1) 1150 Scott empty plot

(1) 1177 Pierce empty plot

(3) 1835 Ellis two empty plots on Pierce side of the property

One across the street empty plot

(3) 1201-1299 Pierce empty plot, with stump and one with stump

(4) 1801 Ellis three stumps and on empty plot

(1) 1940 Ellis empty pot on Buchanan side of the property

(1) 1450 Divisadero empty plot

(1) 2141 Geary with stump

+ Geary medium between Divisadero and Scott missing trees

(1) 1426 Steiner empty plot

(1) 1795 O'Farrell empty plot

(2) 1430 Scott two empty plots on Geary side of the property

(1) 1440 Turk empty plot on Steiner side of the property

(2) 1399 Golden Gate empty plot and one with stump

(1) 1025 Steiner with stump

(1) 949 Steiner with stump

(1) 911-913 Steiner empty plot

(1) 722 Steiner on Grove side of the property empty plot

(2) 1099 Hayes on Pierce side of the property with stumps

(2) 1000 Fell two empty plots

(1) 590 Steiner empty plot

(1) 510 Steiner on Oak side of the property empty plot

(1) 579 Haight box without a tree

(1) 569 Haight empty plot

(1) 533 Haight empty plot

THE ABOVE SURVEY IS THE PROPERTY OF

TENDERLOIN TREE COMMITTEE

Mr. John Nulty co-chair
Tenderloin Tree Campaign
P. O. Box 421949
San Francisco, CA 94142-1949
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___http://tenderlointreecampaign.blogspot.com/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzowMDYxMmM1YjgyZjRmMDI2YTUyNWYwNzUxNTE3YmZmYTo3OmU2N2M6NGE3Y2MxZDJmNzUyYzkxZTM1NDEwMTE3NDBhZjIyODE2NmIzMTczY2FmMmNiZjllNjZhM2YyMWYyYjdjMGRjMDp0OlQ6Tg

WESTERN ADDITION & HAYES VALLEY
APRIL 2026

(1) 58 Octavia empty plot
(1) 188 Octavia two + empty planting area
(6) 55 Page 6 boxes no trees
(1) 20 Page empty plot
(1) 10 Page empty plot
(2) 129-150 Oak on Lily side of property one with stump
(1) 129-150 Oak empty plot
(2) 96 Franklin two empty plots on Oak side of the property
(3) 50 Oak three empty plots on Hickory side of the property
(1) 141 Fell empty plot
(1) 141-155 Fell empty plot
+ 100 Van Ness empty planting beds
35 Van Ness 8 empty beds
One empty plot on Fell side of the property
One empty plot on Van Ness
(3) 401 Van Ness three empty plots on Hayes side of the property
(2) 333 Franklin one empty plot and one on Linden side of the property
(1) 201 Hayes plot with stump on Linden side of the property
(1) 250 Hayes empty plot
(2) 280 Fell empty plots on the Linden side of the property
(5+) 300-321 Linden five empty beds one empty tree plot
(2) 400 Octavia two empty plots
(1) 377-385 Hayes plot with stump
(1) 364 Hayes empty plot
(1) 233 Franklin empty plot on Hayes side of the property
4+ 201 Van Ness one empty plot and three empty planting beds
(1) 301 Van Ness missing tree
(2) 461 Van Ness two missing trees
(4) 555 Franklin empty plot and three empty plots on Fulton side of the property
(1)365 Fulton empty plot
(1) 520 Grove empty plot
(1) 363-365 Grove empty plot
(1) 467 Grove empty plot
(1) 425 Grove with stump
(1) 450 Fulton empty plot
(1) 742 McAllister with stump
(2) 756 McAllister missing trees on each side of the walkway entrance
(2) 768 McAllister missing trees on each side of the walkway entrance
(1) 785 McAllister empty plot
(2) 808 McAllister missing trees on each side of the walkway entrance
(1) 860 McAllister with stump
(1) 870 McAllister empty plot

(1) 900 McAllister on Laguna side of the property empty plot
(1) 887 McAllister across the street with stump
(5) 500 Van Ness five empty planting beds
(2) 701 Van Ness empty plot and empty plot on Turk side of the property
(1) 745 Franklin empty plot
(2) 801 Turk empty plot and empty plot on Elm side of the property
(1) 835 Turk empty plot
+ 900 Turk no trees next to fence and empty plot next to the soccer field
(24) 1040 Eddy empty plots inside field
(1) 1010 Eddy empty plot on Gough side of the property
(2) 990 Eddy two empty plots on Gough side of the property
(1) 920 Eddy plot with stump
(1) 923 Eddy empty plot
(3) 909 Franklin one with stump
Two on Eddy side of the property 1 with stump
(6) 885 Franklin six empty plots
(3) 807 Franklin three empty plots
(4) 799 Van Ness three empty plots on Larch side of the property
Stump on Van Ness
(1) 819 Van Ness empty plot
(1) 851 Van Ness empty plot
(1) 939 Ellis empty plot on Willow side of the property
(2) 950 Franklin on Willow side of the property one with stump
(1) 860 Eddy empty plot
(5) 1000 Franklin five empty plots
(1) 231 Olive empty plot
(2) 999 Van Ness two empty plots on Olive side of the property
(3) 1031 Franklin three empty plots
(2) 1100 Gough empty plot and Ellis side of the property empty plot
(1) 1100 Ellis on Gough side of the property empty plot
(1) 1250 Laguna empty plot on the Ellis side of the property
(10) 45-85 Cleary 7 Stumps in planting areas and 1 empty plot
Two empty plots on Ellis side of the property
(2) 1335 Laguna two empty plots
(1) 1315 Laguna empty plot
(3) 1355 Laguna three empty plots
(1) Quick stop Lane empty plot
(2) 621 Willow empty plot and one across the street
(1) 651-655 Willow empty plot
(1) 1398 Buchanan empty plot
(1) 1300 Buchanan with stump
(1) 1295 Eddy empty plot
(2) 1258-1288 Buchanan empty plot and empty plot on Eddy side of the property
(1) 1355 Eddy empty plot
(3) 1170 Webster three empty plots on Eddy side of the property
(3) 1280 Webster two empty plots and one on Ellis side of the property

(1) 1519-1523 O'Farrell stump in plot
(1) Zump Lane on Geary empty plot
(1) Lottie Bernnice on Geary empty plot
(1) 1465 Laguna empty plot
(1) 1435 Laguna empty plot
(1) 1450 Laguna empty plot
(1) 1570 Post with stump
(1) 1776 Sutter loop of trunk
(1) 1750 Sutter empty plot
(1) 1729-1731 Sutter empty plot
(2) 1691 Laguna two empty plots
(2) 1649-1653 Laguna two empty plots
(1) 1700 Laguna on Sutter side of the property empty plot
(1) 1755 Sutter with stump
(1) 1700 Sutter empty plot
(1) 1825 Post empty plot on Webster side of the property
(2) 1881 Post on Fillmore side of the property one with stump
(1) 1637 Fillmore with stump
+ 1600 Webster medium missing trees
(1) 1747 Buchanan on Sutter side of the property empty plot
(1) 1826 Buchanan empty plot
(2) 1868 Buchanan two empty plots on Bush side of the property
(1) 1825 Bush empty plot
(1) 1615 Sutter empty plot
(1) 1719 Bush empty plot
(1) 1760 Bush empty plot
(1) 1715 Octavia empty plot
(1) 195301957 Pine with stump
(1) 1861-1863 Laguna empty plot on Pine side of the property
(1) 2003 Pine empty plot
(1) 2158 Pine empty plot
(1) 2189 Pine empty plot
(2) 2205 Pine two empty plots
(2) 2109-2111 Bush two empty plots
(1) 1899 Fillmore on Bush side of the property empty plot
(2) 1880 Fillmore two empty plots on Bush side of the property
(1) 1856 Fillmore empty plot
(2) 1669 Fillmore one plot with stump
(1) 1560 Fillmore on Geary side of the property empty plot
(1) 1555 Fillmore empty plot
(10+) 1330 Fillmore on Ellis side of the property empty tree beds
(2) 1310 Fillmore two empty plots
(1) 1260 Fillmore empty plot
(1) 1240 Fillmore empty plot
(1) 1201 Fillmore empty plot
(2) 1150 Fillmore two empty plots

(1) 1125 Fillmore empty plot
(4) 1100 Fillmore empty plot
Three empty plots on Golden Gate side of the property
(1) 1117 Fillmore empty plot
(2) 1540 McAllister two empty plots
(1) 1025 Fillmore with stump
(1) 889 Fulton empty plot
(1) 875 Fulton empty plot
(2) on Friendship Alley on either side of the Alley front empty plots
(1) 805 Webster empty plot
+ Webster between Fulton and Grove medium need more trees and stump
(1) 600 Webster plot need tree
(3) 645 Hayes empty plot two empty plots on Buchanan side of the property
(4) 602-618 Buchanan four empty planter beds
(1) 477 Hickory empty plot
(1) 471 Hickory empty plot
(1) 500 Buchanan on Oak side of the property empty plot
(1) 501 Oak with stump
(2) 370 Page two empty plots
(2) 364 Page two empty plots
(1) 300 Buchanan empty plot
(1) 295 Buchanan empty plot on Haight side of the property
(2) 200 Buchanan two empty plots
(2) 2175 Market one with stump
1 empty plot with 2 poles
(1) 2109 Market in medium stump of palm tree
(1) 2101 Market on Church side of the property empty plot
(1) 2059 Market on 14th Street side of the property empty plot
(1) 2027 Market empty plot
(1) 1800 Market on Waller side of the property 1 brunt dead tree
(1) 80 Octavia on Market street side of the property empty plot
(1) 1844 Market Street empty plot
(2) 52 Waller two stumps
(1) 60 Waller one stump
(1) 74 Waller empty plot
(1) 86 Waller with stump
(1) 41 Waller empty plot
(1) 67 Waller empty plot
(1) 155 Haight empty plot
(3) 100 Laguna three dead trees
(1) 137 Haight empty plot
(1) 115 Haight empty plot
(3) 180-188 Haight three beds without trees
(1) 214 Haight empty plot
(1) 218 Haight empty plot
(1) 333 Haight empty plot

(2) 379-381 Haight empty plot
(1) 325 Haight empty plot
(1) 358-360 Haight empty plot
(1) 135 Webster empty plot
+ 222 Webster on side of the property no trees
(1) 430-432 Page 1 dead tree
(1) 507 Haight empty plot
(1) 535 Haight empty plot
(3) 237 Luaussat three empty plots
(1) 59-61 Germania empty plot
(3) 47 Germania three empty barrels
(1) 119 Fillmore on Germania side of the property with stump
(1) 115 Germania empty plot
(1) 212 Steiner empty plot
(1) 728 Page 1 dead tree with 3 poles, 3 braces and bag
(1) 267 Pierce no tree
(1) 627 Waller not tree
(3) 100 Scott three no trees
(1) 254 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 272 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 286 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 955 Page with stump
(1) 949 Page with stump
(1) 940 Page empty plot
(1) 301 Scott empty plot
(2) 799 Oak two empty plots on Scott side of the property
(1) 987 Oak empty plot
(1) 1001 Oak with stump
(1) 1025 Oak empty plot
(1) 44 Divisadero with stump
(1) 1175 Fell on Divisadero side of the property with stump
(1) 1129 Fell empty plot
(1) 486 Scott on Fillmore side of the property with stump
(1) 465 Scott empty plot
(1) 460 Scott empty plot on Fell side of the property
(1) 520 Scott empty plot
(3) 556-560 Hayes three plots no trees
(1) 1250 Hayes empty plot
(1) 1282 Hayes two empty plots
(1) 650 Divisadero on Grove side of the property loop of stem
(1) 1250 Grove empty plot
(1) 1234 Grove no tree in plot
(1) 701 Scott on Grove side of the property empty plot
(1) 1280 Fulton empty plot
(1) 810 Divisadero empty plot
+ between Fell and McAllister on medium on Divisadero missing trees

(1) 1451 McAllister empty plot
(1) 1592 McAllister empty plot
(1) 1111 Scott on Turk side of the property with stump
(1) 2 Seymour St empty plot
(1) 1042 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 1012 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 1101 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 1207 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 1828 Eddy empty plot
(1) 1865-1875 Eddy empty plot
(1) 1171 Scott with stump
(1) 1150 Scott empty plot
(1) 1177 Pierce empty plot
(3) 1835 Ellis two empty plots on Pierce side of the property
One across the street empty plot
(3) 1201-1299 Pierce empty plot, with stump and one with stump
(4) 1801 Ellis three stumps and on empty plot
(1) 1940 Ellis empty pot on Buchanan side of the property
(1) 1450 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 2141 Geary with stump
+ Geary medium between Divisadero and Scott missing trees
(1) 1426 Steiner empty plot
(1) 1795 O'Farrell empty plot
(2) 1430 Scott two empty plots on Geary side of the property
(1) 1440 Turk empty plot on Steiner side of the property
(2) 1399 Golden Gate empty plot and one with stump
(1) 1025 Steiner with stump
(1) 949 Steiner with stump
(1) 911-913 Steiner empty plot
(1) 722 Steiner on Grove side of the property empty plot
(2) 1099 Hayes on Pierce side of the property with stumps
(2) 1000 Fell two empty plots
(1) 590 Steiner empty plot
(1) 510 Steiner on Oak side of the property empty plot
(1) 579 Haight box without a tree
(1) 569 Haight empty plot
(1) 533 Haight empty plot

THE ABOVE SURVEY IS THE PROPERTY OF
TENDERLOIN TREE COMMITTEE

Tenderloin/North of Market Tree Survey
March 26, 2026

(2) 101 Polk on Dr. Tom Weddell Place side property with stumps
(1) 99 Grove empty plot
(3) 300 Van Ness & Grove tree plot bed total 6 trees missing
(3) 300 Van Ness & McAllister tree plot bed total 6 trees missing
(1) 525 Golden Gate empty plot
(1) 590 Van Ness empty plot
(1) 555 Polk empty plot
(1) 650 Turk Street empty plot
(2) 750 Van Ness empty plots
(1) 747 Eddy empty plot
(1) 700 Eddy empty plot
(1) 640 Polk empty plot
(1) 620 Polk empty plot
(1) 610 Polk empty plot
(1) 691 Eddy empty plot
(1) 665 Eddy empty plot
(2) Eddy 1 empty plot
1 with stump in plot
(1) 700 Eddy on Polk side of property empty plot
(2) 731 Polk on Willow side of property empty plots
(1) 726 Polk on Ellis side of property empty plot
(1) 759-763 Ellis plot with stump
(1) 741Ellis empty plot
(1) 707 Ellis empty plot
(1) 869 Ellis empty plot
(1) 840 Van Ness empty plot
(2) 818 Van Ness empty plots on Willow side of property
(4) 750 Eddy on Willow side of property four empty plots
(3) 1000 Van Ness 1 empty plot
2 empty plots on Myrtle side of property
(1) 1040 Geary empty plot with stump
(2) 1029 Geary empty plots
(2) 999 Geary empty plots on Myrtle side of property
(3) 990 Geary 3 empty plots on Myrtle side of property
(1) 825 Larkin empty plot
(1) 909 Geary empty plot on Larkin side of property
(1) 925 Geary empty plot
(2) 965 Geary 2 empty plots
(1) 750 O'Farrell empty plot
(2) 730 Larkin 2 empty plots
(1) 655 Ellis empty plot
(1) 835 Larkin empty plot

(1) 909 Geary empty plot on Larkin side of property
(1) 925 Geary empty plot
(2) 965 Geary empty plots
(1) 677 Ellis empty plot
(1) 664 Larkin empty plot
(1) 556 Larkin with stump
(4) 555 Larkin (3) on Larkin side of the property
(1) on Turk side of the property
(1) 447-451 Turk empty plot
(1) 358 Golden Gate empty plot
(2) 250 McAllister 2 empty plots
(7) 200 Larkin 2 empty plots on McAllister side of property
5 empty plots on Fulton side of property
(1) 100 Larkin 1 empty plot on Grove side property next to Hyde
(1) 248 Golden Gate empty plot
(1) 101 Hyde empty plot
(2) 155 Hyde empty plots
(5) 50 UN Plaza 5 empty plots in plaza next to Hyde street
(1) 381 Turk empty plot
(2) 259 Hyde 2 empty plots on Eddy side of property
(1) 455 Eddy with stump
(1) 555 Ellis empty plot
(1) 570 Ellis empty plot
(1) 707 O'Farrell empty plot
(1) 656 O'Farrell empty plot
(1) 626 O'Farrell with stump
(1) 825 Geary empty plot
(2) 765 Geary 1 dying tree in plot
(1) 747 Geary 1 dying tree in plot
(1) 735 Geary 1 dying tree in plot
(1) 667-669 Geary empty plot
(1) 550 Leavenworth empty plot
(1) 540 O'Farrell empty plot
(1) 525 O'Farrell empty plot
(2) 545 O'Farrell 1 empty plot
1 with stump
(1) 434 Leavenworth empty plot
(3) 480 Ellis (2) empty plots on Ellis
(1) empty plot on Leavenworth side of property
(1) 391 Leavenworth empty plot
(2) 345 Leavenworth empty plots
(1) 335 Leavenworth empty plot
(1) 240 Leavenworth empty plot with 3 poles and bag
(1) 222 Leavenworth empty plot
(1) 237 Leavenworth tree cut in half
(1) 294 Turk on Leavenworth side of property with stump

(1) 240 Turk empty plot
(5) 201 Turk Five empty plots
(1) 275 Turk empty plot
(1) 191 Golden Gate on Leavenworth side of property with 3 poles
(1) 86 Mc Allister plot with stump
(1) 50 Jones empty plot
(2) 121 Golden Gate on Jones side of property empty plots
(1) 180 Jones no tree 4 poles, 4 braces and screen in plot
(1) 265 Eddy empty plot
(4) 246 Eddy 1 empty plot on Eddy
(2) stumps on Jones side of property
(1) empty plot on Ellis side of property
(1) 230 Eddy on Jones side of property with stump
(1) 345 Jones empty plot with pole
(1) 387 Ellis with 2 foot wide stump
(1) 201 Ellis with 2 poles
(1) 424 Jones empty plot
(3) 450 Jones 3 empty plots
(2) 516 O'Farrell 1 empty plot
1 with 2poles & bag
(1) 520 Jones 1 planter box empty
(1) 532 Jones empty plot with 2 poles
(1) 540 Jones empty plot with 1 pole
(1) 545 Jones empty plot
(1) 634 Geary empty plot
(2) 333 Taylor pot with 3 poles, braces and screen
1 plot with stump
(1) 231 Ellis empty plot
(1) 222 Taylor empty plot with stump & 3 poles
(1) 960 Market on Turk side of property with stump, 3 poles & braces
(1) 55 Mason empty plot
(2) 1129 Market empty plots
(1) 1236 Market empty plot
(1) 1240 Market empty plot

Total trees survey 168 in 117 different locations
North of Market is Van Ness to Geary to Market
Total of 70 square blocks covered

THE ABOVE SURVEY IS THE PROPERTY OF:
TENDERLOIN TREE COMMITTEE

Item 14

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Files No. 260147 and 260225 Commission Streamlining Task Force - 2 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 1:15:49 PM
Attachments:	File No. 260147 and 260225 Commission Streamlining Task Force - 2 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached 2 Letters from members of the public, regarding the Commission Streamlining Task Force.

> **File No. 260147 and File No. 260225 (Motion No. M26-23):** Hearing - Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force Recommendations, Final Report, and Charter Amendment; Various Codes - Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies; and Calling from Committee - Committee of the Whole - Hearing - Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force Recommendations, Final Report, and Charter Amendment - March 17, 2026.

Sincerely,

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

From: Christine Hanson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Re: Board File #260147
Date: Sunday, April 12, 2026 2:22:18 PM

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

I am opposed to limiting or eliminating the work of Commissions which offer more transparency in the way things get done, who does them, and what and where money is spent.

The cost of Citizen oversight Commissions is a pittance when taken in relation to the City budget and so one must ask who is looking forward to hiding what?

We have already seen pay to play events uncovered by the FBI in the form of money awarded to non profits tied to favors so why cut back now on oversight?

It makes about as much sense as cutting staff at federal weather monitoring units in the face of climate change.

Sincerely,
Christine Hanson
District 11

--
Perfectionism is the voice of the oppressor.
Annie Lamott

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 4:01:16 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

The Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendation to downgrade the Commission on the Environment to advisory status - and after 3 years to eliminate it altogether - is damaging to San Francisco's reputation as a climate leader, to say nothing of the actual health and safety of City residents.

The Commission on the Environment promotes environmental justice by directing funding and programs to communities most impacted by pollution and climate change; it strengthens workforce development by investing in youth climate internships and green jobs; it provides residents a formal platform to speak out and influence policy. These are just some of its functions.

Now more that ever, the world needs climate leadership from local governments - not heads in the sand. Drastic cuts to the SF Environment Department in the recent 2-year budget revealed an ominous willingness to ignore action to prevent the ever-increasing severity of climate disasters. Gutting and cutting the Department's oversight body only reinforces this impression. It will not streamline government - it will make it harder for the City to keep its focus on eliminating the cause of global warming. Other departments are each much more focused on their primary mission; it is SFE alone, directed by the Commission, whose mission is to reduce emissions citywide and protect our climate.

Justin Truong
justintruong56@gmail.com
33 Junior Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112

Item 15

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260178 Transfer Tax - 23 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:00:08 PM
Attachments:	260178 Transfer Tax - 23 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 23 Letters from members of the public regarding:

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

Sincerely,

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

From:	Lauren Atkinson
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS)
Cc:	laurenatkinson85@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding
Date:	Thursday, April 9, 2026 11:58:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Myrna Melgar and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over $10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act (File No. 260178) as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,
Lauren Atkinson
1230 12th Avenue
laurenatkinson85@gmail.com
District 7 resident

From:	Dario fernandez
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Cc:	darioyfernandez@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 9:57:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Matt Dorsey and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over $10 million. 59.2% of District 6 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act (File No. 260178) as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,
Dario fernandez
darioyfernandez@gmail.com
District 6 resident

From: Xinyu Zhu
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Subject: Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 7:46:17 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over $10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than $200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- $42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- $64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- $40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

Xinyu Zhu

xz285@riseup.net

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 1:43:33 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

willie yee

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 4:27:54 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Paul Ybarbo

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 10:16:49 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Armand Der-Hacobian

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 9:47:32 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Joie Ryan

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 8:02:38 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Lois Fisher

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 6:43:35 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Carey Wintroub

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Sunday, April 12, 2026 1:00:27 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

JaMel Perkins

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Saturday, April 11, 2026 10:25:26 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Louis Saroni

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 3:49:36 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Brandon Jackson

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 10:11:17 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Callum Hutchins

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 9:24:59 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Maritza Hurtado

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 6:48:15 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Katya Rose Wasserman

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 8:41:09 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Narcowich

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 5:46:35 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Mindy Rosenberg

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 4:32:28 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

nancy field

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 3:58:06 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

John Carver

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 2:21:07 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

caroline kahn werboff

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 1:27:25 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Gary Gerttula

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 12:44:23 PM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Camille Perry

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Support the BUILD Act (#260178): Reduce the Real Estate Transfer Tax.
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 10:06:34 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support reducing San Francisco's Real Estate Transfer Tax to stimulate economic activity and make our city more competitive.

Right now, San Francisco has some of the highest transfer tax rates in the country, reaching as high as 5.5% to 6% on large transactions. These elevated rates have created real barriers to real estate investment and development that our City needs for our economic recovery.

As a result, tens of thousands of approved housing units and the jobs that come with them remain stalled because projects simply don't pencil under current economic conditions.

Lowering rates would:

• Make housing projects financially viable again - reducing the tax could reduce construction costs by $32,000/housing unit.

• Help unlock tens of thousands of approved but unbuilt homes.

• Encourage investment that brings jobs, housing, and economic activity back to San Francisco.

When transfer taxes are too high, they don't just generate revenue, they discourage the very activity our city depends on: construction, investment, and economic growth.

Ordinance #260178 is what we need to fix this problem and boost SF's economic recovery.

I respectfully urge you to show your support for SF's continued economic comeback by voting to pass Ordinance #260178.

Sincerely,

Kate Stoll

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260216 Fire Sprinklers - 16 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 1:33:50 PM
Attachments:	260216 Fire Sprinklers - 16 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 16 Letters from members of the public regarding:

> **File No. 260216:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council to evaluate and advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Fire Department, on the criteria and types of evidence the Fire Marshal should consider in determining whether to waive, modify, or delay certain compliance requirements under the Fire Code that certain existing high-rise residential buildings have sprinkler systems; and to set forth the membership and duties of the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council.

Sincerely,

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

From: Ammala Block
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: File No. 260216
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 4:57:50 PM
Attachments: image001.png

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

To Whom It May Concern:

We need the TAC to determine how this will impact current residents especially elderly tenants.

Thank you.

Ammala Elizabeth T. | Director of Rental Division
Property Management One
DRE 01475302 | SF Realtors | CCRM | SFFSD
1808 Wedemeyer Street, Suite B50 | SF, CA 94129
Direct 415.796.3019 | Office 415.674.1595 | ammala@pm1sf.com
www.pm1sf.com

PM

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 2:23:31 AM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

jeane yee

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 1:39:10 AM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

willie yee

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 2:45:57 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

John Bohn

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:07:50 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Angela Cheung

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 8:17:06 AM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

willie yee

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Sunday, April 12, 2026 5:43:25 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Arlene Wong

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Saturday, April 11, 2026 7:31:11 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Db Parrish

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Saturday, April 11, 2026 4:02:03 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Kelly Carter

From:	Alcantar, Justice (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260216 Fire Code Technical Advisory Council - 10 Letters
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 8:59:38 AM
Attachments:	File No. 260216 - 10 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 10 letters from members of the public regarding:

> **File No. 260216:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council to evaluate and advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Fire Department, on the criteria and types of evidence the Fire Marshal should consider in determining whether to waive, modify, or delay certain compliance requirements under the Fire Code that certain existing high-rise residential buildings have sprinkler systems; and to set forth the membership and duties of the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council.

Sincerely,

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

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 9:17:12 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

willie yee

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 7:03:31 AM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

George Cole

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 12:23:09 AM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Sandra Frykman

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 10:59:01 AM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Lena Lundberg

From: Stefani Phipps
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Sprinkler mandate
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 11:09:18 PM

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

I am a resident of 2190 Washington St. when I first heard of this mandate I thought it was a joke. Rents are already absurdly high in SF. Forcing owners to do overkill safety measures with an already strict rent control law will have them ignoring other quality of life issues in their buildings or abandoning them all together. We have 8 foot ceilings. I can't even imagine what that would look like.
As much as I appreciate the city worrying about my safety I am a grownup who can make my own decisions as to how much is enough to provide comfort. If in fact you are worrying about saving lives why not evacuate the entire Marina and Mission Bay because when an earthquake happens that will be decimated while 2190 Washington will be standing.
Please find something else to worry about and abandon this issue!
Stefani Phipps
Sent from my iPhone

From:	luba@lubasf.com
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Ethics Commission, (ETH); Commission, Fire (FIR)
Subject:	Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate: Conflict of Interest Concerns & Impact on SF Homeowners
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 3:07:46 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 and Mayor Lurie,

I'm a San Francisco real estate professional with 20 years of experience selling homes in this city. I'm writing about the 2022 fire sprinkler retrofit mandate for pre-1975 high-rise residential buildings, and specifically about what I believe is a serious conflict of interest that undermines public trust in this ordinance.

I work with buyers and sellers in the neighborhoods most affected by this mandate... Nob Hill, Russian Hill, Pacific Heights, the Marina. I've seen firsthand what this ordinance has done to my clients. Property values in affected buildings have dropped. Elderly homeowners on fixed incomes are terrified of assessments that could reach $200,000 to $300,000 per unit. Some of my clients can't sell because no buyer wants to inherit a six-figure sprinkler bill. Others can't afford to stay.

And now we learn that Kenneth Cofflin, the former SF Fire Marshal who wrote this ordinance, has started a private consulting business called Code 403 that charges condo associations for help navigating the very rules he created.

Let me be clear about what this looks like from the outside: a government official wrote a mandate that affects 9,800+ families and 126 buildings, retired, and then opened a business profiting from the confusion and compliance costs he created. Whether or not this violates any specific ethics law, it stinks. And it makes every affected homeowner wonder whether this ordinance was written to protect residents or to create a market.

The original ordinance was passed without adequate cost studies and without meaningful notice to the people it would affect. The recent delay to 2032 was a step in the right direction, but a delay isn't a solution. My clients don't need more time to figure out how to pay $300,000. They need the city to go back and do what should have been done in 2022: study the actual costs, explore alternatives to full sprinkler retrofits, and create realistic financial pathways for compliance that don't bankrupt the people this ordinance claims to protect.

I'm asking the Board to:

1. Investigate the Cofflin/Code 403 conflict of interest through the

Ethics Commission

2. Commission an independent cost study for the affected buildings

3. Explore alternative fire safety measures (as the State Fire Marshal's office has suggested are available under existing code)

4. Create a financial assistance program for owners who cannot afford compliance

This is not about opposing fire safety. Nobody wants another tragedy. But good policy doesn't bankrupt the people it's supposed to protect, and good governance doesn't let the author of a mandate profit from its enforcement.

Thank you for your time.

Luba Muzichenko
REALTOR® | CRS® | SRES®
Vanguard Properties
20 Years Selling San Francisco
LubaSF.com | 415-449-8488

Item 17

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Balboa Skate Park - 5 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:05:24 PM
Attachments:	Balboa Skate Park - 5 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 5 Letters from members of the public regarding Balboa Skate Park.

Sincerely,

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

From: Sarah Hobstetter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark
Date: Saturday, April 11, 2026 1:17:41 PM

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

SF Boardof Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Sarah Hobstetter
sarah@hobstetterarch.com

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Erik Parry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark
Date: Saturday, April 11, 2026 12:28:41 PM

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

SF Boardof Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Erik Parry
erikparry7@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94107

From: Arthur Crow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 3:42:10 PM

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

SF Boardof Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Arthur Crow
alabount@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Ezra Freeman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 10:02:41 AM

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

SF Boardof Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Ezra Freeman
ezrafreeman88@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

From: Jason Chew
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:59:21 PM

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

SF Boardof Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Jason Chew
xdragonx57@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

Item 18

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	San Francisco Budget - 3 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:09:39 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco Budget - 3 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 Letters from members of the public regarding the San Francisco Budget.

Sincerely,

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

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 8:38:19 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over $1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

• Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.

• Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.

• Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly $1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Julien DeFrance

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.
Date: Sunday, April 12, 2026 5:09:52 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over $1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

• Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.

• Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.

• Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly $1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Vilmos Nebehaj

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 12:19:40 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over $1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

• Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.

• Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.

• Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly $1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Smith

Item 19

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Crocker Amazon Renovation - 18 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:26:43 PM
Attachments:	Crocker Amazon Renovation - 18 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 18 Letters from members of the public regarding the renovation of Crocker Amazon.

Sincerely,

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

From:	catherine dodd
To:	Commission, Recpark (REC); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Madland, Sarah (REC); commission@sfwater.org; crocker@sfgiants.com; MandelmanStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Crocker Amazon rennovation, artificial turf and tree removal
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 11:05:48 AM
Attachments:	April 16. rec and park hearingdocx.docx

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

please find attached letter opposing tree removal and installation of dangerous artificial turf. There **are** affordable natural grass GOFER free turf fields that are safer for kids and the environment.

May we all be well,
Catherine Dodd PhD RN Public Health Nurse
SF resident since 1977
Environmental Health Expert

Catherine Dodd PhD RN PHN
963 Duncan Street
San Francisco, CA 94131

April 16, 2026

Recreation & Parks Commission recpark.commission@sfgov.org
SFRPD Interim General Manager Sarah Madland sarah.madland@sfgov.org
District 11 Supervisor Chyanne Chen Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org
Mayor Dan Lurie daniel.lurie@sfgov.org
Chief of Infrastructure, Climate and Mobility Alicia Jean-Baptiste a.john-baptiste@sfgov.org
Giants Foundation Liaison for Crocker Amazon crocker@sfgiants.com
Board of Supervisors Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
SF Public Utilities Commission commission@sfwater.org

Subject: Item 9 -Crocker Amazon Park

Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
To: recpark.commission@sfgov.org
Cc: Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org, sarah.madland@sfgov.org, a.john-baptiste@sfgov.org

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Your decision will long outlive you. It will damage the park for generations. The environment of our parks cannot be remediated from the damage proposed in this renovation. Removal of carbon sequestering trees, and the replacement of natural grass turf with plastic blades and backing will damage the park AND the surrounding environment for decades.

Rushing this proposal through is NOT a transparent process. It fails to meet the test of the Precautionary Principle which is City Policy. *The Precautionary Principle requires not using something until it has been proven safe. Plastic grass (aka artificial turf) contains known chemicals that cause cancer and reproductive harm. Infill made of natural cork and sand infill both require glue polymers that have never been evaluated for human (or environmental) as they break down. Cork and sand glued together are not "natural products."*

Would you use products in your home that you did not know were safe? Would you eat or drink food or beverages if you did not know what was in them and what the long-term effects would be?

In this case we know many of the short term and long term effects and you have been warned and are still going forward. We know that plastic grass AKA artificial turf is NOT recyclable (contrary to the Rec & Park report **– there is no where in the US that recycles plastic grass).** If at some point plastic grass becomes recyclable, It becomes a type of fuel – advanced recycling produces many many air pollutants and tons of micro plastics that are known carcinogens and cause reproductive harm. Meanwhile you are agreeing to add tons of plastic to the waste stream every 8 years (more often if hours of use are more than 8 per day).

Plastic turf degrades from the day it is rolled onto the truck for transport. When it is played on, cleaned regularly washed (with POTABLE water) it degrades – the “cushioning” infill degrades leading to more injuries, and micro plastics and nano plastics are produced by the ton which pollute not only the surrounding environment but which children inhale, ingest, and absorb. Microplastics accumulate in organs and more peer reviewed articles have been published each week about the dangers of micro and nano plastics.

San Francisco was the first city to ban plastic straws! But did you know that 1 field of plastic gras = 46 million plastic straws, 3.2 million plastic bags, 2 million plastic bottles? Multiply these numbers by 10 if synthetic infill is used.

Decreasing the demand for plastic, a fossil fuel (petrochemical) product, helps prevent climate change and keeps dangerous chemicals and micro and nano plastics out of the waste stream, out of the aquatic environment and out of our bodies.

The **contribution to climate change** during production is immeasurable. Plastics “off gas” during their entire life. Once Plastic grass arrives and installed it off-gasses above and near the playing field, off gassing increases during warm weather. One of the major chemicals that is off-gassed is **METHANE a potent greenhouse gas**. **polyethylene is the plastic type that releases methane (CH4), ethylene (C2H4), ethane and propylene at the highest concentrations. Bad news, polyethylene is also the most prevalent plastic produced.**

As plastic degrades, the surface area of the plastic increases. Hence, there is more surface to react with the sunlight and a tremendous increase in concentrations of methane and also ethylene, another greenhouse gas. This means that with time for the plastic grass field, more and more greenhouse gases will be produced as the plastic grass degrades and its surface area increases.

Synthetic turf has a huge surface area because of all the small pieces it is made out of, hence the amount of greenhouse gases emitted from synthetic is much higher than a flat sheet of polyethylene, all this surface area also degrades at a highest rate. Synthetic turf is on land and exposed to air directly and therefore responsible for a greater amount of greenhouse gases emitted to the atmosphere.
As recently as 2024,
The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has identified artificial turf as a source of Candidate Chemicals of Concern, including PFAS ("forever chemicals"), phthalates, UV stabilizers, and antioxidants. These chemicals are associated with various health and environmental hazards, such as respiratory toxicity, endocrine toxicity, developmental and reproductive toxicity, immunotoxicity, environmental persistence, and bioaccumulation.

The report also points out that **Senate Bill 676 of 2023 (ch. 498, stats. 2023) specifies that the installation of synthetic grass or artificial turf is no longer included in the definition of drought-tolerant landscaping, once again *allowing municipalities and counties to restrict the use of the product.***

This will NOT save water, in fact, it requires potable not recycled water to clean.

From a health perspective, I cannot underscore the dangers of plastic and infill chemical exposure. Plastic grass requires PFAS (non stick) chemicals in the manufacturing process to keep the blades from sticking together. There are over 15,000 PFAS chemicals known as forever chemicals because they bio accumulate in our bodies and take forever to biodegrade in the environment. PFAS are endocrine disrupting chemicals EDCs which affect our hormones associated with puberty, reproductive development, breast and liver cancer and organ development. PFAS slows metabolism and has explained why people regain weight after losing it. Other key chemicals in plastics include phthalates used to soften plastic, these are EDCs are associated with thyroid abnormalities, brain development and lower IQ. Pthalates change the gene expression related to how the body responds to lipid and carbohydrate loads in the body and is associated with weight gain, pediatric obesity, and heart disease. In little boys, phthalates change the development of genitals and eventually decreased sperm production. In girls they are linked to early breast cancer. Another class of plastic chemicals are Bisphenols used to produce polymers and resins, which are then used to make plastic materials, they are polymers and plastic materials. They are known for making fat cells bigger – they are a synthetic estrogen linked to endocrine related cancers.

Please keep this part of your mission as a guidepost. The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's Mission is to provide **enriching recreational activities**, maintain beautiful parks and **preserve the environment for the well-being of everyone in our diverse community. All our children in every neighborhood deserve to play in healthy environments. Our tax dollars should not be spent on products that endanger the health and well-being of park users and of the environment.**

Your decision has implications for generations please base it on science this is not a solution for the "unmet need" for recreation spaces. Do not approve this renovation without a full EIR.

Sincerely,

Catherine Dodd RN

Health Policy Advisor Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety FACTS
Member, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
Former Region IX USDHHS Director, Former Deputy Chief of Staff for Health and Human Services to Mayor Newsom,
Former District Director Speaker Emeritus Nancy Pelosi
Former Director Women's Health SFGH
Former Maternal Child Health Advisory Board Member

From: Annie Jupiter-Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChenStaff; Commission, Recpark (REC); FielderStaff
Subject: Support the Crocker Amazon Renovation Project = Support for Girls Baseball
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:18:26 AM

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

Good Morning,

I am writing to express my strong support for the renovation of Crocker Amazon Field.

I am a lifelong San Franciscan, born and raised in the Mission District (D9), where I continue to live in a three-generation household. For the past 30 years, I have worked as a public school educator and have served in leadership roles across multiple youth-serving community organizations. I also had the honor of serving as a Commissioner for the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission from 2020–2024.

Public parks shaped my childhood, and they have shaped my family's life as well. My three daughters—all baseball players—developed through city programs including Rec & Park, Jr. Giants, and SFUSD. For the past 20 years, Crocker Amazon has been our home field.

Today, I serve as the volunteer General Manager of the San Francisco Bay Sox Girls Baseball Program, a partnership with the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. Founded in 2015 with just one team of 12 girls, the Bay Sox has grown into a year-round program serving over 130 girls ages 7–18 through teams, clinics, and coach development. It remains the only publicly funded girls' baseball program in the country.

San Francisco should be proud to be a national leader in advancing equity in baseball. Our city was recently selected as one of four to represent the inaugural Women's Professional Baseball League, and today a record number of girls are playing on high school baseball teams here. This progress is not accidental—it is the direct result of sustained public investment.

There is a misconception that there is limited demand for baseball and softball in our city. I encourage you to visit Crocker Amazon on any Tuesday or Thursday evening, where you will see close to 100 girls actively using these fields. I also receive daily inquiries from families eager to join the Bay Sox. The demand is real—and growing.

However, the current conditions at Crocker Amazon do not meet the needs of these young athletes. For more than a decade, players and families have navigated unsafe and inadequate facilities: gopher holes, poor drainage, dust, deteriorating dugouts, and frequent closures. As the largest baseball and softball complex in San Francisco, these fields are in urgent need of renovation. During the 2024 SFYBL season, we lost 48% (57 days) of practice & game time at Crocker Amazon due to weather closure.

I understand and respect the environmental concerns raised by community organizations. At the same time, with over 13.6 million square feet of natural open space available just a two-minute walk away in McLaren Park, I urge you to also consider the needs of young people who rely on dedicated baseball and softball fields to experience joy, build confidence, find community, and stay active. Baseball/Softball field represent such a small amount of our

public spaces and the demand from them is extremely high.

Crocker Amazon serves as a critical hub for public school teams, Rec & Park leagues, and the free Jr. Giants program. It is also the closest baseball/softball complex for neighborhoods including the Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, Sunnydale, the Mission, Bayview, and Portola—communities with high concentrations of low and working-class families who rely on public spaces for recreation, health, and connection. These are among the most heavily used fields in the city, and they deserve investment that reflects that reality.

As a nonprofit fundraiser, I understand that a project of this scale requires strong public-private partnerships. The proposed investment from the San Francisco Giants represents a rare and meaningful opportunity. It will not only improve infrastructure, but also directly support the continued growth of girls' and women's baseball in San Francisco.

I work every day to push Major League Baseball to recognize and invest in our girls who play this game. The San Francisco Giants' investment in Crocker Amazon Field represents a rare opportunity to make that commitment real at the local level. By supporting this renovation, you honor the dedication and resilience of these young athletes and send a clear message to current and future San Francisco girls: they belong in this game, and they deserve high-quality public spaces that match the scale of their ambition.

I respectfully urge you to support the Crocker Amazon Field Renovation Project. Doing so affirms that our city believes in equity, in youth development, and in providing high-quality public spaces for all. It sends a powerful message to the next generation of San Francisco girls that they belong in this game—and that their dreams deserve to be supported.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I welcome the opportunity to connect further or host a visit to see the Bay Sox program in action.

In Community,
Annie Jupiter-Jones

From:	Gregory Stevens
To:	commission@sfwater.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); crocker@sfgiants.com; John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Subject:	Faith Sides with Crocker Amazon Park residents
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 12:45:59 PM

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

Dear Commissioners,

I write to you out of a deep sense of moral responsibility and love for our shared creation. Crocker Amazon Park is not simply land to be developed, but a living part of our community. It is a place where people, trees, soil, and sky come together in relationship. To care for it is to care for one another.

The proposal to replace natural open space with a fenced-in artificial turf complex, advanced by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and Charles B. Johnson, is being framed as a gift. But a true gift is one that is freely desired, life-giving, and rooted in justice. Many neighbors have not asked for this, and experience it instead as a loss.

Our traditions teach us to be stewards, not dominators. Paving over meadows, removing mature trees, and enclosing public land for intensified and restricted use moves us away from that sacred responsibility. It diminishes biodiversity, community access, and the quiet, restorative presence of nature that so many rely on.

Artificial turf raises additional ethical concerns. It brings increased heat, higher injury risks, and exposure to harmful substances such as PFAS and microplastics. It is especially troubling that these installations are often concentrated in communities already burdened by environmental injustice. We must ask ourselves: who bears the cost of these decisions, and who benefits?

I support caring for and investing in Crocker Amazon Park. But we must do so in a way that honors both people and the Earth:

Yes to meaningful community input, where all voices are heard with dignity.
Yes to natural grass, open green space, and the preservation of mature trees.
Yes to a park that welcomes seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth alike.
No to expanding artificial turf and the harms it brings.
No to increased traffic, noise, and intrusive lighting that disrupts community life.
No to privatization or fencing that limits access to what should remain a commons.
No to the unnecessary removal of the trees that have long stood as witnesses to this community.

In this moment, you are called not only to make a policy decision, but to exercise moral leadership. I urge you to choose the path of care, justice, and right relationship with the land and with one another.

Please protect this beloved park, and invest in a future that reflects our highest values.

Sincerely,

__
Rev. Gregory Stevens (they/he)
California Interfaith Power & Light
Northern California Director
(650) 313-3998

From:	S and W Saunders
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Subject:	Crocker Amazon's destructive plans
Date:	Monday, April 13, 2026 8:19:26 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I live in District 11 and I'm very upset that our serene park is being taken away from us and handed over to private developers. It's a case of the powerful and rich taking what they want.

I am writing to urge you to protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced-in artificial turf sports complex.
The plan proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and team owner/Trump donor Charles B. Johnson is being framed as a "gift." However, many neighbors did not ask for this project and do not support paving over meadows, cutting down mature trees, and fencing off large portions of a beloved community park.

Artificial turf also raises serious concerns. Synthetic fields are associated with higher surface temperatures, increased injury rates compared to well-maintained natural grass, and exposure to toxins like PFAS and microplastics. It's particularly troubling that the majority of artificial turf installations have been clustered in neighborhoods already burdened by asthma and environmental justice challenges.

I strongly support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing so the right way:
- Yes to meaningful community input.
- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.
- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.
- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth sports alike.

- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.
- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-nightly bright field lighting.
- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.
- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.

Please stand with neighborhood residents and protect this city treasure. Invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access, not in plastic infrastructure that narrows and intensifies use.

Best,

Sharon Saunders
District 11

From:	Donna Sharee
To:	Commission, Recpark (REC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); crocker@sfgiants.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; WongStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff
Subject:	Fight against the privatization of our park and the risks of plastic turf
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 2:26:51 PM

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

To the Commission and whomever else it may concern:

I have been a resident of District 11 for 34 years. I am huge fan of my lovely nearby park — Crocker Amazon Park. I have written before but I must reiterate that I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a park enjoyed by many San Franciscans. I do not want the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access to myself and many current users.

Plastic turf poses many environmental, health, and aesthetic concerns! Organically managed natural grass fields address all these concerns and also employ city gardeners, which I think is an added plus. 85% of synthetic turf installations are in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.

Please invest in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, which would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

Please prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

I recently learned that an LCC called Crocker Amazon LLC will ask the Commission to accept a gift of $28 million for the Crocker Amazon Park renovation as they planned it. I am very concerned that this would be an overstep of rules — a procedural violation! The environmental review is not complete, the Commission has not yet approved the project, and the project has not gone before the Board of Supervisors for a vote. I am glad that my Supervisor Chen was able to get a third community meeting for the project, but alarmingly this grant will be accepted for the existing project design before that meeting takes place.

I am horrified that the if the Commission accepts the money they are making construction commitments that illegally predetermine the outcome of the meetings, reviews and approvals,

compromising the integrity of the Department and the Commission.

Sincerely,
Donna Sharee

Donna Sharee Design
cell 1.415.314.6235
dsharee@earthlink.net

From:	M Avila
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Hola le pide de favor que no pongan plástico bal parque necesitamos la naturaleza para vivir mejor guarde el dinero para otras cosas que la ciudad necesita más cosas importantes
Date:	Saturday, April 11, 2026 3:07:56 PM

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

Sent from my iPhone

From: SF Forest
To: Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc: Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; WongStaff (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject: Item 9 on the agenda - CROCKER AMAZON BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL FIELDS – GRANT ACCEPTANCE, GRANT AGREEMENT AND NAMING - public comment
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 4:04:45 PM
Attachments: image.png

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



Dear Members of the Recreation and Parks Commission,

San Francisco Forest Alliance is strongly against the current plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

We urge you not to accept the offered grant, and not to recommend that the board of Supervisors authorizes the Department to enter into a Grant Acceptance Agreement concerning the terms and conditions of the Grant.

These terms and conditions are unacceptable.

This item should not be even discussed until the next community meeting about the project - promised to residents and park volunteers - takes place.

We are especially appalled by plans to cut down 128 mature, healthy, historic trees - the majority of existing park trees - each to be replaced with 2 saplings (god only knows where and when these plantings will take place). This "generous" offer is equivalent to an offer of a replacement of a $100 bill in your wallet with two(!!) $1 bills. How many saplings are really needed to replace services (carbon sequestration, cleaning air pollution, wildlife habitat, shade) of one mature healthy tree?

We support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing so the right way. The city needs to invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access.

Sincerely,

San Francisco Forest Alliance

San Francisco Forest Alliance is a 501(c)4 not-for-profit organization with a mission of **inclusive environmentalism**. We fight to protect our environment through outreach and providing information. We oppose the unnecessary destruction of trees, oppose the use of toxic herbicides in parks and public lands, and support public access to our parks and conservation of our tree canopy. We stand for transparency in the use of public funds.

From:	Beth rubenstein
To:	Commission, Recpark (REC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); crocker@sfgiants.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); commission@sfwater.org
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 10:05:51 AM

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

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.

We can and must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically

managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

Sincerely,

Beth

Beth Rubenstein
415-846-4732

From:	Tony Rafael Figueroa
To:	Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Madland, Sarah (REC); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); crocker@sfgiants.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); commission@sfwater.org
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Saturday, April 11, 2026 10:25:29 PM

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

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.

We can and must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

--
Best,
--
Tony R. Figueroa

University of California, Berkeley | Class of 2023
B.S. Nutritional Science - Physiology & Metabolism
tony_rf@berkeley.edu | (323) 500-8697

From:	Anna Chan
To:	Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mauer, Dan (REC); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Madland, Sarah (REC); crocker@sfgiants.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); commission@sfwater.org
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Saturday, April 11, 2026 10:25:16 PM

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

Dear Commissioners,

As someone who has grown up in this neighborhood and lived here my entire life, I am writing to urge you to protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced-in artificial turf sports complex.

The plan proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and team owner/Trump donor Charles B. Johnson is being framed as a "gift." **However, many neighbors did not ask for this project and do not support paving over meadows, cutting down mature trees, and fencing off large portions of a beloved community park.**

Artificial turf also raises serious concerns. Synthetic fields are associated with higher surface temperatures, increased injury rates compared to well-maintained natural grass, and exposure to toxins like PFAS and microplastics. It's particularly troubling that the majority of artificial turf installations have been clustered in neighborhoods already burdened by asthma and environmental justice challenges.

I strongly support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing so the right way:

- Yes to meaningful community input.
- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.
- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.
- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth sports alike.
- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.

- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-nightly bright field lighting.
- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.
- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.

Please stand with neighborhood residents and protect this city treasure. Invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access, not in plastic infrastructure that narrows and intensifies use.

Sincerely,
Anna Chan

From: Stephen Cosbey
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); crocker@sfgiants.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); commission@sfwater.org
Subject: Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field and Proposed Renovation
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 8:28:02 PM

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

Dear All,

I am writing to urge you to protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced-in artificial turf sports complex.

The plan proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and team owner/Trump donor Charles B. Johnson is being framed as a "gift." However, many neighbors did not ask for this project and do not support paving over meadows, cutting down mature trees, and fencing off large portions of a beloved community park.

Privatization of a "Public Park" removes the "Public" from Public Park. WHAT ARE YOU THINKING?

Artificial turf also raises serious concerns. Synthetic fields are associated with higher surface temperatures, increased injury rates compared to well-maintained natural grass, and exposure to toxins like PFAS and microplastics. It's particularly troubling that the majority of artificial turf installations have been clustered in neighborhoods already burdened by asthma and environmental justice challenges.

I strongly support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing

so the right way:

- Yes to meaningful community input.
- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.
- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.
- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth sports alike.
- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.
- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-nightly bright field lighting.
- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.
- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.

Please stand with neighborhood residents and protect this city treasure. Invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access, not in plastic infrastructure that narrows and intensifies use.

Sincerely,
Stephen H Cosbey

Alligator Plumbing

San Francisco, CA

From: Justice Alcantar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Crocker Amazon Baseball/Softball Field Renovation
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 3:38:16 PM

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

Hello Supervisors,

My name is Justice Alcantar, current D11 resident/lifetime resident of San Francisco. I am writing today to express my strong support and the extreme need for the proposed renovation at Crocker Amazon not only as a D11 resident, but also as someone who has played on these fields since my chubby toddler hands could pick up a baseball.

I have played baseball at Crocker Amazon my entire life, and have been coaching the country's largest publicly funded girl's baseball program (the San Francisco Bay Sox) at the very fields I have spent countless days and nights at as a player, experiencing the same issues that have just worsened over time.

The fields are frequently out of commission several days after initial rainfall and closure announcements leading to increasingly more and more missed games and practices that are intrinsic to our players' development. During the 2024 SFYBL season, **we lost 48% (57 days)** of practice & game time at Crocker Amazon due to weather closure. For my all girl's baseball team whose home field has always been Crocker, where we hold year round clinics/practices/games for girls, this was (and is) an absolute detriment to player development and team building. It is difficult enough as it is to be the only girls on the field, so getting objectively less practice time than other teams negatively impacts their confidence even further.

I am currently volunteering 4 days a week coaching two all-girls baseball teams that play in the San Francisco Youth Baseball League (SFYBL) on top of working a full time job because I love how much joy it brings the kids to get out there and be active and social, something that is becoming increasingly difficult to get them to be into in this digital age. It is frustrating for me and the players I coach that at the slightest bit of rainfall we have to continually refresh RPD's field closure website all the way up until game time just to be told that the field is not playable and will continue to not be for several days.

Throughout my entire time using this sports complex (roughly 25 years) I have not only been injured on account of the gopher/pot holes/cracks, but I have also seen countless of my players injured as well. The neglect of Crocker Amazon is something that needs to be addressed. I am acutely aware that the city's gardeners are spread too thin and do their

best with the resources and quality of facilities they have. But we have seen so many successful field renovations across the city (West Sunset/Palega/Kimbell etc.) so it is confusing to me why improving the safety & usability of a massive sports facility that is home to 29 different teams & organizations throughout the city is not an easy decision.

At this point, I frankly do not care if the field is turf or grass because at the end of the day it has needed renovation for decades and the kids just need a safe and reliable place to play. Again, we have seen successful field renovations with both grass and turf fields with facilities like West Sunset and Kimbell, so why not Crocker? I understand the environmental concerns listed out by community organizations but if they used the Crocker Amazon baseball fields for their intended purpose, I strongly believe they would have more empathy for what the youth have to deal with on a daily basis. With the entire **13.6 million square feet of McLaren Park** accessible by a 2 minute walk from Crocker Amazon's entrance, it feels as though the joy our city's youth get out of being outdoors and engaged with their community is being overshadowed.

Please give this project a fighting chance. The community of District 11 deserve an outdoor space that is not riddled with cracks, holes and decaying facilities, and the youth of San Francisco deserve safe and reliable fields to cultivate their joy for organized sports and community building. Please do not let a loud minority of angry individuals, many of whom are not D11 residents nor do they have kids using the fields daily, outweigh the needs of our city and its youth. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar

From:	Carmen Iton
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Commission, Recpark (REC); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Crocker Amazon Park
Date:	Monday, April 13, 2026 1:39:53 PM

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

I am writing to urge you to protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced-in artificial turf sports complex.

The plan proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and team owner/Trump donor Charles B. Johnson is being framed as a "gift." However, many neighbors did not ask for this project and do not support paving over meadows, cutting down mature trees, and fencing off large portions of a beloved community park.

Artificial turf also raises serious concerns. Synthetic fields are associated with higher surface temperatures, increased injury rates compared to well-maintained natural grass, and exposure to toxins like PFAS and microplastics. It's particularly troubling that the majority of artificial turf installations have been clustered in neighborhoods already burdened by asthma and environmental justice challenges.

I strongly support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing so the right way:
- Yes to meaningful community input.
- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.
- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.
- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth sports alike.
- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.
- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-nightly bright field lighting.
- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.
- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.

Please stand with neighborhood residents and protect this city treasure. Invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access, not in plastic infrastructure that narrows and intensifies use.
Sincerely,
Carmen

From:	Anastasia Glikshtern
To:	Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); WongStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Subject:	Public comment for Item 9 on the agenda - CROCKER AMAZON BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL FIELDS – GRANT ACCEPTANCE, GRANT AGREEMENT AND NAMING
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 5:04:40 PM

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

Dear Members of the Recreation and Parks Commission,

You should be well informed about the high toxicity of artificial turf - state-of-the-art, or not. The information is overabundant. It is full of PFAS and other harmful chemicals, and is shedding microplastics. The myth about PFAS-free synthetic turf disappears as soon as independent tests for each claimant are performed. At the end of my comment I'm listing links to some of the articles on the subject, you, so far, have chosen to ignore.

These wonderful sports fields - everywhere in the city - are leaking PFAS into soil and groundwater (which is mixed with our drinking water). Of course, children playing on the fields get much more of their damaging impact, then the rest of us.

All over the country, and around the world, bans on synthetic turf are enacted. It is done in places which care about the health of their people and the environment. Obviously, San Francisco is not one of those places.

Instead of working on approval of another piece of this toxic monstrosity in another city park, you should be working on removing the existing toxic shields of plastic and replacing them with the natural grass fields. It is being done. And, no, it is not more expensive if you include all the costs associated with the synthetic turf.

The Giants' hypocrisy is remarkable, albeit not uncommon. Giants' field in Oracle park is natural grass. "State-of-the-art artificial turf" is not good for Giants' players - but, according to their spokesperson, supposed to be "high quality" and excellent for our children.

Here is what AI says about the synthetic turf experiment at Candlestick Park:
"Synthetic turf at Candlestick Park was replaced with natural grass in 1979 primarily due to the **severe deterioration of the turf, causing it to become a "rock-hard" safety hazard with split seams and poor traction**. After serving from 1970–1978, the surface was plagued by **high player injury rates and high replacement costs**, leading the 49ers to push for a return to grass.

The information on PFAS toxicity is far from new:
There were two movies on PFAS in 2018 & 2019: The Devil We Know (documentary) & Dark Waters (feature - legal thriller). And I recently saw a review for a new UK documentary: "In Our Blood: The Forever Chemicals Scandal " - review – no one should have

to live like this -https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2026/mar/22/in-our-blood-the-forever-chemicals-scandal-review-no-one-should-have-to-live-like-th

Here are some links:

Join NFL Players in Calling for an End to Artificial Turf

- https://secure.everyaction.com/nFugED4PS024K3MzeonwRQ2

Artificial Turf Wars: People Fighting to Protect Their Communities - https://www.sierraclub.org/loma-prieta/blog/2024/05/artificial-turf-wars-people-fighting-protect-their-communities#

Synthetic Turf is HAZARDOUS -

https://www.beyondplastics.org/fact-sheets/synthetic-turf

Athletes Likely to Have Higher Levels of PFAS after Play on Artificial Turf – Study - https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2024/mar/15/athletes-higher-pfas-levels-artificial-turf

Science Friday - PFAS Chemicals, And You – **https://www.sciencefriday.com/segments/pfas-dupont-lawsuit-robert-bilott/**

PFAS in drinking water linked to increased cancer risk, groundbreaking study finds - **https://usrtk.org/healthwire/pfas-drinking-water-cancer/?mc_cid=bd3a82f858&mc_eid=c8940479cd**

Scientists reveal PFAS impact on liver function - https://share.google/yrsWBGPF3ebWQ6GuM

Once it was hailed as a drought fix — but now California's moving to restrict synthetic turf over health concerns – https://calmatters.org/environment/2023/10/california-synthetic-turf-pfas/

17 reasons to avoid fake lawns – how bad is artificial grass for the environment? - https://www.jackwallington.com/17-reasons-to-avoid-fake-lawns-how-bad-is-artificial-grass-for-the-environment/

Chemical Exposure in artificial turf: What parents need to know - https://3littleplums.com/blog/chemical-exposure-in-artificial-turf-what-parents-

need-to-know

'Forever chemicals' may increase liver disease risk in adolescents by as much as 3-fold -
https://keck.usc.edu/news/forever-chemicals-may-increase-liver-disease-risk-in-adolescents-by-as-much-as-3-fold/

PFAS exposure linked to a nearly 200% increase in infant mortality, study finds -
https://www.ehn.org/pfas-infant-mortality

Forever Chemicals Linked to Multiple Sclerosis in Concerning New Study : ScienceAlert -
https://www.sciencealert.com/forever-chemicals-linked-to-multiple-sclerosis-in-concerning-new-study

Microplastics Burrow Into Blood Vessels and Fuel Heart Disease -
https://scitechdaily.com/microplastics-burrow-into-blood-vessels-and-fuel-heart-disease/

Microplastics that accumulate in the body may 'clog up' immune cells | Live Science -

https://www.livescience.com/health/microplastics-that-accumulate-in-the-body-may-clog-up-immune-cells

Regards,
Anastasia Glikshtern
1683 34th Ave.,
San Francisco, CA 94122
415-377-8661

From: Emily Boecker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Recreation and Parks" Crocker Amazon Park Baseball and Softball Fields Renovation Project
Date: Saturday, April 11, 2026 3:45:47 PM

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

Hello,
I am requesting that members of the Board of Supervisors to oppose Recreation and Parks' Crocker Amazon Park Baseball and Softball Fields Renovation Project when it comes before the full Board for a vote. Artificial turf poses serious risks to wildlife and companion animals and replaces natural habitat with synthetic surfaces. Please protect the park by preserving natural grass, trees, and open space, and by rejecting artificial turf. Thank you.
Emily Boecker

From:	David Romano
To:	Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); SFUN - San Franciscans for Urban Nature; Mauer, Dan (REC)
Subject:	Renovation of the Crocker/Amazon playing field
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 6:05:45 PM

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

Dear Commissioners:

Please don't approve the use of artificial turf in the proposed renovation of the Crocker/Amazon playing fields; plastic grass should not be used in our playing fields and playgrounds. We should use natural grass turf. The San Francisco Recreation and Parks Commission should lead with green and environment friendly policies

Plastic grass (synthetic turf) is subject to high temperatures, it is scratched and degraded from use and it deteriorates over time due to exposure to the elements. Micro-particles of plastic are constantly being released into the environment. Rubberized surfaces are mostly recycled tire rubber. Plastic grass and rubberized surfaces heat up well above the ambient air temperature. Even in San Francisco temperatures are more than hot enough to facilitate the release of chemicals linked to numerous negative health effects. Unfortunately, we use the same rubberized surfaces on children's playgrounds.

You can see the news on the dangers of plastics in our environment most Sundays in the San Francisco Chronicle in Earthweek: Diary of a Changing World, by Steve Newman:

- "A new study (by University of Rhode Island scientists) finds the microplastic pollution that now permeates the planet can travel to the brain and cause behavioral changes." - Week ending, September 22, 2023
- "Studies have found that microplastic pollution is accumulating not only in our arteries, but also in all 62 human placentas examined.... the particles have also recently been found in human blood and breast milk, which indicates we are being exposed to the pollution on a massive scale, as are other creatures. 'If we're seeing effects on placentas, then all mammalian life on this planet could be impacted,' said lead researcher Matthew Campen of the University of New Mexico.'" - week ending March 1, 2024
- "Microplastics are crossing the blood-brain barrier and accumulating in human brains, according to a new study published in Nature Medicine." - week ending Feb 7, 2025

The following is from Real Grass for Healthy Kids! greenwichfreepress.com March 12, 2021:

"Scientists have shown that both the grass-like blades and the backing of artificial turf contain PFAS, highly toxic fluorinated chemicals. PFAS are known as "forever chemicals" since they accumulate in the body and do not break down. They have been linked to endocrine disruption and cancer. Children are especially vulnerable to harm from PFAS because of their developing bodies and the chemicals' persistence in the body. In a recent New York Times Op Ed piece (What Are Sperm Telling Us?), we read that 'Chemical companies are as reckless as tobacco companies were a generation ago, or as opioid manufacturers were a decade ago. They lobby against even safety testing of endocrine disruptors, so that we have little idea if products we use each day are damaging our bodies or our children. We're all guinea pigs.' Most people think manufacturers must prove that chemicals are safe before they put them on the market. They are wrong. Weak and outdated federal law presumes that most chemicals are safe until proven toxic." – *Real Grass for Healthy Kids!* greenwichfreepress March 12, 2021

The long- term health of our parks, playing fields and the people who play on them is not served by plastic grass and

rubberized surfaces.

Artificial turf actually increases water use. Plastic grass has to be washed regularly to stay clean. This water is not allowed to go into the ground because it is toxic; has to go into into the stormwater drains and is lost. Grass allows water to go into the ground where it replenishes the aquifer. Best practices gardening uses organic fertilizers and doesn't need pesticides for grass. We want more gardeners. We want a living environment not a dead plastic world brought to us by profit-seeking corporations and their politician friends. We need to be more concerned about our environment and health and less concerned about promoting the artificial turf industry.

In the May/June (2020) issue of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's newsletter, Currents, there is a report on "Our Sewer System's Secret Weapon." The article talks about how, "…during large rain events, stormwater and wastewater volumes exceed the capacity of our pipes, causing overflow and discharge of excess wastewater to local waterways. This can carry pollutants and debris to the Bay or Pacific Ocean that are harmful to the environment." The article goes on to talk about how "Green infrastructure … works to alleviate this problem by slowing down the rate in which stormwater goes into the sewer system." Some examples of "Green Infrastructure" are rain gardens, permeable pavement and green roofs.

The Beach Chalet Soccer Fields (BCSF) in Golden Gate Park used to have a permeable surface; it's called grass. The Crocker/Amazon playing could still have this amazing, life-supporting permeable surface called grass if San Francisco does the right thing. Rainwater and water from irrigation filters through the grass to replenish the groundwater supply. Now, after the renovation of the Soccer Fields by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (SFRPD), instead of grass there are seven acres of artificial turf. The area has been effectively paved over. The run-off from the artificial turf is so toxic it can't be allowed to enter the ground but, instead, has to go into the sewer system. The SFPUC is committed to preventing overflow in the sewer system with its "Green Infrastructure" projects, yet the decision by the SFRPD to pave over the Soccer Fields was made without opposition from the SFPUC.

There is nothing good and potentially a lot of bad that can result from the installation of artificial turf at the Crocker/Amazon playing fields. Frequent earthquakes are the norm in California and could cause damage to the drainage system allowing toxic run-off to infiltrate the groundwater. If this were to occur, there is no easy way to get the toxins out of the water supply. In addition, the entire field will need to be ripped up and replaced in a few years creating even more chances for environmental contamination.

Thousands of chemicals are used to manufacture modern tires. Many are never revealed to scientists, regulators or the public. They are protected as "trade secrets." We cannot assess what dangers they present until (in this case) scientists used liquid chromatography mass spectrometry and nuclear magnetic resonance to analyze each individual compound present."

These rubberized surfaces are also planned for the playgrounds of Crocker/Amazon. Our children deserve better.

It is sad to think that some people think it is beyond the bounds of possibility that San Francisco could actually maintain a grass field. The SF Giants play on grass, The 49ers play on grass, Tunnel Top Park has acres of grass, the Polo Field is a natural grass field. You can have well-drained, organically fertilized, gopher-netted playing fields, usable all year long. Please don't allow artificial turf in our parks and playgrounds.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

David Romano
759 La Playa St., Apt.1
San Francisco CA 94121

From:	Kathy Howard
To:	ChenStaff; Chin, Linshao (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	RPC Item 5 B: Funding for artificial turf (Crocker Amazon) should be removed from tomorrow's RPC agenda
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 3:00:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Chen,

The funding for artificial turf at Crocker Amazon Playground is on the Recreation and Park Commission CONSENT calendar tomorrow. This scheduling of the Crocker project tomorrow makes the April 26th community meeting that you worked so hard to get a sham meeting.

RPD has already stated its one-sided position on installing artificial turf all over the Crocker Amazon Playground. When asked if advocates' calls for real grass may be met, Rec and Park's Dan Mauer said the artificial turf is "non-negotiable . . ." because it does not meet Rec and Park's goals.

Excuse me, but I thought the Department of Recreation and Park served the people. The people – and our parks – do not serve RPD's goals. RPD's goal is to convert a beautiful, peaceful, grassy park with magnificent trees and open to everyone into a plastic, fenced in, fee-based sports complex while destroying the local residents' natural parkland.

Tomorrow's 'approval' may look innocent, but once approved, the funding will be used as an argument to support the installation of artificial turf at Crocker Amazon Playground.

Please ask Rec and Park to remove the approval of purchasing artificial turf from the Recreation and Park Commission's Agenda tomorrow.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Howard

From: Michael Rich
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop the plastic pollution
Date: Sunday, April 12, 2026 3:17:23 PM

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

As a park loving resident I demand that our park not be bullied into a plastic nightmare because of the SF Giants. Artificial turf creates heat and pollution. I never in my life would have thought that I would have to beg for parks not to be covered in plastic.

Michael Rich
1045 Prague Street
San Francisco 94112
Sent from my iPhone

Item 20

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Julien DeFrance - 5 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:33:39 PM
Attachments:	Julien DeFrance - 5 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 5 Letters from Julien DeFrance regarding various topics.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); blueprint@sfblueprint.org; Ethics Commission, (ETH)
Subject:	Re: Disgraced SF human rights chief collects city retirement benefits as corruption case moves through courts
Date:	Friday, April 10, 2026 1:29:37 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
Dear Members of the Ethics Commission,

In light of her criminal activities, and disservice to our city, can Sheryl Davis's retirement benefits be suspended?

We The People, shouldn't have to keep on paying her a fat $5,000 check every month.

In addition, could we envision having her refund every single payment already received so far?

Please advise.

JD.

On Wed, Apr 8, 2026 at 2:47 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

> San Francisco, are you freaking kidding me?
>
> https://nypost.com/2026/04/08/us-news/disgraced-sf-human-rights-chief-sheryl-davis-collects-city-retiree-benefits/
>
> Sheryl Davis — 57-year-old former head of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission who resigned in September 2024 after she was accused of conflicts of interest — is receiving a retirement benefit of $4,952.23 per month, according to the San Francisco Employees' Retirement system.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Mayor, MYR (MYR); PublicRecords, DHR (HRD); DHR-Publicsafety, DHR (HRD); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: S.F. supervisor Jackie Fielder seeks leave of absence through June 30
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 11:57:26 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Dear members of the San Francisco Department of Human Resources (DHR)

Is it acceptable for a supervisor to take a paid leave of absence?

Shouldn't this leave be unpaid?

While city employees accrue sick leave benefits, is it the case for elected officials?

https://sfdhr.org/my-illness-disability-or-preventative-care

Has she regardless accrued enough of such paid leave days to cover the 3 and a half months ranging from early/mid-March to June 30th?

Why should we taxpayers have to pay for a supervisor who isn't presently fulfilling her civic duties?

Please advise.

JD.

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com>
> **Date:** April 10, 2026 at 13:26:02 PDT
> **To:** Ethics Commission <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>, Daniel Lurie <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
> **Cc:** of Supervisors Board <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, bos@sfgov.org
> **Subject: Fwd: S.F. supervisor Jackie Fielder seeks leave of absence through June 30**
>
> Dear Members of the San Francisco Ethics Commission,
> Dear Mayor,
>
> I am writing to request clarification on whether it is permissible under the City Charter, the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, or any applicable ethics rules for a sitting member of the Board of Supervisors to continue receiving their full taxpayer-funded salary while on an extended, excused leave of absence from all official duties.
>
> Specifically, Supervisor Jackie Fielder (District 9) has requested to be excused

from all Board of Supervisors and committee meetings through June 30, 2026 — a period of approximately three months. During this time, she will not be attending meetings, voting on legislation, or fulfilling the core public duties for which she was elected. Her annual salary is approximately $175,370.

My questions are as follows:

1. Is there any legal or ethical requirement that an elected official's salary be suspended or reduced during an extended leave of absence from official duties?
2. Does the Ethics Commission have jurisdiction to review whether continued salary payment under these circumstances constitutes a misuse of public funds? Should her leave instead be UNPAID? And any salary payments received since mid-March be refunded to the City?
3. Are there any precedents or existing policies governing this situation?

I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your response.

Best regards,

JD.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Ng, Wilson (BOS)** <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>
Date: Wed, Apr 8, 2026 at 1:38 PM
Subject: RE: S.F. supervisor Jackie Fielder seeks leave of absence through June 30
To: julien.defrance@gmail.com <julien.defrance@gmail.com>
Cc: BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>

Dear Julien,

On behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, I am confirming receipt of your inquiry.

The Supervisor will continue to receive a salary for the duration of her excusal.

Sincerely,

—

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Web: www.sfbos.org

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

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Clerk of 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: Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 7, 2026 4:34 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: S.F. supervisor Jackie Fielder seeks leave of absence through June 30

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,

Dear Mayor,

Could you please shed some light on whether or not this leave of absence is paid or unpaid?

As if our taxes aren't already wasted in so many so-called "non-profits", other frivolous programs, and a fat government body that can't seem to be cutting itself down…

Is Jackie Fielder getting a 3 and a half months vacation/staycation on the taxpayers dime?

We The People, deserve to know.

https://missionlocal.org/2026/04/sf-jackie-fielder-leave-of-absence

Please advise.

Thank you.

JD

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Mayor, MYR (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); blueprint@sfblueprint.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT - END THE SF MANDATE! REPEAL THE HSCO & CITY OPTION HEALTH FEE NOW.
Date:	Friday, April 10, 2026 1:43:08 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing as a San Francisco resident and supporter of our local restaurant community to urge you to introduce legislation — or place a ballot measure before voters — to repeal the San Francisco City Option health fee mandate.

https://sfstandard.com/2025/04/11/san-francisco-restaurant-health-fee-scam-budget/

As reported by the SF Standard, this program requires small businesses to pay roughly $350 per employee per month — effectively doubling rent for many restaurant owners — while hundreds of millions of dollars in collected fees sit unused. According to a city report, approximately $200 million has gone unclaimed, underscoring that this mandate is not delivering meaningful healthcare access to workers; it is simply burdening the businesses that make our neighborhoods vibrant.

Every San Franciscan who dines out sees this fee tacked onto their bill. It discourages patronage, drives customers to neighboring cities, and sends the message that San Francisco is hostile to small business. At a time when our city is still rebuilding economically from the pandemic, this is exactly the wrong signal to send.

No party of 2 should be paying $120 for to share a pizza, one serving of fries and 2 drinks. This is getting beyond ridiculous. Our paychecks are literally worth nothing in this city.

The Golden Gate Restaurant Association, small business owners, and even members of the San Francisco Democratic Party are now calling for repeal. I urge you to listen. This program was created two decades ago, before the Affordable Care Act expanded access to healthcare. It has outlived its purpose.

Please act swiftly to end this mandate — through ordinance or ballot measure — and give our local restaurants and small businesses the relief they urgently need.

The SF Restaurant Week is starting today, and is your opportunity to announce a much needed reform (and suppression) of these unwarranted San Francisco tariffs.

Thank you for your service to San Francisco.

Best regards,

JD.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Mayor, MYR (MYR); Ethics Commission, (ETH); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT - Introduce Legislation Blocking Retirement Benefits for Corrupt City Officials
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 9:33:02 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to immediately introduce legislation blocking retirement and pension payments to any San Francisco city official, executive, or employee who is convicted of corruption, theft, fraud, or any crime committed in connection with their public duties.

The case of Sheryl Davis makes the need for this reform impossible to ignore. Despite facing 17 felony counts and 2 misdemeanor charges — including misappropriation of public funds and conflict of interest — Davis continues to collect $4,952.23 per month in city retirement benefits. City audits have documented millions in misused taxpayer dollars under her watch, including funds diverted to enrich herself, her partner, and her son.

https://nypost.com/2026/04/08/us-news/disgraced-sf-human-rights-chief-sheryl-davis-collects-city-retiree-benefits/

https://missionlocal.org/2026/03/sheryl-davis-james-spingola-arrested-hrc/

While current city charter language allows for pension forfeiture upon conviction of a crime of moral turpitude, this standard is rarely applied and provides no protection during the period between charges and conviction.

San Franciscans should not be forced to fund the retirement of individuals who betrayed the public trust.

I am asking you to:

1. Introduce legislation that automatically suspends retirement benefit payments upon felony indictment for crimes committed in office, pending final conviction or acquittal.
2. Mandate permanent forfeiture of all city retirement benefits upon conviction for any crime of corruption, theft, or fraud committed while serving in a city role.
3. Close existing loopholes that allow officials to resign and retain benefits before criminal proceedings conclude.

The Harlan Kelly case showed this can be done — but it should not take years and require extraordinary circumstances. It should be the automatic, codified standard.

San Franciscans deserve a city government that holds its own accountable. Please act now.

Sincerely,

JD.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); blueprint@sfblueprint.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); FielderStaff; MahmoodStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT - Supervisor Fielder's Extended Staycation/Leave Must Be UNPAID!
Date:	Thursday, April 9, 2026 4:40:45 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Supervisor Jackie Fielder has been on voluntary leave since mid-March and will not return until the end of June — a period of over three months. During this time, she is not performing her duties as an elected official. San Francisco taxpayers are footing the bill.
This is unacceptable.

Regardless of the circumstances surrounding her absence, an elected official who voluntarily steps away from their responsibilities for months on end should not continue drawing a taxpayer-funded salary. Her constituents deserve representation. Her district deserves an active supervisor.

I am calling on you to take immediate action:

1. Convert Supervisor Fielder's leave to unpaid status effective immediately.

2. If she is unwilling or unable to return and serve, initiate removal proceedings.

San Franciscans work hard.

We expect the same from those we elect and pay. This prolonged, paid absence is a disservice to every taxpayer in this city.

Do your jobs and hold her accountable.

We The People are watching and will hold you accountable too!

Best regards,

JD.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: The Rights of Nature, a fresh approach!
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 8:33:26 AM
Attachments:	untitled-design-16.png 64fc468632e616517b1a5de9_webclip.png BOS SF Rights of Nature 2026 #1.docx

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from Magick Altman, regarding the San Francisco environment.

Sincerely,

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

From: Magick Altman <magicktarot11@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 11, 2026 3:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: The Rights of Nature, a fresh approach!

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

Dear Supervisors,
Last Tuesday, I presented the a basic history and outline of the Rights of Nature. I suggested that the SF BOS pursue this approach to respect and protect our amazing eco-system her in the City and County of San Francisco. You can learn more about these principles and laws throughout the US and the World at



Indigenous-led Rights of Nature
movementrights.org

.There is also the work of the Community Environmental Legal Defense Fund. Or

CELDF - Community Rights Pioneers - Protecting Nature and Communities
celdf.org

I have also attached the comments I made on April 7th, 2026 at he Board Meeting.
I look forward to the opportunity do a short 15min. Presentation and time to answer questions.

You can also access the Santa Monica rights of nature, and this will show you templates for the laws.

Legal Templates
earthlawportal.org

This is a way to use the present legal system to make the preservation of Life.
Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglass stated in a minority decision that Trees have Standing back in the 60's.
Setting the precedent for this concept to evolve, as he has to safeguard more and more of the cities and countries of the World.

-

-

Looking forward to your response, questions and interest.
With Respect,
Magick Altman
707 327 7940

-

At the beginning of each meeting you have stated that we are on unceded Ramaytush Ohlone land. It is time to give weight to your words.

The Indigenous peoples all over the world have always lovingly held Mother Earth as the source of Life, not as property.

As scientists now know, the extraction, exploitation system, will soon make our beloved Earth unlivable for many. Species are going extinct at an unprecedented rate.

There is a solution, and it is already in motion. It's called the Rights of Nature. These laws recognize the right of ecosystems to "exist and flourish."

Tamaqua, Pennsylvania is the very first place in the world to recognize the Rights of Nature and codify it. Pennsylvania was where this colonizer state started. Now we start again and honor the original people of this land.

It is in the Constitution of Ecuador. Since 2006, dozens of communities in ten states in the

U.S. have enacted Rights of Nature laws. over 40 countries have implemented around 500 Rights of Nature laws at various levels.

I was successful in getting these Rights into the General Plan of Sebastopol and am offering a tutorial to present to this body, as we did at the Bioneers, to begin the process of enacting these Rights here in the Visionary city of San Francsico.

For example, if a business wants to dump toxic waste into our Bay, we can implement these laws because that body of water has the right to exist and thrive.
It is not too late but we must act now.
San Francisco is destined to lead the world, and it is time to take this next evolutionary leap.
On the Federal level the mask of democracy has fallen off the face of fascism. It is not too late on the local level, but we must act now.

.

Item 22

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: BOMA Comments on File #260177 - Environment Code - Climate Action Plan
Date:	Tuesday, April 14, 2026 8:14:19 AM
Attachments:	BOMA Comment Letter File#260177 Climate Action Plan.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from Maddie Campbell with the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco, regarding:

> **File No. 260177:** Ordinance amending the Environment Code to update the City's climate action goals and planning process, and to update City Departments' roles and responsibilities regarding the City's climate action goals; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Sincerely,

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

From: Maddie Campbell <maddiec@boma.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 3:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: John Bryant <jbryant@boma.com>
Subject: BOMA Comments on File #260177 - Environment Code - Climate Action Plan

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

Good afternoon,

Please find attached comments from the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco (BOMA SF) on File #260177 - Environment Code - Climate Action Plan.

Thank you!

--

Madeline (Maddie) Campbell
Manager of Government Affairs | BOMA San Francisco
C: (916) 420-0852
O: (415) 362-8567x3
E: maddiec@boma.com
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 920
San Francisco, CA 94104

April 13, 2026

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

Re: File #260177, Environment Code - Climate Action Plan

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco (BOMA), we write to express our support but also offer our comments and concerns for File No. 260177, Environment Code - Climate Action Plan.

BOMA represents more than 72 million square feet of office space in San Francisco. Our members operate some of the most efficient buildings in the world, support building decarbonization, and have a long history of championing sustainability.

BOMA has partnered for years with the Department of the Environment ("the Department") to craft feasible policy solutions that address the climate crisis. We previously worked with the Department on the draft 2025 Climate Action Plan ("CAP") and submitted official feedback in a letter on June 13, 2025 ("June letter"). We wish to continue to our collaboration with the Department during the development of the final 2026 Climate Plan, and a potential Building Performance Standard.

We share the City's commitment to reducing emissions and believe that durable, effective policy requires continued collaboration and careful consideration of implementation challenges. We remain committed to collaborating on equitable, effective policy solutions that reduce carbon emissions and offer the following comments and questions about this legislation.

Emission Reduction Baseline Considerations

San Francisco's commercial building owners and managers are committed to creating a cleaner environment and began decarbonizing their buildings before the city proposed a local Building Performance Standard (BPS). At the same time, our members have navigated extraordinary challenges, including historically low occupancy rates and reduced operational demand caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the draft 2025 Climate Action Plan the Department proposed a 2022 baseline for emission reductions. In response, in our June 2025 letter we advocated using 2019 as a base year as it is the only reliable year that captures normal operating conditions. Importantly, this legislation differs from both positions and proposes using 2020 as the baseline year for emission reductions. **We respectfully wish to maintain our position that 2019 is the appropriate, fair and reasonable baseline year for emissions reductions.**

As we know, 2020 was the year the COVID-19 pandemic began – causing buildings to have drastically different operating conditions than normal, with some reducing their energy consumption due to high vacancy and others increasing their consumption to enhance ventilation and filtration efforts. It is problematic to use 2020 as a baseline year because it distorts the reality of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The table below illustrates the progression of SF office occupancy through the pandemic and its aftermath:

Year	Office Vacancy	Physical Occupancy (Kastle)	Status
2019	5.7%	~100% of normal	Full operations
2020	16.7%	~25% average	Pandemic shutdown
2022	27.0%	~40%	Partial return
2024	34-37%	~45-47%	Stabilized hybrid

Analysis of the city's benchmark database[1] shows that in 2020, 89% of commercial buildings had lower total emissions than in 2019, with a median 2020-to-2019 GHG ratio of 0.771. For buildings that were nearly empty in 2020, a "20% reduction from 2020" translates to roughly a 38% reduction from normal pre-pandemic operations – the baseline year is a significant and material change for our members.

A 2019 baseline is the most accurate and defensible reference point because it reflects buildings operating as designed, rather than under pandemic-related constraints or transitional conditions. Today, office occupancy has stabilized at approximately 45% of pre-pandemic levels, significantly below 2019 but well above 2020. Neither 2020 nor 2022 represents a steady-state operating condition. Using a 2020 baseline instead effectively measures performance against an anomalous year, resulting in targets that are misaligned with real-world operations.

While we do not oppose this legislation on this issue alone, we want to clearly register our concern and request that the baseline year be revisited as the Department develops the 2026 CAP and any future BPS. Establishing a fair and accurate baseline is critical to ensuring continued industry engagement and the long-term success of the City's building decarbonization efforts.

[1] Analysis of city-provided benchmark report data as accessed from data.sfgov.org, April 10, 2026 data set.

Implementation Timeline: Phased Compliance from BPS Enactment

This legislation establishes a 20% emissions reduction target by 2030. We understand that the Department may develop a Building Performance Standard ("BPS") to achieve this target, likely through a separate ordinance following adoption of the 2026 Climate Action Plan. Based on typical legislative and rulemaking timelines, this process could take several months to a year or more, which could place BPS enactment as late as 2028.

With the 2030 deadline approximately 3.5 years away, a BPS enacted in 2028 would leave building owners with roughly two years to comply. Major capital projects—such as HVAC system replacements, electrification upgrades, and building envelope improvements—typically require 18–36 months from design through completion for large commercial buildings. A two-year compliance window is therefore not feasible for most properties that have not already initiated planning and investment.

To ensure successful implementation, **BOMA requests establishing a phased compliance period of at least five years from the date of BPS enactment**, regardless of the underlying Chapter 9 target. We welcome the opportunity to work with the Department to develop a timeline that is both ambitious and achievable.

Flexibility Mechanisms and Incentives

BOMA San Francisco supports the City's goal of net zero emissions by 2040. Achieving this goal will require meaningful flexibility and a clear understanding of the practical realities facing building owners. Reducing gas use in large commercial buildings often requires replacing boilers, domestic hot water systems, and other equipment with electric alternatives. For a typical office building, a full boiler-to-heat-pump conversion can cost between $20–$100 per square foot, depending on system complexity and required electrical upgrades. Hotels and other high-load buildings may face even higher costs. These capital investments are substantial and are typically passed through to tenants under cost sharing lease clauses.

As currently drafted, this legislation does not include offsetting mechanisms—such as carbon credits, alternative compliance pathways, or portfolio-based flexibility—and removes the prior Section 906 market-based compliance framework. Without these tools, building owners have limited options to meet targets in a cost-effective and operationally feasible manner. Our analysis of city benchmark data indicates that a significant majority of commercial buildings are not currently on a trajectory to meet the 20% reduction target by 2030, underscoring the urgency of meaningful incentives and technical assistance.

To support successful implementation, we urge the Department to re-incorporate multiple compliance pathways, including portfolio-based approaches, recognition of early action, and other market-based mechanisms. Timelines should reflect long-term capital planning cycles, and enforcement should account for good-faith efforts to comply.

Aligning policy requirements with the financial and operational realities of commercial real estate will be critical to achieving emissions reductions at scale.

These considerations are particularly important for small business tenants, who are often least equipped to absorb increased costs. Because most commercial buildings operate as pass-through entities, both capital and operating expenses are ultimately borne by tenants. As San Francisco works to revitalize its downtown, climate policy should avoid placing additional financial strain on the businesses the City is seeking to attract and retain.

Finally, we encourage the Department to explore incentive-based approaches to support compliance, as outlined in our June 2025 letter. This could include identifying and leveraging local, state, and federal funding opportunities for energy retrofits, as well as developing programs that reward early action. For example, Washington State's Early Adopter Incentive Program under its Clean Buildings Performance Standard provides financial support for buildings that achieve early compliance. We welcome the opportunity to partner with the Department to explore similar models in San Francisco.

Clarify the "18,000 Buildings" Metric

Sec. 902(b)(2) offers an alternative compliance path: "decarbonizing the equivalent of 18,000 buildings." This metric is:

- New: It never appeared in the draft CAP or prior stakeholder discussions
- Undefined: There is no definition of what "decarbonized" means for a building
- Potentially citywide: It could be measured at the portfolio level rather than per building

As currently written, this provision creates uncertainty regarding how compliance would be measured and implemented**. We urge the Department to clearly define this metric and its intended application prior to release of the 2026 Climate Action Plan to ensure transparency and effective stakeholder engagement.**

Align San Francisco BPS with Statewide Metrics

This legislation requires the Department to produce an updated Climate Action Plan by December 31, 2026, and grants permissive authority to "adopt rules and regulations" (Sec. 905(a)(4)). The Department will develop the 2026 CAP, which may include a Building Performance Standard ("BPS") as the State of California is developing a statewide BPS through the California Energy Commission ("CEC").

As San Francisco advances a local BPS, **we urge the Department to define the "building emissions" metric and align San Francisco's BPS with the State's expected total site Energy Use Intensity ("EUI") framework to avoid conflicting compliance requirements.**

The legislation references “building emissions” without defining the measurement metric. During the stakeholder process, the Department communicated a focus on gas-only emissions. The CEC is expected to recommend a total site EUI metric in its forthcoming report. These approaches are fundamentally different: a gas-only metric incentivizes electrification but does not account for electric efficiency, while a total EUI metric captures both. Without alignment, BOMA members could face duplicative or conflicting compliance obligations under local and state BPS programs.

Building owners require regulatory certainty to make long-term capital investment decisions. Aligning San Francisco’s BPS metric with the state’s anticipated approach would reduce complexity, avoid conflicting compliance signals, and create a more consistent regulatory environment. It would also recognize the significant electric-side efficiency investments already made by building owners, including lighting retrofits, controls upgrades, and Title 24-compliant tenant improvements, as well as ongoing contributions to grid decarbonization through CleanPowerSF and the obligation to purchase 100% renewable power.

We also request clarity on the emission factors that will be used to calculate “building emissions.” The CEC’s statewide BPS is expected to use grid-average emission factors consistent with EPA Portfolio Manager methodology. If San Francisco uses a different accounting approach – for example, crediting the City’s 100% renewable electricity ordinance and treating local electric consumption as zero-emission – the resulting compliance framework could diverge significantly from the state standard even if both nominally measure “total emissions.” We urge the Department to specify the emission factor methodology as part of the 2026 CAP to provide building owners with a clear and predictable compliance framework.

We also reiterate our request from the June 2025 letter that the CAP clearly specify the data sources used to determine compliance. Based on prior discussions, we understand that data collected under the Existing Commercial Buildings Energy Performance Ordinance through ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager will serve as the basis, and we urge the Department to confirm this in the final Plan.

We welcome the new public dashboard requirement under Sec. 905(a)(2) and urge the Department to include building-level benchmarking data and clear progress metrics that allow building owners to track their standing relative to any future BPS targets.

Finally, we encourage the Department to provide regular benchmarking feedback to building owners, clearly communicate how performance targets will be calibrated over time, and coordinate closely with state agencies to streamline reporting requirements. Transparency and alignment will help ensure that benchmarking remains a constructive, predictable tool for improving building performance.

Conclusion

BOMA San Francisco supports the goals of this legislation and the City's broader commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As the Department advances the 2026 Climate Action Plan and considers a Building Performance Standard, we ask that the baseline year, emissions metric, implementation timeline, and compliance flexibility be clearly defined, achievable, and aligned with state efforts. We have documented areas where this legislation diverges from positions discussed during the stakeholder process – not to oppose the legislation, but to ensure that these differences are addressed through continued collaboration as the Department moves toward implementation.

We remain committed to working in partnership with the Department and City leaders to develop practical, effective solutions that balance environmental goals with economic realities. By prioritizing collaboration, transparency, and flexibility, San Francisco can continue to lead on climate while supporting a resilient and competitive commercial real estate market.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input and look forward to continued engagement on the development of the final 2026 Climate Action Plan and any future Building Performance Standard.

Sincerely,



John R. Bryant
Chief Executive Officer
BOMA San Francisco

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject: FW: Tackle Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:50:37 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from a member of the public regarding:

> **File No. 250991:** Resolution urging the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to develop and implement a comprehensive enforcement and intervention plan to address drug use or suspected drug activity especially within 250 feet of parks, playgrounds, schools, and youth centers including issuing citations, conducting assessments, and removing individuals for processing or detoxification services.

Sincerely,

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

From: System No-Reply <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 9:46 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Tackle Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	System No-Reply
Email	example@example.com

District

D5

Subject

Tackle Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Supervisor Mahmood + Office:

I’m writing to urge you to uphold the Board's resolution calling on SFPD, DEM, DPW, and DPH, to tackle illegal drug activity 250 feet near schools, parks, and playgrounds, specifically Sgt. John Macaulay Park, on the Larkin/O'Farrell block.

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

San Franciscans expect action when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Item 24

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Support for the Pacific Islander Cultural District
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:57:46 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Neo Veavea from the United Territories of Pacific Islanders Alliance (UTOPIA), regarding:

> **File No. 260179:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Pacific Islander Cultural District in and around the Visitacion Valley and Sunnydale neighborhoods; to require the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to submit written reports and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor describing the cultural attributes of the District and proposing strategies to acknowledge and preserve the cultural legacy of the District; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Sincerely,

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

From: UTOPIA San Francisco. <utopiasf.org@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 7:23 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Gaynor Siataga <gaynorsiataga@hotmail.com>; Gaynor Siataga <gsiataga@yahoo.com>; Gaynor Siataga <siataga@gmail.com>
Subject: Support for the Pacific Islander Cultural District

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

Talofa,

My name is Neo Veavea, and I am writing in strong support of the Pacific Islander Cultural District.c

As a longtime community leader, 60 year resident of Visitacion Valley and representative of UTOPIA SF (United Territories of Pacific Islanders Alliance, established in 1998), I have witnessed firsthand the impact that culturally rooted spaces have on our community.

For over 25 years, UTOPIA SF has provided vital support to Pacific Islander LGBTQ+ individuals and families—creating spaces for healing, leadership, and connection. Our work, rooted in San Francisco, has helped inspire the growth of similar organizations across the country, expanding visibility and opportunity for Pacific Islanders nationwide.

The Cultural District is essential in preserving the spaces and institutions that make this work possible. It protects our history, safeguards our community gathering places, and ensures that future generations can continue to thrive in a city that recognizes their presence and contributions.

Pacific Islanders have long played a role in strengthening San Francisco—through service, cultural leadership, and community care. This district ensures that our legacy is not only remembered, but protected and uplifted.

I respectfully urge you to honor and protect the Pacific Islander Cultural District and the community it represents.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to equity and inclusion.

Sincerely,

Fa'afetai tele lava,

Iereneo T Veavea (Neo)
Community Leader | U.T.O.P.I.A San Francisco

United Territories of Pacific Islanders Alliance (UTOPIA SF)
Empowering our LGBTQ+ Pacific Islander Family

utopiasf.org@gmail.com
(415) 359-4683

"Soifua maloloina ma le alofa — wishing you health, love, and unity."

click here for our story Visibility At Pride

Support our fundraiser for SF Pride 2026

Click Link *GoFund*

Item 25

From:	Alcantar, Justice (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Letter from Laurie J. Mullins
Date:	Wednesday, April 15, 2026 2:21:03 PM
Attachments:	PC 17 - Lorie J. Mullins.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached communication from Lorie J. Mullins for your consideration.

Sincerely,

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

March 31, 2026

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 APR 15 AM08:47
BOS-11

Office of the Attorney General
State of California
455 Golden Gate Ave., #11000
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Angel Herrera

Dear Sir/Madam:

Since 1999, my address has been in Pacifica, California. My next door neighbors, the Herrera's, had been there years before that time. They had a son, Angel who will be 22 in September, is 6' tall and weighs 140lbs. I've known him since birth. Aside from some juvenile issues in his early teens, that behavior is all behind him and has been for some time. He has since fallen in love and has a Significant Other ("SO") that has already given him a 3yo daughter, and is due to birth his son. Angel is a soft spoken, quiet and calm young man and is always courteous and respectful to all human beings. Unfortunately, the law enforcement of several cities in 4 counties have been working overtime to harass him and are looking to "tie him" to an armed robbery.

For the recent history to my personal knowledge, I have watched what it's like to get into the system and forever have a target on your back. For instance:

- Driving to his parents home for a family celebration, 2 officers saw him, made a U-turn and followed him home and wanted to do a pat down. He had his SO and her mother in the car and they correctly objected. As he was home, his mother, sister and neighbors came out to see what the commotion was. The first car called for back up, so now there were 2 cars and 4 officers at the scene. When all of us ladies tried to talk them out of searching Angel for driving on the street, they called for a Supervisor to come for "crowd control". That was 2 more cars and 4 more officers. All blocking our quiet little street and making a scary presence. It was agreed to being searched, they found nothing and then left. During this entire time, Angel was leaning on a car parked on the street and said absolutely nothing as opposed to the women who love him, and we were quite verbal. Before the 8-10 officers left and clearing the street, hands were shaken with Angel and then quiet.

- In the middle of the week at about 6:15am, we were awakened by loud pounding on the front door. When the door was opened, a man dressed in combat gear like he was going to Afghanistan and carrying a very large gun, stated that they were looking for "an escaping armed fugitive" and could they go into the backyard. He was told No. Upon hearing this he told his partner access was denied even though this individual had already unlocked the gate to the backyard and was preparing to enter. These two men left the property and we could see what looked like 2 huge SWAT tanks with City of San Jose on the side and the man with a bull horn who had screamed "Angel Herrera come out of the house with your hands up." Hearing that shockingly loud command, Angel went into flight mode and took off out the back. Hence, the door to door knocking seeking permission to enter backyards. Looking across the street at the houses, it could be seen that at the end of each driveway there stood another officer in combat gear, no less than 6 police cars in addition to the tanks were blocking the street at both ends and the cul-de-sac. There was a K-9 unit and we looked up to see at least 2 drones in the air. Since Angel did not come out, the officers breached through the front door and their

entry was scary to his then 2 yo daughter sleeping in the living room, his family and the other occupants of the home.* The police proceeded to remove the occupants wearing their pajamas (it had starting to rain lightly), and they were moved up the street into a neighbor's driveway. In the meantime, they used flash bangs outside their house and by now the entire street was awake and coming out to see. Soon, Angel was seen standing in someone's backyard and the command was given by the K-9 handler to attack. To this day he has nerve damage to his arm from that incident. Angel was taken by ambulance to SF General. The officers came into the house, disengaged the Ring cameras, and proceeded to aggressively ransack the house. During the search they confiscated cash that belonged to his parents, they took the ATM card and driver's license for his SO. For that time the occupants of the Herrera household were not allowed to return home and it completely disrupted their daily routine and frightened these kind people. Angel was taken to the hospital and his parents nor a lawyer was allowed to talk or see him. He was there for several days and WAS NOT charged with a crime, yet they transferred him to Santa Clara County and was still incommunicado. After several days he was just let go! At midnight this criminal mastermind they are trying to make him out to be, called his mom and asked her to come get him because it was dark and intimidating. She called Uber to bring him home. He was denied access to an attorney and was let go without being charged, but the incident reached the State agency their clients were under the purview of, who then came very soon and removed all of their clients (and their livelihood), and relocated them (some of these fragile folks had lived there for years and was thought of like family), and the Herrera's lost their license. Imagine how shocking and disruptive this must have been for those gentle people. The street was not returned to normal until after noon on that day. 6 hours of police presence that did not result in a criminal charge. There must have been 15 officers from 2 different counties and/or cities attacking that house. How much did that cost the taxpayers?

**Angel's parents, Mr. & Mrs. Herrera were licensed by the State as caretakers in their home for adult's incapable of living on their own due to health reasons. They are caring and compassionate people who consider these gentle people as family. They are included in all family functions; their daily lives include offsite activities; taken to medical appointments; and the infrastructure of daily living is consistent. For 30 years, the Herrera's have been caring for people, and yet this single incident (with no findings of fact, obviously, it was due to the over the top and intimidating police presence), in their complaint free history has cost them their license. Apparently, no one gave any thought about these fragile people and the potential trauma of suddenly being taken from a dependable home and thrust into the unknown.*

- About the time of the Pacifica raid was happening the house where Angel was staying in San Francisco was also breached (luckily, no one was home), and not only completely tossed but furniture was damaged or destroyed. This was the home of his SO's mother. Is the SFPD involved too?

- The most recent incident was Angel driving home alone in San Rafael, his car was tagged for whatever reason, so he was "boxed" in and pulled over. The officers shattered the driver's window and dragged him out of the car. During that scuffle they used pepper spray and tased him and later stated in their report that "he attacked them." When in reality they were laughing and having a good time roughing up the 140 lb young man as if he was the threat. After being brought in, they found his name in the system and locked him up. Again, not allowed to call or be seen by anyone. Finally, it was conveyed that $5,000 was the bail amount and his parents paid it. Then they were told they had to wait 5 days until his release because "they" had to determine if he was a threat to society. Ultimately, Santa Clara County was notified and he was moved there. San

Rafael PD has not refunded the bail money nor did they charge him with anything. The Santa Clara prosecutor is trying to "tie him" to an armed robbery in San Jose and he has been incarcerated (but not charged) for that reason. It has been plausible speculation that someone directly involved in the armed robbery is giving up names to reduce their own liability. If there are undisputed facts or evidence that he was at that robbery, then he should be charged with a crime. But he has spent a lot of time in at least 2 different jails without being charged with a crime. He is not in a gang. He just wants to make a living and take care of his family, preferably without the police breathing down his neck for no reason.

How many thousands of dollars have been wasted by at least 4 different counties on this young man without any charges being filed? The money spent by his parents for attorneys is obscene. And after losing their livelihood, it reeks of punitive retribution. The Herrera family are Latino and US citizens, so it doesn't seem like a leap to suspect racial profiling. Don't know what kind of burr got under the saddle of the ADA, but perhaps their ladder climbing ambitions should not rely on "tying him" to a robbery that he was miles away from at the time.

Again, if there is **evidence** of him being part of this or any other crime, then charge him and have a jury decide. If there is **no evidence**, then he must be released (some of the participants in the subject armed robbery have been released with ankle bracelets, but not Angel), and let him be there for his newborn son.

As his neighbor and friend, this has been stressful for many people. Angels 2 yo daughter has trigger responses due to that very loud early morning breach. He is surrounded by people who care for him and consistently support his accomplishment to stay clean with the law and take care of his family. All of us have been affected by this blatant disregard for his rights, and it's disheartening to witness local law enforcement cannot be trusted to act within the limits and parameters of the law, common sense and civility.

Please see what you can do about this overly reactive and dramatic situation. It appears law enforcement agencies want to participate in this waste of tax dollars and infringe on his right of due process that is guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

Respectfully,

/S/

Lorie J. Mullins
648 Southmoor Dr.
Pacifica, CA 94044
650-738-9372

Cc: Local Bay Area Channels 2, 4, 5 and 7
American Civil Liberties Union
Innocence Project
Marin County District Attorney and San Rafael City Council
San Francisco County District Attorney and City Council
San Mateo County District Attorney and City Council
Santa Clara County District Attorney
San Jose City Council

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Comments for Smoking Ordinance # 260361
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 3:04:25 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Julia Pérez, regarding:

> **File No. 260361:** Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; and eliminating exceptions allowing indoor smoking in bars with no employees, bars with historically compliant semi-enclosed smoking rooms, and hotel rooms, to conform to provisions of California law.

Sincerely,

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

From: Julia Pérez <juliaprz924@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 4:38 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comments for Smoking Ordinance # 260361

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

Mayor and Board of Supervisors,

I recently heard about the new smoking ordinance being proposed and felt compelled to share my opinion which I know is shared by many of my neighbors as well. While I think it is a good idea to bring our local smoking ordinance into compliance with state smoking restrictions, I also think the ADDITIONAL prohibition on smoking on bar patios is very

misguided and should be REMOVED from the ordinance, even though I am sure it is well intentioned.

I've lived in San Francisco for over two decades now in busy commercial neighborhoods like the Mission and the Richmond. Things can often get rowdy outside of bars with people congregating on the sidewalk to smoke particularly at night and on the weekends. However, I've noticed that those few bars with their own smoking patios have been the BEST neighbors. The sidewalks stay clear, and excess noise and litter is reduced. I've sometimes wondered why MORE bars don't have smoking patios since it really does help keep our neighborhoods more tidy and orderly, and it's something we should be encouraging instead of discouraging.

I understand the intention is to keep second hand smoke away from people, and as a nonsmoker myself, I appreciate that. But bar patios reserved for adult patrons are a much better solution than telling smokers to smoke on the sidewalk where even more people are effected. And my understanding is that all indoor portions of bars are already smoke free, so this really is a matter of relocating outdoor smoking from patios to the sidewalk.

Please consider my suggestion and remove the bar patio smoking ban from the ordinance.

Thank You,
Julia Pérez

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Public Comment: Supervisor Dorsey"s recovery advisor at White House pushing unscientific, harmful RFK Jr recovery policies
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 2:42:17 PM
Attachments:	Tom Wolf at WH 2 4-14-26.png Screenshot 2026-04-15 at 1.16.56 PM.png Screenshot 2026-04-15 at 1.16.28 PM.png Screenshot 2026-04-15 at 1.24.35 PM.png

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Lea McGeever regarding various subjects.

Sincerely,

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

From: Lea McGeever <lea.mcgeever@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 1:32 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; dorseyintern@gmail.com; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment: Supervisor Dorsey's recovery advisor at White House pushing unscientific, harmful RFK Jr recovery policies

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm afraid I feel compelled to once again point out how the SF BOS is working with harmful, conservative people and pushing an unscientific, marginalizing, racist, queerphobic agenda. I've done this repeatedly without result since the BOS continues to pass Dorsey's abstinence-oriented, anti-harm reduction policies. But at least I'll be able to tell the people that you do indeed know, you've known for years, and are complicit in the social regression happening right now.

Let's establish that Dorsey is still publicly supporting Tom Wolf's anti-harm reduction work:



Let's establish that the Drug-Free Sidewalks group that Dorsey is an advisory committee member of also is involved with Tom Wolf as his X handle TWolfRecovery is tagged in this Drug-Free Sidewalks post, which Dorsey also reposted from his X account:




Now here is Tom Wolf at Trump's White House disparaging harm reduction, a scientifically proven method of saving lives, especially BIPOC LGBTQ+ lives, saying "radical harm reduction is on the way out and we are ushering in a new era of recovery from addictions as a solution to the drug and homeless crisis." He says in the video "accountability is a cornerstone of recovery" which so far has meant punishing and criminalizing people who cannot or will not be abstinent.



Let's establish that Tom Wolf markets himself as a recovery advocate in San Francisco and has tagged Michael Shellenberger in this post.



And my own social media rant about the BOS's complicity in supporting Matt Dorsey/Tom Wolf's agenda here in SF. Shame on you all for every AYE vote you gave these policies that hurt the poor the most, that hurt the most marginalized the most. Shame shame shame.



--D6 resident

Lea McGeever, again

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: The Great Hyw
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 3:11:39 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from John Taylor regarding the Great Highway/Sunset Dunes.

Sincerely,

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

From: John Taylor <wxyz8125@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2026 6:56 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: The Great Hyw:

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

I was on Sloat Bivd. yesterday and wanted to get to Lincoln ave. to Golden Gate Park. Will needless to say I had to
take 47th street to get to the park. What a waste of time ,all the stop signs and triffic. Who ever thougth to close the
Great Hyw. What a bad idea. I noticed that the so called street park was not being used. That Hyw. was always a
good and fast way to get to Golden Gate park and beond. Note we have a beautiful park for us for recreation. Why close
the Great Hyw makes no sence to me (Stupid idea). When I finaly got to the park I could not enter the park
from Lincoln ave. I wanted to see the Windmills could not get in because the park entance is closed to traiffic. All

I have to say you ,I ask the broad of supervisors they need to rethink these things. You have made it harder to visit
the Park or traveling by the Ocean on The Great Hyw. Please do something and pay attention to this problem.
Thank you

Item 29

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Don"t Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 3:39:54 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Fiora Watts regarding zoning.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations, Administrative Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 230001: General Plan Amendments - Housing Element 2022 Update

File No, 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250985: Local Coastal Program Amendment - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

Sincerely,

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

-----Original Message-----
From: fiora.watts@everyactioncustom.com <fiora.watts@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 11:25 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Don't Block Common-Sense and Compliant Amendments [File Nos. 250700, 251073, 251072, 230001, 250701, 250985, 251071, 250966]

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors Dorsey, Fielder, Mayor Lurie and others,

The Land Use Committee, on a vote of 2-1, has blocked Supervisor Chan's amendments and its Chair declined to invite HCD, the state oversight agency, to answer questions publicly.

The Committee must advance these compliant amendments for the protection of sound housing, historic resources, and our coastline to the full Board so the public can see where every Supervisor stands.

HCD leadership should also appear before the Board to explain how the housing numbers are calculated and how the proposed upzoning affects compliance.

San Franciscans deserve transparent and accountable planning.

Additional comments: As a long-time resident of Ingleside Terrances, I am alarmed and disgusted by the proposed buildings that would permanently change the look and feel of the neighborhood I love. These monstrous buildings are completely out of scale with surrounding single family homes, would block views, depreciate housing value, bring noise, chaos and displacement to thousands of residents, and would be a disaster for a quiet neighborhood like Ingleside where many families like mine have lived for decades. It is a neighborhood where children grew up and are actually returning to as adults because of it's unchanged, serene, almost suburban feel. I have known the same neighbors on our block for years. I do not want to see our homes and peace of mind destroyed. Please do not drive out long time residents and families. I urge you to reject this completely inappropriate and disastrous concept.

Sincerely,
Fiora Watts
San Francisco, CA 94127