File No	250604	Committee Item No Board Item No.	
(	COMMITTEE/BOARI	OF SUPERVISOR	रऽ
	AGENDA PACKET	CONTENTS LIST	
Committee:	Budget and Appropriation		
Board of Su	pervisors Meeting	Date	
Cmte Boa	rd		
	Motion		
	Resolution		
	Ordinance		
	Legislative Digest		
	<b>Budget and Legislative A</b>	-	
	Youth Commission Repo	rt	
	Introduction Form		
$\boxtimes$ $\square$	Department/Agency Cove	•	
_ • MYR	Submission Letter 5/30/20	25	
	MOU		
	Grant Information Form		
	Grant Budget		
$\vdash$	Subcontract Budget		
H	Contract/Agreement	In all a m	
H	Form 126 – Ethics Comm	ISSION	
H	Award Letter		
H	Application		
	Public Correspondence		
OTHER	(Click on hyperlink to be	forwarded to the Legisla	ativo Rosparch
	ew the entirety of volumin		itive ixescarcii
OCITICI TO VI	ow the chinety of volumn	ous accuments <sub></sub>	
$\square$	MYR Trailing Legislation	₋ist	
	MYR 30-Day Waiver Req		
		- 30-Day Waiver 6/5/202	5
	CEQA Determination 6/4/	-	
	10-Day Fee Ad Notice 6/1	8/2025	
	CEQA Referral 6/3/2025		
	REC Presentation 6/20/20	)25	
	MYR Letter 6/25/2025		
	10-Day Fee Ad Notice 7/9	9/2025	
			_
Completed	hu. Pront Iolina	Doto Luky 2 2025	
•	by: Brent Jalipa	DateJuly 2, 2025	)
Completed	<b>by:</b> Brent Jalipa	Date	

## AMENDED IN COMMITTEE 6/25/2025 ORDINANCE NO.

FILE NO. 250604

1	[Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields: Golf Course Fees Generally]
2	
3	Ordinance amending the Park Code to 1) authorize the Recreation and Park Department
4	to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor
5	event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other
6	costs related to maintaining those City properties; 2) increase golf course fees by
7	increasing the San Francisco resident rates at certain courses, by increasing the cost
8	of golf cards that entitle Pacifica residents to resident discounts at Sharp Park, by
9	adjusting weekend hours, and by limiting resident senior discounts to weekdays; 3)
10	require the Recreation and Park Department on an ongoing basis to post and update
11	on its website the golf course fees in lieu of listing those fees in the Park Code; and 4)
12	make various clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's
13	determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.
14 15	NOTE: Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain Arial font.  Additions to Codes are in <u>single-underline italics Times New Roman font</u> .  Deletions to Codes are in <u>strikethrough italics Times New Roman font</u> .
16	Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.  Board amendment deletions are in strikethrough Arial font.  Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code
17	subsections or parts of tables.
18	
19	Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:
20	
21	Section 1. Environmental Findings.
22	The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
23	ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
24	Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
25	

1	Supervisors in File No. 250604 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms
2	this determination.
3	
4	Section 2. Purpose.
5	(a) Like many City departments, the Recreation and Park Department has begun to
6	experience increased costs to operate and maintain its properties, including due to an
7	updated structure for sewer bills that will lead to the Department paying an increased amount
8	for stormwater runoff from park property. These updates have led to the projection of deep,
9	structural deficits to the Recreation and Park Department's budget that could trigger cuts to
10	essential park services. The Board of Supervisors finds it is necessary to adjust the fees for
11	using the park facilities that contribute most to these costs, so that the Department can
12	continue to maintain existing levels of service across the board.
13	(b) The Park Code references fee amounts for the golf courses that do not reflect
14	the Controller's annual adjustments to those fees based on changes in the Consumer Price
15	Index. This ordinance removes out-of-date fee amounts from the Park Code and directs the
16	Recreation and Park Department to maintain a current fee schedule on its website.
17	
18	Section 3. Article 12 of the Park Code is hereby amended by adding Section 12.10.
19	revising Sections 12.12, deleting Sections 12.12.1, 12.12.2, 12.12.3, 12.12.4, 12.12.5, and
20	12.12.6, and revising Sections 12.20, 12.22, 12.23, and 12.36, to read as follows:
21	SEC. 12.10. AUTHORIZATION TO IMPOSE FEES.
22	The Department shall charge fees as authorized by the Board of Supervisors by
23	ordinance. This Article 12 codifies various base fees as of the date that the Board approved
24	those fees. The base fees for golf courses are stated in uncodified Section 4 of Ordinance
25	No, available in Board File No. 250604 and on the Board website. Article 12 and

1	Ordinance No. do not necessarily reflect the current fee amounts, as the Controller
2	annually adjusts base fees to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index under Park Code
3	Section 12.20. The Department shall regularly publish on its website a fee schedule that
4	shows the current fee amounts, inclusive of annual adjustments. Notwithstanding these
5	procedures, the Board may modify the fees by ordinance at any time.
6	
7	SEC. 12.12. GOLF FEES – GENERAL.
8	(a) Authorization. The Recreation and Park Department (the "Department") is hereby
9	authorized to charge fees at the San Francisco municipal golf courses at Harding Park,
10	Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, Golden Gate Park, and McLaren Park (collectively, the
11	"Golf Courses") in the manner and in conformance with the standards set forth herein <u>, in the</u>
12	amounts authorized in Section 4 of Ordinance No. , available in Board of Supervisors
13	File No. 250604, and as adjusted by . Tthe Department and the Controller shall adjust golf
14	fees in accordance with Section 12.20 of this Article 12.
15	(b) Discount Fee Categories.
16	(1) Resident Junior Rates shall apply to persons 17 years of age and under.
17	(2) Resident Rates shall apply to persons holding Resident Golf Cards.
18	(3) Resident Senior Rates shall apply to persons 65 years of age and above
19	holding Resident Golf Cards.
20	(4) Tournament Rates.
21	(A) Tournament Rates shall apply to persons playing in the Family Tournament
22	held at Golden Gate Park, the City Championship held at Lincoln Park and Harding Park, and
23	any other City-sponsored City-sponsored tournament approved by the Department General
24	Manager or his or herthe General Manager's designee. Residents shall pay Tournament

Rates, not Resident Rates, for tournament play.

1	(B) Junior Tournament Rates are equal to 50% of the regular Tournament Rate
2	and shall apply to all players aged 17 years and under who are participating in the Family
3	Tournament or the City Championship, and to all groups of 16 or more players aged 17 years
4	and under with respect to any other City-sponsored tournament that the Department may
5	approve pursuant to subsection (b)(4)(A). <u>Tournament organizers are required to include this</u>
6	discount when charging fees to juniors to participate in tournaments.
7	(5) Resident Twilight Rates shall apply to rounds by persons holding Resident
8	Golf Cards that commence no earlier than four hours before sunset, as determined by the
9	Department.
10	(c) Resident Golf Cards.
11	— (1) The Department shall charge a fee of \$90 for a San Francisco Resident Golf
12	Card, entitling the holder to discounts (Resident Rates) on the Golf Courses for two years
13	from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to San Francisco residents and/or San
14	Francisco property owners only upon presentation of valid proof of residency or ownership.
15	— (2) The Department shall charge a fee of \$60 for a Pacifica Resident Golf Card
16	entitling the holder to discounts (Resident Rates) at the Sharp Park Golf Course only, for two
17	years from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to Pacifica residents only upon
18	presentation of valid proof of residency.
19	— (3) The Department shall charge a fee of \$25 for replacement of San Francisco
20	Resident Golf Cards and Pacifica Resident Golf Cards.
21	— (4) If a San Francisco or Pacifica resident golf card application is returned to the
22	applicant because the information on the application is incorrect or incomplete, there shall be
23	an additional administrative fee of \$5.
24	

#### (c)(d) Flexible Pricing.

- (1) Except where a particular fee or charge is specifically listed in this Article 12 or in Section 4 of Ordinance No.

  Sections 12.12.1 through 12.12.6, the Department General Manager or his or her the General Manager's designee may impose a fee or charge for all other golf-related services or items, and may approve temporary fee increases and/or decreases in those fees and charges from time to time, based on one or more of the following factors: the type of use, fluctuations in customer demand at particular times or on particular days or dates or as among different Golf Courses, rates at comparable courses, and course conditions.
- (2) The Department General Manager or his or herthe General Manager's designee may also apply the factors identified in subsection (c)(d)(1) to approve the following temporary increases and/or decreases to any category of Resident Rates and any category of Tournament Rates:
  - (1)(A) discounts of up to 50% for Resident Rates;
    - (2)(B) increases of up to 50% for Tournament Rates;
- 16 (3)(C) increases of up 25% for Resident Rates; and
  - (D) increases of up to 50% for Resident Rates at Harding Park only during major City-wide special events.
    - (e) Reservations. The Department may charge persons holding any category of Resident Golf Cards an additional reservation fee of \$15 per reservation for any advance reservation made between 8 and 30 days before the reserved tee time, and may charge persons who do not hold a Resident Golf Card an appropriate reservation fee based on the flexible pricing standards set forth in subsection (d)(1).
    - (f) Special Projects Maintenance Fee. The Department shall require each player at Harding Park, Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, and Golden Gate Park who is above the

- age of 17 to pay an additional fee for that Golf Course of \$2 per nine holes, which the
   Department shall set aside in a separate fund for that Golf Course to pay for special
   maintenance repairs or course improvements.
  - (g) Cost Recovery Fee. For the use of the City Golf Courses, the Department shall require each player to pay an additional surcharge of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, to cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses.

#### SEC. 12.12.1. HARDING PARK GOLF COURSE.

#### (a) Greens Fees.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonThurs.)	Weekend (FriSun.)
Resident	<del>\$52</del>	<del>\$66</del>
Resident Twilight	<del>\$41</del>	<del>\$50</del>
Resident Junior	<del>\$20</del>	<del>\$25</del>
Resident Senior	<del>\$37</del>	<del>\$66</del>
Tournament	<del>\$125</del>	<del>\$135</del>

(b) Replay Rate. A same-day replay rate is available to golfers holding a Resident Golf Card who complete an 18-hole round. The replay rate shall be 30% of the originally purchased round. The replay round must be used by the purchaser of the full price round. Replay rounds may not be reserved in advance.

#### SEC. 12.12.2. FLEMING GOLF COURSE.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonFri. noon)	Weekend (Fri. noon- Sun.)
Resident	<del>\$22</del>	<del>\$24</del>
Resident Senior	<del>\$16</del>	<del>\$21</del>

Resident Junior	<del>\$12</del>	<del>\$15</del>
Tournament	<del>\$32</del>	\$43

#### SEC. 12.12.3. LINCOLN PARK GOLF COURSE.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonFri. noon)	Weekend (Fri. noon- Sun.)
Resident	<del>\$24</del>	<del>\$29</del>
Resident Senior	<del>\$14</del>	<del>\$22</del>
Resident Junior	<del>\$12</del>	<del>\$17</del>
Tournament	\$44	<del>\$54</del>

#### SEC. 12.12.4. SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonFri. noon)	Weekend (Fri. noon- Sun.)
Resident	<del>\$25</del>	<del>\$30</del>
Resident Senior	<del>\$15</del>	<del>\$23</del>
Resident Junior	<del>\$13</del>	<del>\$18</del>
Tournament	<del>\$47</del>	<del>\$57</del>

#### SEC. 12.12.5. GOLDEN GATE PARK GOLF COURSE.

#### <del>(a) Greens Fees.</del>

Fee Category	Weekday (MonFri. noon)	Weekend (Fri. noon-Sun.)
Resident	<del>\$12</del>	<del>\$14</del>
Resident Senior	<del>\$9</del>	<del>\$12</del>
Resident Junior	<del>\$6</del>	\$8
Tournament	<del>\$19</del>	<del>\$27</del>

(b) The Family Tournament. The Family Tournament has been hosted at Golden Gate Park Golf Course for over 50 years and is open to everyone. The Family Tournament is a group of 16 or more players composed of two family members alternating shots, playing two rounds of nine holes. The Junior Tournament Rate shall be applicable only to team members 17 years old and younger. The fee per team shall be the sum of the fees for one round of the applicable Tournament Rate per person per day.

#### SEC. 12.12.6. MCLAREN PARK (GLENEAGLES) GOLF COURSE.

Fee CategoryWeekday (Mon.-Thurs.)Weekend (Fri.-Sun.)Resident – 9 holes\$24\$28Resident – 18 holes\$32\$40Resident Senior – 9 holes\$20N/AResident Junior – 9 holes\$15N/A

#### SEC. 12.20. ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.

 (a)—Beginning with fiscal year 2003-2004, fees set forth in this Article 12, unless otherwise specified, may be adjusted each year, without further action by the Board of Supervisors, to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index (CPI), as determined by the Controller.

No later than April 15 of each year, the Recreation and Parks Department shall submit its current fee schedule to the Controller, who shall apply the price index adjustment to produce a new fee schedule for the following year.

No later than May 15 of each year, the Controller shall file a report with the Board of Supervisors (i) reporting the new fee schedule, and (ii) identifying any fees that produce

1	revenue which is significantly more than the costs of providing the services for which each fee
2	is assessed and describing how such revenue is used by the Department or the City.
3	(b) Through and until fiscal year 2017-18, all golf fees for San Francisco residents,
4	juniors, seniors may be increased annually by the CPI, or up to \$1.00, upon approval of the
5	Recreation and Park Commission; and all golf fees for non-S.F. residents and tournaments
6	may be increased by two times (2X) the CPI, or up to \$1.00, whichever is greater, upon
7	approval of the Recreation and Park Commission. Beginning with fiscal year 2018-19, all fees
8	or charges specifically listed in Sections 12.12 through 12.12.6 will be adjusted pursuant to
9	subsection (a) based on the rates most recently approved by the Board of Supervisors or
10	most recently adjusted under this Section 12.20, as applicable.
11	
12	SEC. 12.22. EVENTS.
13	The following fees shall be charged for use of the parks for events:
14	* * * *
15	(i) Cost Recovery Fee for Outdoor Events. The Department shall require an additional
16	surcharge of 10% for the use of the parks for outdoor events, to cover operating costs related to the
17	outdoor event facilities.
18	
19	SEC. 12.23. PICNICS.
20	The following fees shall be charged for use of the parks for picnics per day:
21	* * * *
22	(d) Cost Recovery Fee. For the use of picnic areas, the Department shall require an additional
23	surcharge of \$5 for picnics with up to 100 participants, and \$25 for picnics with more than 100
24	participants, to cover operating costs related to the picnic areas.

1	SEC. 12.36. ATHLETIC FIELD FEES.
2	The following fees shall be charged for use of the athletic fields:
3	* * * *
4	(c) Cost Recovery Fee. The Department shall require an additional surcharge of \$1 per hour
5	for the use of the athletic fields to cover operating costs related to the athletic fields.
6	
7	Section 4. This ordinance section is uncodified.
8	(a) This Section 4 states the fees that the Recreation and Park Department may
9	charge in fiscal year 2025-26 for use of the municipal golf courses at Harding Park, Fleming.
10	Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, Golden Gate Park, and McLaren Park (collectively, the "Golf
11	Courses"), inclusive of prior adjustments to those fees by the Controller under Park Code
12	Section 12.20. In accordance with Park Code Sections 12.10 and 12.20, all of the fees listed
13	in this Section 4 shall constitute base fees and shall be subject to annual adjustment by the
14	<u>Controller.</u>
15	(b) Additional text (< <as and<="" arrows="" at="" beginning="" contrasting="" exemplified="" here,="" td="" with=""></as>
16	end, encompassed in parentheses>>) is included in this Section 4 for informational purposes
17	to describe where this section is enacting changes to certain golf course fees, separate from
18	the Controller adjustments.
19	(c) The Recreation and Park Department shall maintain on an ongoing basis and
20	publish on its website a fee schedule showing the golf course fee amounts in effect.
21	
22	<u>I, GOLF FEES – GENERAL.</u>
23	(a) Resident Golf Cards.
24	(1) The Department shall charge a fee of \$136 for a San Francisco Resident Golf
25	Card, entitling the holder to discounts (Resident Rates) on the Golf Courses for two years

1	from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to San Francisco residents and/or San
2	Francisco property owners only upon presentation of valid proof of residency or ownership.
3	(2) The Department shall charge a fee of \$300 for a Pacifica Resident Golf Card
4	entitling the holder to discounts (Resident Rates) at the Sharp Park Golf Course only, for two
5	years from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to Pacifica residents only upon
6	presentation of valid proof of residency. (<< Prior to the effective date of this ordinance, this
7	<u>fee was \$91.&gt;&gt;)</u>
8	(3) The Department shall charge a fee of \$38 for replacement of San Francisco
9	Resident Golf Cards and Pacifica Resident Golf Cards.
10	(4) If a San Francisco or Pacifica Resident Golf Card application is returned to the
11	applicant because the information on the application is incorrect or incomplete, there shall be
12	an additional administrative fee of \$6.
13	(b) Reservations. The Department may charge persons holding any category of
14	Resident Golf Cards an additional reservation fee of \$19 per reservation for any advance
15	reservation made between 8 and 30 days before the reserved tee time, and may charge
16	persons who do not hold a Resident Golf Card an appropriate reservation fee based on the
17	flexible pricing standards set forth in Park Code Section 12.12(c)(1).
18	(c) Special Projects Maintenance Fee. The Department shall require each player at
19	Harding Park, Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, and Golden Gate Park who is above the
20	age of 17 to pay an additional fee for that Golf Course of \$3 per nine holes, which the
21	Department shall set aside in a separate fund for that Golf Course to pay for special
22	maintenance repairs or course improvements.
23	(d) Cost Recovery Fee. For the use of the Golf Courses, the Department shall
24	require each player to pay an additional surcharge of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, to

1 <u>cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses.</u> (<<This is a new fee that did not exist prior

to the effective date of this ordinance.>>)

#### II. HARDING PARK GOLF COURSE.

(a) Greens Fees.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonThurs.)	Weekend (FriSun.)
Resident	<u>\$91</u>	<u>\$109</u>
Resident Twilight	<u>\$57</u>	<u>\$70</u>
Resident Junior	<u>\$31</u>	<u>\$36</u>
Resident Senior	<u>\$65</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Tournament</u>	<u>\$168</u>	<u>\$181</u>

(<< The above table reflects an increase as of the effective date of this ordinance from the prior Weekday Rates for Residents (\$73) and Resident Seniors (\$52); and an increase from the prior Weekend Rates for Residents (\$91). The Park Code previously listed a Weekend Rate for Resident Seniors, but that rate was the same as the Weekend Rate for Residents (\$91), and therefore did not constitute a further discount for Residents who are Seniors. This table lists the Weekend Rate for Resident Seniors as "N/A" to clarify that Resident Seniors do not receive a further discount on weekends and would instead pay the Resident rates.>>)

(b) Replay Rate. A same-day replay rate is available to golfers holding a Resident Golf Card who complete an 18-hole round. The replay rate shall be 30% of the originally purchased round. The replay round must be used by the purchaser of the full price round. Replay rounds may not be reserved in advance.

#### III. FLEMING GOLF COURSE.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonThurs.)	Weekend (FriSun.)
<u>Resident</u>	<u>\$38</u>	<u>\$44</u>
Resident Senior	<u>\$32</u>	N/A
Resident Junior	<u>\$18</u>	<u>\$22</u>
Tournament	\$4 <u>5</u>	\$60

(<< The above table reflects an increase as of the effective date of this ordinance from the prior Weekday Rates for Residents (\$33) and Resident Seniors (\$26); an increase from the prior Weekend Rates for Residents (\$34); the removal of the prior Weekend Rate for Resident Seniors (\$32) such that Resident Seniors on weekends would pay the regular Resident Rates; and that Weekend Rates will commence on Fridays as of opening time for the course rather than the prior time of Fridays at 12:00 p.m.>>)

#### IV. LINCOLN PARK GOLF COURSE.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonThurs.)	Weekend (FriSun.)
Resident	<u>\$36</u>	<u>\$42</u>
Resident Senior	<u>\$22</u>	N/A
Resident Junior	<u>\$18</u>	<u>\$26</u>
Tournament	<u>\$61</u>	<u>\$75</u>

<u>Veekend Rate for Resident Seniors (\$32) such that Resident Seniors on weekends would</u>
<u>pay the regular Resident Rates; and that Weekend Rates will commence on Fridays as of opening time for the course rather than the prior time of Fridays at 12:00 p.m.>>)</u>

#### V. SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE.

<u>\$50</u>

\$32

**\$19** 

<u>\$70</u>

Fee Category

Resident Senior

Resident Junior

<u>Tournament</u>

Resident

Weekday (Mon.-Thurs.)

Weekend (Fri.-Sun.)

<u>\$60</u>

N/A

\$27

\$90

(<<The above table reflects an increase as of the effective date of this ordinance from the

prior Weekday Rates for Residents (\$37) and Resident Seniors (\$23) and Tournaments (\$66):

weekends would pay the regular Resident Rates; and that Weekend Rates will commence on

Fridays as of opening time for the course rather than the prior time of Fridays at 12:00 p.m.>>)

an increase from the prior Weekend Rates for Residents (\$43) and Tournaments (\$79); the

removal of the Weekend Rate for Resident Seniors (\$34) such that Resident Seniors on

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

### VI. GOLDEN GATE PARK GOLF COURSE.

#### (a) Greens Fees.

16

17

15

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

Fee Category	Weekday (MonThurs.)	Weekend (FriSun.)
Resident	<u>\$19</u>	<u>\$22</u>
Resident Senior	<u>\$15</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Resident Junior	<u>\$10</u>	<u>\$13</u>
<u>Tournament</u>	<u>\$28</u>	<u>\$38</u>

(<< The above table reflects the removal as of the effective date of this ordinance of the prior Weekend Rate for Resident Seniors (\$19) such that Resident Seniors on weekends would pay the regular Resident Rates; and that Weekend Rates will commence on Fridays as of opening time for the course rather than the prior time of Fridays at 12:00 p.m.>>)

(b) The Family Tournament. The Family Tournament has been hosted at Golden
 Gate Park Golf Course for over 50 years and is open to everyone. The Family Tournament is
 a group of 16 or more players composed of two family members alternating shots, playing two
 rounds of nine holes. The Junior Tournament Rate shall be applicable only to team members
 17 years old and younger. The fee per team shall be the sum of the fees for one round of the
 applicable Tournament Rate per person per day.

#### VII. MCLAREN PARK (GLENEAGLES) GOLF COURSE.

Fee Category	Weekday (MonThurs.)	Weekend (FriSun.)
Resident – 9 holes	<u>\$31</u>	<u>\$36</u>
Resident – 18 holes	<u>\$41</u>	<u>\$51</u>
Resident Senior – 9 holes	<u>\$26</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Resident Junior – 9 holes	<u>\$19</u>	<u>N/A</u>

Section <u>5</u>4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within 10 days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

Section <u>6</u>5. Scope of Ordinance.

(a) In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and

1	Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title
2	of the ordinance.
3	(b) The deletion of sections of the Park Code referencing specific fees in Section 3
4	of this ordinance does not mean that the Department is prohibited from charging those fees.
5	Rather, it reflects the intent of this ordinance to remove those fees from the Code and to
6	transition them to the uncodified Section 4 of this ordinance, as provided in said Section 4.
7	
8	Section <u>7</u> 6. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word
9	of this ordinance, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be
10	invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision
11	shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance. The
12	Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each and
13	every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or
14	unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this ordinance or application
15	thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.
16	
17	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
18	DAVID CHIU, City Attorney
19	By: <u>/s/</u> MANU PRADHAN
20	Deputy City Attorney
21	n:\legana\as2025\2500343\01850649.docx
22	
23	
24	
25	

#### REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

(Amended in Committee, 6/25/2025)

[Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields - Golf Course Fees Generally]

Ordinance amending the Park Code to 1) authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; 2) increase golf course fees by increasing the San Francisco resident rates at certain courses, by increasing the cost of golf cards that entitle Pacifica residents to resident discounts at Sharp Park, by adjusting weekend hours, and by limiting resident senior discounts to weekdays; 3) require the Recreation and Park Department on an ongoing basis to post and update on its website the golf course fees in lieu of listing those fees in the Park Code; and 4) make various clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

#### **Existing Law**

The Park Code sets the fees that the Recreation and Park Department may charge for the use of various park facilities. After fees are adopted, the Controller has authority to adjust them annually based on changes to the Consumer Price Index, so the amounts stated in the Park Code are generally not up to date.

#### Amendments to Current Law

The ordinance would add a "cost recovery surcharge" on top of the fees that the Recreation and Park Department currently charges for the use of certain park facilities. Specifically, there would be an added surcharge of \$4 per 9 holes of golf or \$6 per 18 holes of golf; 10% for the use of the outdoor event facilities; \$5 for picnics with up to 100 participants and \$25 for picnics with more than 100 participants; and \$1 per hour for the use of athletic fields.

The ordinance also makes certain changes specific to golf course fees: it increases the resident rates at Harding Park, Fleming, and Sharp Park; adjusts the timing of weekend hours at all the golf courses so that weekend rates commence on Fridays; limits resident senior discounts to weekdays (on weekends, resident seniors would pay the discounted resident rates but would not receive additional senior discounts beyond the regular resident discount); and increases the rate for Pacifica residents to purchase golf cards for Sharp Park. The ordinance also makes various non-substantive changes, including to clarify that tournament organizers who receive a discount from the Department for having resident juniors participate in their tournaments must pass those discounts on to those resident juniors, rather than receiving the discount but then still charging the juniors the full rate.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS Page 1

Finally, because the rates listed in the Park Code are annually adjusted and not current, the ordinance makes them uncodified – that is, it removes the golf course fee amounts from the Park Code and directs the Recreation and Park Department to regularly publish the current rates on its website. The fees will remain in effect even though they will no longer appear in the Park Code, and the Controller will retain its authority to annually adjust these fees based on the Consumer Price Index.

#### **Background Information**

The ordinance adds a cost recovery surcharge to the fees that the Recreation and Park Department charges for use of the golf courses and certain other park facilities. The Department has begun to experience increased costs to operate and maintain its property, including due to an updated structure for sewer bills that will lead to it paying an increased amount for stormwater runoff from park property. These cost increases could trigger cuts to essential park services if not addressed. The proposal is intended to adjust the fees for the park facilities that contribute most to these cost increases, so that the Department can continue to maintain existing levels of service across the board.

As originally introduced, the ordinance only proposed the cost recovery surcharge described in the above paragraph. On June 25, 2025, the ordinance was amended in committee to propose the changes specific to golf course fees.

n:\legana\as2025\2500343\01844071.docx

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



# San Francisco Recreation & Parks

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



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET & APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

June 20, 2025

### Budget: Recreation - Proposed Reductions

#### RPD disagrees with the proposal to eliminate 7 additional recreation positions

#### **Recreation Staffing Model**

- Programs are run with both permanent and part-time staffing.
- If permanent positions are vacant due to hiring delays, RPD uses the salary dollars for part-time employees that run programming.
- Despite vacancies due to attrition and hiring, Recreation's current 253 FTE, is higher than its budgeted 186 FTE by 67 FTE.

#### **Aquatics**

- Due to on-going, nationwide Lifeguard shortage, permanent Aquatics positions have been left vacant for an extended period.
- RPD has used TEX positions for a Lifeguard Trainee program

Aquatics	Budget	Actual	Balance	Comments
Permanent Positions	62.72	48.72	14.00	Approved by Mayor's Office for hire in May
Attrition Savings - Miscellaneous	(8.55)	(8.72)	0.17	Vacancies held in attrition
<b>Funded Permanent Positions</b>	54.17	40.00	14.17	
Temporary Staff FTE	8.32	22.44	(14.12)	Using salary balance for TEX staffing
Total Staffing	62.49	62.44	0.05	1



## Budget: Partnerships - Policy Recommendation

#### RPD disagrees with the potential cut of 6 filled Partnerships positions

Elimination of the Partnerships Division would leave the Department with no staff to support and project manage community driven projects and programs. This team supports hundreds of donors and community groups in every supervisorial district.


Examples of current and recently completed projects supported by partnerships include India Basin, Crocker Amazon Playing Fields, Herz Playground Rec Center, Esprit Park, Gilman Playground, Heron's Head, Francisco Park, McLaren Park Tennis Courts, Embarcadero Plaza, Jackson Park, Koshland Park, Reforestation of Parks in the Southeast of San Francisco, Tenderloin Rec Center Playground, and more.

Over the last five years the partnerships division has generated on average \$29M a year in philanthropic support and state and federal grants <u>unrelated to the former</u> San Francisco Parks Alliance.





## **Utility Cost Recovery Surcharge**



RPD's total utility budget is expected to increase by **roughly 50% over the next two years**.

• \$13M in FY 2024-25 to \$20M in FY 2026-27


## Proposed surcharges to offset utility increases

- Golf: \$4 (9 holes), \$6 (18 holes)
- Athletic Fields: \$1 per hour
- Picnic Areas: \$5–\$25
- Outdoor Events: 10% of venue fees

#### **Estimated revenue**

- \$1.2M (FY25-26), \$1.75M (FY26-27)
- Recovers ~10% of utility costs (FY25-26, 9 months)
- Indexed to CPI
- Total utility budget projected compound annual growth is 17% over five years

#### **Court Reservations**



Proposed \$1M in new revenue from implementing a **\$5 per** hour court reservation fee.

#### For reservations made more than one week in advance:

- Not for profit or individual \$20 per hour
- For profit \$40 per hour

#### 28 out of 66 locations will have reservations

 Walk-up play remains free at the majority (68%) of court locations

#### **Other Major Cities:**

Seattle: \$7-\$15/hour

Berkeley: \$12/hour

Santa Cruz: \$20–\$30/hour

Oakland: \$10–\$15/hour

 New York, Los Angeles, Portland, Chicago: All charge for reservable court access



## Recreation Scholarships and Cost Recovery

Current Recreation Cost Recovery: \$0.15 for every \$1 spent.

Proposal allows Recreation to recover up to specified amounts based on the type of program and the participants. Model is a best practice in other Bay Area cities, (San Jose, Santa Clara, Mountain View, Milpitas) and around the country.

Cost recovery models provide equitable distributions of funding support, greater transparency on the cost of programming, and improved financial sustainability.

#### Program categories

- Community benefit are group-based, inclusive, and promote community health and/or engagement
- **Individual benefit** are more specialized, skill-focused, or serve a single participant, justifying a higher recovery target.

RPD offers over 3,500 classes annually, with fees ranging from \$0 to \$600 and most benefit the community.

Program Category	Maximum Cost Recovery	Examples
Community Benefit	Up to 50%	Peace Parks Program: No increase, remains free Senior Dance Programs: No increase, remains free
Individual Benefit for Youth, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities	Up to 75%	Youth Swim Lessons: \$5 increase per lesson Youth Karate: \$3.80 increase per lesson
Individual Benefit for Adults	Up to 100%	Adult Yoga: \$8 increase per lesson

## **Recreation Scholarships and Cost Recovery**





**Scholarships:** Applicants must live in San Francisco and have income equal to or less than 250% of the current federal poverty level or live in public housing, be in Foster Care, or unhoused.

25% of all program participants are currently on scholarship

Scholarship	Eligibility
50% Subsidy	Households that meet income eligibility.
75% Subsidy	Household are in 2+ government subsidized programs AND <b>Adult</b>
100% Subsidy	Household are in 2+ subsidized programs AND Child or Senior

RPD projects an additional **\$0.6M in FY 2025-26** and **\$1.2M in FY 2026-27** with the adoption of a new program cost recovery model.



## Golden Gate Park Paid Parking



## Paid parking in all legal parking areas within Golden Gate Park (~3,100 spaces)

#### Rate:

Set in consultation with SFMTA. Demand responsive rate averaging \$3.00/hour with early bird option.

#### **Projected Schedule:**

9 a.m. to 6 p.m., 7 days per week

#### **How to Pay:**

App to facilitate mobile payment and pay stations located near park destinations.

#### **Implementation Date:**

Scheduled for January 2027

#### **Net Revenue:**

\$4.9M for six months





### Golf

#### Original proposal

Eliminate \$7.5M General Fund subsidy in FY 2026-27 through the potential leasing of golf courses to private operators.

With approval of trailing budget legislation, and revised golf fees, (pending introduction), RPD will no longer pursue lower cost private sector maintenance agreements.

This solution (a new Utility Cost Recovery Surcharge and revised Golf Fees) will preserve excellent public sector work, generate an additional \$4M over the next two years, and result in up to a 60% reduction of the General Fund subsidy.







## **Golf Affordability**



## Maintaining Affordable Access to Municipal Golf For All

- No fee increases at Lincoln or Golden Gate (except for utility surcharge)
- Youth rates unchanged, except for utility surcharge
- First Tee provides free access to 11,000 youth annually (2,000 at Harding)
- Senior discounts continue Mon–Thurs at all courses
- Harding Park Highlights
  - Youth on Course: \$3-\$5 per round at Harding/Fleming
  - 14 high schools retain discounted access
  - PGA HOPE: SF resident rates for all veterans
  - Beginner lesson discounts for seniors, adults, and youth



### Potential service reductions October 2025

If legislation is not approved, Rec Park will need to reduce services, vacate positions, and implement layoffs as necessary in October 2025 by an additional \$5M, (\$6.7M on an ongoing 12-month basis,) which includes **34 full-time** and **92 part-time positions**.

	FY26	FY27
Revenue at risk		
No Paid Parking in GGP		(4.9)
No additional fee revenue	(2.9)	(4.0)
At risk revenue subtotal	(2.9)	(8.9)
Service reductions to balance		
Service Reductions	5.0	6.7
Year 1 savings		2.2
Potential reductions subtotal	5.0	8.9
Ending Balance	2.2	0.0

#### **SWIMMING POOLS (\$0.5M; 4 full-time and 4 part-time positions)**

- Closing one pool out of 9 pools (8 year-round) at a time on a rotating schedule to reduce costs while keeping overall access available across the city.
  - o Swim lessons serve about 5,000 children annually, but waitlists have soared to nearly 7,000—a 131% unmet demand.

#### RECREATION CENTER PROGRAMS (\$0.5M; 18 part-time positions)

• Reduced hours at 25 recreation centers from 60 to 40 per week, a 30% reduction. Fewer senior, tot, and drop-in program hours.

#### **SUMMER CAMPS (\$0.9M; 70 part-time positions)**

- A 25% reduction in summer camps—2,500 fewer camp slots
  - o In 2024, our summer camps are offering 9,000 spots, but more than 4,200 children are still on the waitlist. One of our most popular, the Jr. Warriors basketball league has more kids waiting to join than are enrolled.

#### PARK MAINTENANCE (\$2.0M, 21 full-time positions)

- Reducing 2.5 hours from 120 restrooms from 8 AM–8 PM to 8 AM–5:30 PM results in a 21% reduction in open restroom hours.
- Reduction in Local 261 gardener apprenticeship program; currently, we have a class of 15, which will be reduced to 6.
- Reduction in trash service

#### **PUBLIC SAFETY (\$1.1M, 9 full-time positions)**

 A 10+% cut to Park Rangers—reducing our ability to prevent illegal encampments and possibly eliminating fixed posts like UN Plaza and Dolores Park.





#### **BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



City Hall

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

#### NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

## BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: July 9, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall

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

**Subject:** File No. 250604. Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the

Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and

athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to

maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's

determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

On June 25, 2025, the Budget and Appropriations Committee amended this duly noticed proposed ordinance. If this legislation, as amended passes, the fees that were noticed will further increase as follows:

The Recreation and Park Department (Department) General Manager or the General Manager's designee may approve a temporary increase to any category Resident Rates and any category of Tournament Rates with increases of up to 50% for Resident Rates at Harding Park only during major City-wide special events.

General Golf Fees will be established for Resident Golf Cards. The Department shall charge a fee of \$136 for a San Francisco Resident Golf Card, entitling the holder to discounts on the Golf Courses for two years from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to San Francisco residents and/or San Francisco property owners only upon presentation of valid proof of residency or ownership. The Department shall charge a fee of \$300 for a Pacifica Resident Golf Card entitling the holder to discounts at the Sharp Park Golf Course only, for two years from the date of issuance. Golf Cards shall be available to Pacifica residents only upon presentation of valid proof of residency. The Department shall charge a fee of \$38 for replacement of San Francisco Resident Golf Cards and Pacifica Resident Golf Cards.

If a San Francisco or Pacifica Resident Golf Card application is returned to the applicant because the information on the application is incorrect or incomplete, there shall be an additional administrative fee of \$6. The Department may charge persons holding any category of Resident Golf Cards an additional reservation fee of \$19 per reservation for any advance reservation made between 8 and 30 days before the reserved tee time, and may charge persons who do not hold a Resident Golf Card an appropriate reservation fee based on the flexible pricing standards set forth in Park Code, Section 12.12(c)(1).

The Department shall require each player at Harding Park, Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, and Golden Gate Park who is above the age of 17 to pay an additional fee for that Golf Course of \$3 per nine holes, as a special projects maintenance fee. For the use of the Golf Courses, the Department shall require each player to pay an additional surcharge of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, to cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses.

Harding Park Golf Course Greens Fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will increase from \$73 to \$91 Monday through Thursday and increase from \$91 to \$109 for weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Twilight weekday cost will be \$57 Monday through Thursday and \$70 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$31 Monday through Thursday and \$36 Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will increase from \$52 to \$65 Monday through Thursday; and Tournament weekday fees will be \$168 for Monday through Thursday and \$181 weekend days Friday through Sunday. A same-day replay rate is available to golfers holding a Resident Golf Card who complete an 18-hole round. The replay rate shall be 30% of the originally purchased round. The replay-round must be used by the purchaser of the full price round. Replay rounds may not be reserved in advance.

Fleming Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will increase from \$33 to \$38 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$34 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will increase from \$26 to \$32 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$22 Friday through Sunday; and Tournament weekday fees will be \$45 Monday through Thursday and \$60 for Friday through Sunday.

Lincoln Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be \$36 Monday through Thursday and \$42 for weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be \$22 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$26 for weekends Friday through Sunday; and Tournament fees will be \$61 Monday through Thursday and \$75 Friday through Sunday.

Sharp Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be increased from \$37 to \$50 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$43 to \$60 for weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be increased from \$23 to \$32; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$19 Monday through Thursday and \$27 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Tournament costs will be increased from \$66 to \$70 for Resident Seniors Monday through Thursday; Tournament Costs for Residents will increase from \$79 to \$90 Friday through Sunday.

Golden Gate Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be \$19 Monday through Thursday and \$22 for weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior will cost \$15 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior will cost \$10 Monday through Thursday and \$13 Friday through Sunday; and Tournament costs will be \$28 Monday through Thursday and \$38 Friday through Sunday. The Family Tournament is a group of 16 or more players composed of two family members alternating shots, playing two rounds of nine holes. The Junior Tournament Rate shall be applicable only to team members 17 years old and younger. The fee per team shall be the sum of the fees for one round of the applicable Tournament Rate per person per day.

McLaren Park (Gleneagles) Golf Course fees will be established as follows: Resident fee for 9 holes will cost \$31 weekdays Monday through Thursday and \$36 weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident fee for 18 holes will be \$41 Monday through Thursday and \$51 Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior for 9 holes will be \$26 Monday through Thursday; and Resident Junior for 9 holes will be \$19.

The Park Code references fee amounts for the golf courses that do not reflect the Controller's annual adjustments to those fees based on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The Department shall regularly publish on its website a fee schedule that shows the current fee amounts, inclusive of annual adjustments. Notwithstanding these procedures, the Board may modify the fees by ordinance at any time.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Thursday, July 3, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee:

Brent Jalipa (Brent. Jalipa @sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712)

Angela Calvillo

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors City and County of San Francisco

edm:bjj:

#### CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

#### DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address: 915 E 1ST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839 Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

BRENT JALIPA CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES) 1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

#### COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description

BJJ Fee Ad File No. 250604-2

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

06/29/2025 , 07/06/2025

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

Publication\$4233.60Set aside for CCSF Outreach Fund\$470.40Clearinghouse Service Charge\$705.60Total\$5409.60

EXM# 3943218

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JULY 9,
2025 - 1:30 PM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT THE BOard of Supervisors of the City and County
of San Francisco's Budget
and Appropriations Commit-NOTICE OF PUBLIC of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 250604. Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the determination under tre
California Environmental
Quality Act. On June 25,
2025, the Budget and
Appropriations Committee 2025, the Budget and Appropriations Committee amended this duly noticed proposed ordinance. If this legislation, as amended passes, the fees that were noticed will further increase as follows: The Recreation and Park Department Ceneral Ce (Department) General Manager or the General Manager's designee may Manager a temporary increase to any category Resident Rates and any category of Tournament increase to any category Resident Rates and any category of Tournament Rates with increases of up to 50% for Resident Rates at Harding Park only during major City-wide special events. General Golf Fees will be established for Resident Golf Cards. The Department shall charge a fee of \$136 for a San Francisco Resident Golf Card, entitling the holder to discounts on the Golf Courses for two years from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to San Francisco residents and/or San Francisco property owners only upon presentation of valid proof of residency or ownership. The Department shall charge a fee of \$300 for a Pacifica Resident Golf Card entitling the holder to discounts at the Sharp Park Golf Course

only, for two years from the date of issuance. Golf Cards shall be available to Pacifica date of issuance. Golf Cards shall be available to Pacifica residents only upon presentation of valid proof of residency. The Department shall charge a fee of \$38 for replacement of San Francisco Resident Golf Cards and Pacifica Resident Golf Cards. If a San Francisco or Pacifica Resident Golf Cards. If a San Francisco or Pacifica Resident Golf Card application is returned to application is returned to the applicant because the information on the application is incorrect or incomplete, there shall be an additional administrative fee of \$6. The Department may charge persons holding any category of Resident Golf Cards an additional reservation fee of \$19 per reservation for any advance reservation made between 8 and 30 days before the and 30 days before the reserved tee time, and may charge persons who do not hold a Resident Golf Card an nolida Resident Golf Card an appropriate reservation fee based on the flexible pricing standards set forth in Park Code, Section 12.12(c)(1). The Department shall require each player at Harding Park, Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, and Golden Gate Park who is above the age of 17 to pay an additional fee for that Golf Course of \$3 per nine holes, as a special projects maintenance fee. For the use of the Golf Courses, the Department shall require each player to pay an additional surcharge of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, to cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses Harding Park Golf Course Greens Fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will increase from \$73 to \$91 Monday through Thursday and increase from \$91 to \$109 for weekend days Friday through Thursday and \$70 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Unior weekday cost will be \$31 Monday through Thursday and \$75 Monday through Thursday and \$18 Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be \$31 Monday through Thursday and \$18 Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be \$31 Monday through Thursday and \$18 Friday through Sunday, A same-day replay rate is available to golfers holding a Resident Golf Card who complete an 18-hole round. The replay rate shall be 30% of the originally purchased round.



used by the purchaser of the full price round. Replay rounds may not be reserved in advance. Fleming Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will increase from \$33 to \$38 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$34 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will increase from \$26 to \$32 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$18 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$22 Friday through Sunday; and Tournament weekday fees will be \$45 Monday through Thursday and \$60 for Friday through Sunday. Lincoln Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be \$36 Monday through Thursday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be \$22 Monday through Thursday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be \$22 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$26 for weekend Friday through Sunday; and Tournament fees will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$75 Friday through Sunday; and Tournament fees will be \$61 Monday through Thursday and \$75 Friday through Sunday. Sharp Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be increased from \$37 to \$50 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$43 to \$60 for weekfrom \$43 to \$60 for week-ends Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be increased from \$23 to \$32; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$19 Monday through Thursday and \$27 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Tournament costs will be increased from \$66 to \$70 for Resident Seniors Monday for Resident Seniors Monday through Thursday; Tourna-ment Costs for Residents will increase from \$79 to \$90 Friday through Sunday. increase from \$79 to \$90
Friday through Sunday.
Golden Gate Park Golf
Course fees will set or
increase by category as
follows: Resident weekday
cost will be \$19 Monday
through Thursday and \$22
for weekends Friday through
Sunday; Resident Senior will
cost \$15 Monday through
Thursday; Resident Junior
will cost \$10 Monday through
Thursday and \$13 Friday
through Sunday; and
Tournament costs will be
\$28 Monday through \$28 Monday through Thursday and \$38 Friday through Sunday. The Family Tournament is a group of 16 or more players composed of two family members

alternating shots, playing two rounds of nine holes. The Junior Tournament Rate shall be applicable only to team members 17 years old and younger. The fee per team shall be the sum of the fees for one round of the applicable Tournament Rate per person per day. McLaren Park (Gleneagles) Golf Course fees will be estabapplicable Tournament Rate per person per day. McLaren Park (Gleneagles) Golf Course fees will be established as follows: Resident fee for 9 holes will cost \$31 weekdays Monday through Thursday and \$36 weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident fee for 18 holes will be \$41 Monday through Thursday and \$51 Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior for 9 holes will be \$26 Monday through Thursday; and Resident Junior for 9 holes will be \$19. The Park Code references fee amounts for the golf courses that do not reflect the Controller's annual adjustments to those fees based on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The Department shall regularly publish on its website a fee schedule that shows the current fee amounts, inclusive of annual adjustments. Notwithstanding these procedures, the Board may modify the fees by ordinance at any time. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov .org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Thursday, July 3, 2025. For any questions about this hearing. Research please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa) (Safov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco EXM-3943218#

# San Francisco Examiner $PUBLIC\ Notices$

Qualified for San Francisco and San Mateo Counties

File & Publish New Business Name: Examiner.DBAstore.com Other Legal Notices: Examiner.LegalAdStore.com

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER DALY CITY INDEPENDENT. SAN MATEO WEEKLY. REDWOOD CITY TRIBLINE. FNOLIBER - BULLETIN. FOSTER CITY PROGRESS. MILLIRAGE - SAN BRUND SUN. BOUTOULE & VILLAGER. EXAMINER - SO. SAN FRANCISCO. EXAMINER - SAN BRUND SUN. BOUTOULE & VILLAGER. EXAMINER - SO. SAN FRANCISCO. EXAMINER - SO. SAN FRANCISCO.

CITY OF SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of South San Francisco, California, will hold a public hearing at a meeting on Wednesday, July 9, 2025, at 6:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the Council Chambers at the Library, Parks and Recreation Building, 901 Civic Campus Way, South San Francisco, California, for consideration of the following, at which time and place any and all persons interested may appear and be heard thereon. City Council consideration of an ordinance amending Title 20 of the South San Francisco Municipal Code to make minor revisions, corrections, and clarifications related to regulations for tobacco retailers and sales of tobacco products, and determination that the proposed amendments are categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15601(b)(3). Those wishing to comment may either appear in person at the public hearing or submit written comments via the e-comments portal by 4:30 p.m on the meeting date. Comments received by the deadline will be entered into the record for the meeting. Please note the eComment link will be enabled once the agenda has been published. Use the e-comment portal by clicking on the following link: https://ci-ssf ca.granicusideas.com/meetings?scope=past If you have any questions regarding this matter, contact the Economic and Community Development Department, Planning Division, at 315 Maple Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 94080 by phone at: (650) 877-8535 or email at: planning@ssf.net /s/ Rosa Govea Acosta, City Clerk, City of South San Francisco.

CNSB # 3942189

GOVERNMENT NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2025
-1:30 PM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL ROOM 250, CITY HALL 1 DR. CARLTON B. 1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT the Board of Supervisors
of the City and County of San
Francisco's Budget and
Appropriations Committee will
hold a public hearing to
consider the following
proposal and said public
hearing will be held as follows,
at which time all interested
parties may attend and be
heard: File No. 250604.
Ordinance amending the Park Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields to cover stormy help other related other costs related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. On June 25, 2025, the Budget and Appropriations Committee amended this duly Committee amended this duly noticed proposed ordinance. If this legislation, as amended passes, the fees that were noticed will further increase as follows: The Recreation and Department Park Department (Department) General Manager or the General Manager's designee may approve a temporary increase to any category Resident Rates and any category of Tournament Rates with Rates and any category of commander Rates with increases of up to 50% for Resident Rates at Harding Park only during major Citywide special events. General Golf Fees will be established for Resident Golf Cards. The Department shall charge a fee of \$136 for a San Francisco Resident Golf Card, entitling the holder to discounts on the Golf Courses for two years Golf Courses for two years from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to San Francisco residents and/ or San Francisco property owners only upon presentation of valid proof of residency or ownership. The Department shall charge a fee of \$300 for a Pacifica Resident Golf Card entitling the holder to discounts at the Sharp Park Golf Course only, for two years from the date of issuance. Golf from the date of issuance. Golf Cards shall be available to Pacifica residents only upon presentation of valid proof of residency. The Department shall charge a fee of \$38 for replacement of San Francisco Resident Golf Cards and Pacifica Resident Golf Cards. If a San Francisco or Pacifica If a San Francisco or Pacifica Resident Golf Card application because the information on the application is incorrect or incomplete, there shall be an additional administrative fee of \$6. The Department may charge persons holding any category of Resident Golf Cards an additional Cards an additional reservation for any advance reservation made between 8 reservation made between 8 and 30 days before the reserved tee time, and may charge persons who do not hold a Resident Golf Card an appropriate reservation fee based on the flexible pricing standards set forth in Park Code, Section 12.12(c)(1). The Department shall require each player at Harding Park, each player at Harding Park Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, and Golden Gate Park who is above the age of 17 to pay an additional fee for that Golf Course of \$3 per nine holes, as a special projects maintenance fee. For the use of the Golf Courses, the Department shall require each Department shall require each player to pay an additional surcharge of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, to cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses. Harding Park Golf Course Greens Fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will increase

weekday cost will increase from \$73 to \$91 Monday through Thursday and increase from \$91 to \$109 for

weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Twilight

weekday cost will be \$57

as part of the official public

\$70 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$31 Monday through Thursday \$36 Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will increase from \$52 to \$55 Monday through Thursday; and Tournament weekday fees will be \$168 for Monday through Thursday and \$181 weekend days Friday through Sunday. A same-day replay rate is available to golfers holding a Resident Golf Card who complete an 18-hole round. The replay rate shall be 30% of the originally purchased round. The replay-round must be used by the purchaser of the full price round. Replay the full price round. Replay rounds may not be reserved in advance. Fleming Golf Course davance. Flerining Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will increase from \$33 to \$38 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$34 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will increase from \$26 to \$32 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$22 Friday through Sunday; and Tournament weekday fees will be \$45 Monday through Thursday and \$60 for Friday through Sunday. Lincoln Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category eekend days Friday through unday; Resident Senior set or increase by categor as follows: Resident weekday cost will be \$36 Monday through Thursday and \$42 for weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior Sunday; weekday cost will be \$22 through Thursday Resident Junior weekday cost vill be \$18 Monday through will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$26 for weekends Friday through Sunday; and Tournament fees will be \$61 Monday through Thursday and \$75 Friday through Sunday, Sharp Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be increased from \$37 to \$50 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$43 to \$60 for weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be increased from \$20 to \$20 will be increased from \$23 to \$32; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$19 Monday through Thursday and \$27 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Tournament costs will be increased from \$66 to \$70 for Resident Seniors Monday through Thursday; Tournament Costs for Residents will increase from \$79 to \$90 Friday through Sunday. Golden Gate Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be \$19 Monday through Thursday and \$22 for weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior will cost \$15 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior will cost \$10 Monday through Thursday and \$13 for Resident Seniors Monday through Thursday and \$13 Friday through Sunday; and Tournament costs will be \$28 Monday through Thursday and \$38 Friday through Sunday. The Family Tournament is a group of 16 or more players composed of two family composed of two family members alternating shots, playing two rounds of nine holes. The Junior Tournament Rate shall be applicable only to team members 17 years old and younger. The fee per team shall be the sum of the fees for one round of the applicable Tournament Rate per person per day. McLaren Park (Gleneagles) Golf Course fees will be established as follows: will be established as follows: Resident fee for 9 holes will cost \$31 weekdays Monday through Thursday and \$36 weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident fee for 18 holes will be \$41 Monday through Thursday and \$51
Friday through Sunday;
Resident Senior for 9 holes will be \$26 Monday through Thursday; and Resident Junior for 9 holes will be \$19. The Park Code references fee Park Code references fee amounts for the golf courses that do not reflect the Controller's annual adjustments to those fees based on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The Department shall regularly publish on its website a fee schedule that shows the current fee amounts, inclusive of annual adjustments. of annual adjustments.

Notwithstanding these
procedures, the Board may
modify the fees by ordinance at any time. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made

record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board of supervisors @ sfow. org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://stbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Thursday, July 3, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent,Jalipa@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIETIONS

COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2025 - 1:30 PM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT the Board of Supervisors
of the City and County of San
Francisco's Budget and
Appropriations Committee will
hold a public hearing to
consider the following consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows. at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 250592. Ordinance amending the Building, Subdivision, and Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes to adjust Administrative Codes to adjust fees charged by the Department of Building Inspection and to establish Subfunds within the Building Inspection Fund; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. On June 25, 2025, the Budget and Appropriations Committee amended this duly noticed proposed ordinance. If noticed proposed ordinance. It this legislation, as amended, passes, the fees that were noticed will further increase as follows: Building Code, Chapter 1A, will be amended to raise fees in the tables of Section 110A. Table 1A-A will be modified for Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$1 to \$2,000 will be as follows new construction permit issuance fee will be amended issuance fee will be amended to increase from \$160 to \$161 for the first \$500 plus for each additional or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000; alterations to permit issuance fee will increase from \$168 to \$169 for the first \$500 plus for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000; and no plans permit issuance fee will permit issuance fee will increase from \$193 to \$195 for the first \$500 plus and increase from \$6.33 to \$6.47 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$2,001 to \$50,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$237 to \$238 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$6.46 to \$6.54; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$223 to \$224 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$6.75 to \$6.83; and no plans permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$2.828 to \$292 plus each will be as follows: from \$288 to \$292 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$9.31 to \$9.40. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$50,001 to \$200,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000 will increase from first \$50,000 will increase from \$547 to \$552 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$5.81 to \$5.88; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000 will increase from \$547 to \$552 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$5.81 to \$5.88; and no plans permit issuance fee for the first

\$5.00 will increase from \$735 to \$743 plus each additional \$1,000 will increase from \$4.55 to \$4.61. Building

Permit Fees with tota

valuation of \$200,001 to \$500,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000 will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. thereof will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000 will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase fraction thereof will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$1,418 to \$1.434 for the first \$200,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000, will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 will be as follows: new construction permit new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$2,771 to \$2,798 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$3.42 to \$3.46; alterations to rnereof will increase from \$3.42 to \$3.46; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$2,771 to \$2,798 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$3.42 to \$3.46; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$2,771 to \$2,798 for the first \$500,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000, will increase from \$3.42 to \$3.46. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$4,479 to \$4,527 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2,83 to \$2,87 its learning to \$2,80 it thereof will increase from \$2.83 to \$2.87; alterations to \$2.83 to \$2.87; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$4,479 to \$4,527 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.83 to \$2.87; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$4,479 to \$4,527 for the first \$1,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000, will increase from \$2.83 to \$2.87. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$5,000,001 to \$50,000,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$15,803 to \$16,000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1000 plus each additional \$1,000 plus each additional \$ additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.47to \$1.49; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$15,803 to \$16,000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase fraction thereof will increase from \$1.47 to \$1.49; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$15,803 to \$16,000 for the first \$5,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$1.47 to \$1.49. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$50,000,001 to \$100,000,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance construction permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$82,049 to \$83,121 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$82,049 to \$83,121 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$82,049 to \$83,121 will be established for the first \$50,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$100,000,001 to \$200,000.000 will be as follows: new will increase from \$82,049 to will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$166,419 to \$168, 553 plus each additional more will increase from \$1,650 to \$1,672; 150 kva or less will increase from \$393 to \$398; \$1,000 or fraction thereof 151 kva or more will increase from \$602 to \$609; and Fire Pump installations will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69: from \$602 to \$609; and Fire Pump installations will increase from \$813 to \$824. Category 4 - Installations of Fire Warning and Controlled Devices up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$455 to \$461; 2,501 to 5,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$671 to \$680; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,236 to \$1,251; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$2,041 to \$2,067; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$4,157 to \$4,212; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$4,157 to \$4,212; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$8,209 to \$1,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$8,209 to \$1,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$8,200 sq. ft. will sq. ft alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$100,000,000 fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$166,419 to \$168,553 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$166,419 to \$168,553 for the first \$100,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69. Building Permit Fees with total Permit Fees with total valuation of \$200,000,001 and up will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 ft. will increase from \$8,209 to \$8,319; 100,001 to 500,000 will increase from \$432,116 to sq. ft. will increase from \$12,049 to \$12,211; 500,001 \$437,894 plus each additional \$12,049 to \$12,211; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$27,376 to \$27,749; and more than 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$54,956 to \$55,697. Fire Warning and Controlled Devices (Retrofit Systems) for buildings of not more than 6 dwelling units will increase from \$616 to \$624; buildings not more than 12 dwelling units will increase from \$812 to \$842; buildings with more \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.16 to \$2.69: alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$432,116 to \$437,894 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$432,116 to \$437,894 for the first \$200,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69. Table 1A-C will be modified to increase hourly permit issuance/inspection rates from \$399 to \$405 per hour for regular inspections and from to \$842; buildings with more than 12 dwelling units and non-residential occupancy up to 3 floors will increase from \$1,210 to \$1,226; 4-9 floors will increase from \$2,465 to \$2,497; 10-20 floors will increase from \$4,148 to \$4,203; 21-30 floors will regular inspections and from \$457 to \$477 per hour (minimum of two hours) for increase from \$8.209 off-hour inspections for plan floors will increase from \$12,049 to \$12,211. Category 5 - Miscellaneous Installations review fee not covered in the table for Permit Issuance Fees by Category. Permit issuance fees for Category 1P - Single Residential Unit – water 5 - Miscellaneous Installations for a remodel/upgrade of existing hotel guest/SRO rooms up to 6 rooms will increase from \$519 to \$525, and each additional group of 3 rooms will increase from \$261 to \$264; data, communications, and wireless system of 11 to 500 cables will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each fees for Category 1P - Single Residential Unit — water service, sewer replacement, single plumbing fixture installation, shower pan installation, or kitchen or bathroom remodels will increase from \$273 to \$276; Category 1M - Single Residential Unit — mechanical gas appliance (furnace, hydronic heat, heat pump) will increase from \$264 to \$267; Category 2PA - Plumbing installation for residential construction with 6 or less dwelling units or guest rooms; \$279 to \$283, and each additional group of 100 cables will increase from \$67 to \$68 security systems of 10 components or less will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional group of 10 components will increase from \$42 to \$43; office workstations of 5 or less will increase from \$279 to \$283, dwelling units or quest rooms; without underground plumbing installation (includes water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$477 to \$483; increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional group of 10 workstations will increase from \$95 to \$97; temporary exhibition wiring from 1 to 100 booths will increase from \$406 to \$411, and each additional group of 10 booths will increase from \$67 to \$68; exterior/interior electrical signs will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional sign at the same address will gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$477 to \$483; Category 2PB - Plumbing installation for residential construction with 6 dwelling units or guest rooms or less; with underground plumbing installation (includes water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$692 to \$701; Category 2M - Mechanical gas appliances for residential construction with 6 dwelling units or guest rooms or less will increase from \$395 to \$400; Category 3PA - 7-12 Dwelling Units will increase from \$978 to \$991; Category 3PB - 13-36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,957 to \$1,987 t

units or guest rooms, commercial and office - per floor will increase from \$344 to \$348; Category 5P/5M - Office, mercantile & retail buildings: New or Tenant Improvements; heating/cooling equipment to piping voltage wiring systems for 1-10 floors will increase from \$850 to \$860, and each additional floor will increase from \$95 to \$97; and solar photovoltaic systems with 10 KW rating or less will increase KW rating or less will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional 10 KW rating will increase from \$235 to \$238. Table 1A-G - Inspections, Surveys and Reports will be modified to increase the standard hourly rate, and re-inspection fee from \$399 to \$405 per hour: off-hours inspection rate from \$457 to \$477 per hour with a minimum of two hours, plus permit fee; survey inspection rate and survey of nonresidential buildings will increase from \$399 to \$405 per hour, with a minimum two hours; survey of residential buildings for any purpose or Condo Conversions for a single unit will increase from \$3856 to \$450. cooling equipment to piping connected thereto - per tenant or per floor, whichever is less will increase from \$575 to will increase from \$575 to \$582; Category 6PA - Restaurants (new and Restaurants (new and remodel) fee includes 5 or less drainage and or gas outlets -no fees required for public or private restroom will increase from \$537 to \$543; Category from \$537 to \$543; Category 6PB - Restaurants (new and remodel) fee includes 6 or more drainage and/or gas outlets - no fees required for public or private restroom will increase from \$1,507 to \$1,525; Category 8 - New boiler installations over 200 kbtu will increase from \$478 to \$484; Category 9P/M - Surveys will increase from \$500 to \$507; Category 10P/M - Condominium conversions will increase from \$609 to \$617; Category 11P/M - Miscellaneous will increase from \$302 to \$310; Boiler purpose or Condo Conversions for a single unit will increase from \$3,656 to \$3,700; two to four units will increase from \$4,679 to \$4,738; and five plus units will \$4,738; and five plus units will increase from \$5,093 to \$5,159 plus Standard Hourly Inspection Rate; hotels including 10 guestrooms will increase from \$3,497 to \$3,541, and 11+ guestrooms will increase from \$3,497 to \$4,068 plus an increase from \$113 to \$114 per guestroom over 10; and temporary certificate of occupancy will increase from \$683 to \$670; demolition permit fee will increase from \$629 to \$646; house moving permit fee, will see the second se Miscellaneous will increase from \$302 to \$310; Boiler Maintenance Program for permits to operate or renew certificates issued online will increase from \$121 to \$122 and in-house will increase from \$207 to \$208; and connection to utility company-provided steam will increase from \$207 to \$208 per hour with a minimum of one-half hour. Table 1A-D will be modified to increase standard hourly rates for inspection rates from \$555 to \$571 per hour; off-hour inspections from house moving permit fee will increase from \$399 to \$405 per hour with a three-hour minimum; re-roofing permit fees for single-family homes hour; off-hour inspections from \$680 to \$742; and a new and duplexes will increase from \$306 to \$309 and for all standard hourly rate for housing inspection will be standard hourly rate for housing inspection will be established for \$596 per hour. Table 1A-E will be modified to increase hourly issuance/inspection rates from \$399 to \$405 per hour for regular inspections and from \$457 to \$477 per hour (minimum of two hours) for off-hour inspections for installations not covered by the fee schedule. Category 1 - General Wiring: Residential Buildings up to 10,000 sq. ft. up to 10 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$270 to \$273; 11 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$421 to \$426; up to 40 outlets and or devices, includes up to 200 Amp service upgrade, will increase from \$527 to \$534; more than 40 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$726 to \$734 and exhibitions of \$726 to \$734 and exhibitions of \$736 to \$734 and exhibitions of \$736 to \$734 and exhibitions of others the re-roofing permit fee will increase from \$504 to others the re-rooling permit fee will increase from \$504 to \$509; and night noise permits will increase from \$663 to \$670. Table 1A-K - Penalties, Hearings, Code Enforcement Assessments will be modified to increase the filing fee for an Abatement Appeals Board hearing from \$526 to \$534 per case; emergency order will increase from \$493 to \$497, with a minimum of two hours; and for vacant building – initial and annual registration will increase from \$1,825 to \$1,850. Table 1A-N - Energy Conservation will be modified for the initial inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings and two-family dwellings and two-family dwellings and two-family will on \$448. two-family dwellings to increase from \$443 to \$448, apartment houses and residential hotels up to 20 rooms to increase from \$598 to \$603 and each additional devices will increase from \$725 to \$734; and buildings of 5,000 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,053 to \$1,066. Category 2 - General Wiring: Nonresidential to \$603 and each additional 10 rooms, or portion thereof, will increase from \$197 to \$200. Compliance inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings will increase from \$197 to \$200, apartment houses and residential hotels up to 20 rooms will increase from \$295 to \$299 and each additional 10 rooms, or portion thereof, will increase from \$153 to \$155; and certification of a qualified energy inspector will increase from \$444 to \$450. Table 1A-P - Residential Code Enforcement and License \$1,066. Category 2 - General Wiring: Nonresidential Buildings & Residential Buildings over 10,000 sq. ft. up to 5 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$406 to \$410; 6 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$622 to \$630; areas up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$844 to \$855; 2,501 to 5,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,236 to \$1,251; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$2,092 to will increase from \$2,092 to \$2,119; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$4,122 to \$4,177; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. Enforcement and License Fees will be modified to ft. will increase from \$8,414 to \$8,528; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. 88,528; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$12,505 to \$12,669; 100,001 to 500,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$25,337 to \$25,683; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$56,302 to \$57,026; and more than 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$112,544 to \$113,993. Category 3 - Service Distribution and Utilization Equipment of 225 amps rating or less will increase from \$393 to \$397; 250 to 500 amps will increase from \$602 to \$609; 600 to 1000 amps will increase from \$11 to \$822; 1,200 to 2,000 amps will increase from \$41032 to \$41408 to \$6000 to \$600

Flees will be modified to increase one and two-family dwelling unit fees from \$136 to \$140 per rental unit. Apartment house license fees of 3 to 12 units will increase from \$514 to \$542 per year; 13 to 30 units will increase from \$839 to \$863 per year, and apartment houses of more than 30 units will increase from \$1,011 to \$1,066 and \$153 to \$156 for each additional 10 units or portion thereof. Hotel license fees will increase per year as follows: 6 to 29 rooms will increase from \$930 to \$99 rooms will increase from \$930 to \$99 rooms will increase from \$930 to \$99 rooms will increase from \$1127 to \$1156.150 to 200 2,000 amps will increase from \$1,232 to \$1,248; more than rooms will increase from \$1,127 to \$1,154; 150 to 200 rooms will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,454; and hotels 2,000 amps will increase from \$1,597 to \$1,619; 600 volts or with more than 200 rooms will increase from \$1,804 to \$1,849 and increase from \$1,849 and increase from \$153 to \$156 for each additional 25 rooms or portion thereof. Table 1A-Q - Hotel Conversion Ordinance fees will be modified to increase appeals of initial or annual status determination, inspection staff review of requests for hearing to exceed 25% tourist season rental limit, and inspection staff review of unsuccessful review of unsuccessfu challenge of a usage repor and standard hourly inspection or request for winter rental from \$399 to \$405; claims of exemption based on low income housing will increase from \$788 to \$799; claims of exemption based on partially completed conversion increase from \$1,183 to \$1,199; initial unit usage \$1,199; initial unit usage report will increase from \$788 to \$799; permit to convert will increase from \$1,300 to \$1,317; and statement of exemption - Hearing Officer fee will increase from \$788 to \$799. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place increase from \$8,209 to \$8,319; and more than 30 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov. org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Thursday.

public review on Thursday, July 3, 2025. For any questions

about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for

the Budget and Appropriations

(Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela

Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of

Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

LEGISLATION
INTRODUCED AT, AND
SUMMARY OF ACTIONS
OF THE JUNE 24, 2025
MEETING OF THE SAN
FRANCISCO BOARD OF

SUPERVISORS

are available at www.sfbos. org; 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett

Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102; or by calling (415) 554-5184. EXM-3942494#

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS
CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE
CHAMBER, ROOM 250,
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO CA 94102

FRANCISCO, CA 94102 JULY 1, 2025 - 2:00 PM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc,

in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM-3942488#

at the same address will increase from \$85 to \$86;

garage door operator requiring

increase from \$281 to \$284;

quarterly permits for a maximum of five outlets in any

one location will increase from

\$641 to \$650; survey, per hour or fraction thereof will increase from \$281 to \$284; survey,

from \$281 to \$284; survey, research, and report preparation, per hour or fraction thereof will increase from \$532 to \$536; witness testing: life safety, fire warning, emergency, and energy management systems hourly rate will increase from \$424 to \$430 and off-hour inspections hourly rate, two hour minimum, will increase from \$457 to \$477; energy management.

\$477; energy management, HVAC controls, and low-

receptacle installation

increase from \$1,957 to \$1,982; Category 3PC - Over 36 Dwelling Units will increase

from \$7,887 to \$7,989; Category 3MA - 7-12 Dwelling Units will increase from \$987

Units will increase from \$987 to \$996; Category 3MB - 13-36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,957 to \$1,980; Category 3MC - Over 36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$8,293 to \$8,403; Category 4PA - Fire sprinklers - one and two family dwelling units will increase from \$264 to \$267; Category 4PB - Fire sprinklers - 3 or more dwelling

EXM-3943214#

PUBLIC NOTICE
ASSESSMENT PROTEST
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN,
pursuant to Section 1601 of
the Revenue and Taxation
Code, that the Assessment
Roll of the City and County
of San Francisco for the of San Francisco, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2025, will be delivered by iscal year commencing July
1, 2025, will be delivered by
the Assessor into the custody
of the controller of said City
and County by June 30,
2025. Copies will be available
for inspection by anyone
interested during regular
business hours in the office
of the Assessor, City Hall, #1
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
Room 190, San Francisco,
California, during the period
of Wednesday, July 2, 2025
through Monday, September
15, 2025.
NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN
that the Assessment Appeals
Board will meet commencing
on July 1, 2025, to equalize
the assessments of property
on the Assessment Roll and
will continue in session for that
purpose from time to time until

purpose from time to time until the business of equalization is disposed of.

the business or equalization is disposed of.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that assessment protests will be accepted during the period of July 2, 2025 through September 15, 2025. Verified written applications for the equalization of assessments may be filed during said period either online at www.sfbos.org/aab or with the Administrator of the Assessment Appeals Board located at City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 405, San Francisco, California 94102.

Printed application forms, Printed application forms, full information and clerical

assistance are available during said period in the office of the Assessment Appeals
Board. Printed application
forms and general information
can also be obtained from the
internet at www.sfbos.org/aab.
Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Assessment Appeals Board Assessment Appeals Board
City & County of Sa
Francisco

June 29, 2025 **EXM-3939760#** 

## CIVIL

FOR CHANGE OF NAME Case No. CNC-25-559877 Superior Court of California, County of SAN FRANCISCO Petition of: KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR for Change of Name TO ALL INTERESTED

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:
Petitioner KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR to KAYLENE SUE FLYING WHITEBIRD
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this

matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. many should not be granted.
Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.
Notice of Hearing:
Date: JULY 22, 2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: 103N, Room: 103N.

103N
The address of the court is
400 MCALLISTER STREET,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(To appear remotely, check
in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To to www.courts.ca.gov/find-n court.htm.)

court.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show
Cause must be published at
least once each week for four
successive weeks before the
date set for hearing on the
petition in a newspaper of
general circulation, printed in
this county: SAN FRANCISCO
EXAMINER
Date: JUNE 5, 2025 Date: JUNE 5, 2025 MICHELLE TONG

Judge of the Superior Court 6/15, 6/22, 6/29, 7/6/25 CNS-3937796# SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

### **FICTITIOUS** BUSINESS NAMES

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT File No. M-300923

The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:

ALVIOR REAL ESTATE, 446 ALVIOR HEAL ESTATE, 446
GRAND AVE., SOUTH SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94080
County of SAN MATEO
AMA CONSULTING TEAM,
418 AVALON DR., SOUTH
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080 This business is conducted by A CORPORATION

A CORPOHATION STATE OF INCORPORATION: CALIFORNIA
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A. Leclare that all information declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.) S/ MARIO ALVIOR - CFO This statement was with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/23/2025. Mark Church, County Clerk

6/29, 7/6, 7/13, 7/20/25 NPEN-3942918# **EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE &** VILLAGER

# FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT File No. M-300852 The following person(s) is (are) doing business as: LUXBMUSIC, 3432 BAY ROAD, REDWOOD CITY, CA

94063 County of SAN MATEO LUXWIN BALA, 3432 BAY ROAD, REDWOOD CITY, CA94063 This business is conducted by AN INDIVIDUAL

AN INDIVIDUAL
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 05/04/2020.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)

false is guilty of a crime.) S/ LUXWIN BALA - OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/10/2025 Mark Church, County Clerk 6/29, 7/6, 7/13, 7/20/25 NPEN-3942566# **EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE &** 

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT File No. 2025-0406703 Fictitious Business Name(s)/

VILLAGER

CBP PROPERTIES, 566
COMMERCIAL ST., SAN
FRANCISCO,, CA 94111
County of SAN FRANCISCO Registered Owner(s): CAPITAL BRIDGE PARTNERS, INC. (CA), 566 COMMERCIAL ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111 This business is conducted by

I his business is conducted by: a Corporation
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 06/20/2025.

06/20/2025.

I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars

(\$1,000).) CAPITAL PARTNERS, INC. BRIDGE S/DANIEL E. RABB. CEO This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on

06/20/2025.

NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
6/29, 7/6, 7/13, 7/20/25
CNS-3942394#
SAN FRANCISCO
EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT

NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300892
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
OXO. 23305 BERNHARDT
ST., HAYWARD, CA 94545 - 1622 County of SAN MATEO
BEACON SALES
ACQUISITION, INC., 505
HUNTMAR PARK DRIVE, SUITE 300, HERNDON, VA 20170
This business is conducted

This business is conducted by Corporation, State of Incorporation: DE The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 06/02/2025.

I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)

S/ CHĀRLES GARTLAND, VICE PRESIDENT
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/17/2025.

Mark Church, County Clerk NILES LOPSHIRE, Deputy Original
6/22, 6/29, 7/6, 7/13/25
NPEN-3940035#
EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER declare that all information

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. 2025-0406617
Fictitious Business Name(s)/
Trade Name (DBA):
GOLDEN STATE SHORING,
945 TARAVAL ST. #330., SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94116
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s): Registered Owner(s): SEISCORE (CA), 2366 20TH AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116 This business is conducted by

a Corporation
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 06/01/2025.

declare that all information I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000.) (\$1,000).) SEISCORE

S/ JOE LAZZARETTI, PRESIDENT

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on NOTICE-In accordance with

NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, another under rederal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code). 6/22, 6/29, 7/6, 7/13/25 CNS-3939085#

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

## FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT File No. M-300802

The following person(s) is (are) doing business as: DALE PLUMBING & DALE PLUMBING & HEATING, 25 CROCKER AVE, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 County of SAN MATEO DALE PLUMBING, INC, 25 CROCKER AVE, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

C11Y, CA 94063
This business is conducted by N/A
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A. I declare that all information I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)
DALE PLUMBING, INC,

S/ TIMO PRESIDENT SPOERL This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/04/2025. Mark Church, County Clerk

Mark Church, County Clerk [Deputy], Deputy Original 6/15, 6/22, 6/29, 7/6/25 NPEN-3928706# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT File No. M-300845

The following person(s) is (are) doing business as: REPRESENT REALTY, 1300

charge persons holding any category of Resident Golf Cards an additional reservation fee of \$19 per reservation fee of \$19 per reservation fee of \$19 per reservation for any advance reservation made between 8 and 30 days before the reserved tee time, and may charge persons who do not hold a Resident Golf Card an appropriate reservation fee based on the flexible pricing standards set forth in Park Code, Section 12.12(c)(1). The Department shall require each player at Harding Park, Fleming, Lincoln Park, Sharp Park, and Golden Gate Park who is above the age of 17 to pay an additional fee for that Golf Course of \$3 per nine holes, as a special projects maintenance fee. For the use of the Golf Courses, the Department shall require each player to pay an additional surcharge of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, to cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses. Harding Park Golf Courses. Harding Park Golf Courses the Weekday cost will increase from \$73 to \$91 Monday through Thursday and increase from \$91 to \$109 for weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident weekday cost will be \$57 Monday through Thursday and \$70 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident weekday cost will be \$31 Monday through Thursday and \$70 weekend days Friday through Sunday; Resident weekday cost will be \$168 for Monday through Thursday and Thursday and \$181 weekend days Friday through Thursday and Sof the originally purchased for the full price round. Replay rounds may not be reserved in advance. Fleming Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will increase from \$26 to \$32 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$24 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Thursday and an increase from \$34 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Thursday and an increase from \$34 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Thursday and an increase from \$34 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Thursday and an increase from \$36 to \$44 for weekend days Friday through Thursday; Resident weekday cost will increa

will set or increase by category

as follows: Resident weekday cost will be \$36 Monday

will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be \$36 Monday through Thursday and \$42 for weekend days Friday through Senday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be \$22 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$18 Monday through Thursday and \$26 for weekends Friday through Sunday; and Tournament fees will be \$61 Monday through Thursday and \$75 Friday through Sunday; Sharp Park Golf Course fees will set or increase by category as follows: Resident weekday cost will be increased from \$37 to \$50 Monday through Thursday and an increase from \$43 to \$60 for weekends Friday through Sunday; Resident Senior weekday cost will be increased from \$23 to \$32; Resident Junior weekday cost will be \$19 Monday through Thursday and \$27 weekend days Friday through Thursday increase from \$70 for Resident Seniors Monday through Thursday; Tournament Costs for Residents will increase from \$70 for Senior will be \$19 Monday through Thursday; Tournament Costs for Residents will increase from \$70 for Senior will set or increase by category as follows: Resident Weekday cost will be \$19 Monday through Thursday; Tournament Costs for Residents will increase from \$70 for Senior will set or increase by category as follows: Resident Senior will cost \$15 Monday through Thursday; Resident Senior will cost \$15 Monday through Thursday; Resident Senior will cost \$10 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior will co

senior will cost \$15 Monday through Thursday; Resident Junior will cost \$10 Monday through Thursday and \$13 Friday through Sunday; and Tournament costs will be \$28 Monday through Thursday and \$38 Friday through Thursday and \$38 Friday through Thursday and provided the senior of the

to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public

record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors.

Written comments should be

addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email

(board.of.supervisors@sfgov. org). Information relating to

# San Francisco Examiner $PUBLIC\ Notices$

Qualified for San Francisco and San Mateo Counties File & Publish New Business Name: Examiner.DBAstore.com Other Legal Notices: Examiner.LegalAdStore.com

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER DALY CITY INDEPENDENT SAN MATEO WEEKLY REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE FOOLITER - BULLETIN FOSTER CITY PROGRESS MILLBRAE - SAN BRUNO SUN BOUTIOUE & VILLAGER EXAMINER - SO. SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER - SAN BRUNO

**GOVERNMENT** 

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE
CHAMBER, ROOM 250
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
JULY 9, 2025 - 1:30 PM
The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/ legislative-research-center-lrc in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184. EXM-3944953#

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAMBER, ROOM 250 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 JULY 9, 2025 - 10:00 AM The agenda packet and The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at https://sfbos.org/ legislative-research-center-Irc in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184. EXM-3944876#

LEGISLATION
INTRODUCED AT, AND
SUMMARY OF ACTIONS OF
THE JULY 1, 2025 MEETING
OF THE SAN FRANCISCO OF THE SAN FHANCISCO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
are available at www.sfbos.
org; 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett
Place, Room 244, San
Francisco, CA 94102; or by
calling (415) 554-5184. EXM-3944723#

NOTICE OF REGULAR
MEETING SAN FRANCISCO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE
CHAMBER, ROOM 250,
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
JULY 8, 2025 - 2:00 PM
The agenda packet and
legislative files are available
for review at https://sfbos.org/
legislative-research-center-irc,
in Room 244 at City Hall, or by
calling (415) 554-5184.

EXM.3944717#
NOTICE OF REGULAR

EXM-3944717#

NOTICE OF REGULAR
MEETING
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS
PUBLIC SAFETY AND
NEIGHBORHOOD
SERVICES COMMITTEE
CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE
CHAMBER, ROOM 250
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
Thursday, July 10, 2025 –
10:00 AM
The agenda packet and
legislative files are available
for review at https://sfbos.
org/legislative-researchcenter-irc, in Room 244 at
City Hall, or by calling (415)
554-5184.
EXM-3944444# EXM-394444#

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2025
-1:30 PM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT the Board of Supervisors
of the City and County of San
Francisco's Budget and
Appropriations Committee will
hold a public hearing to
consider the following
proposal and said public
hearing will be held as follows,
at which time all interested
narries may attend and hearties may attend and which time all interested heard: File No. 250604.
Ordinance amending the Park
Code to authorize the
Recreation and Park Recreation and Department to add a Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. On June 25, 2025, the Budget and Appropriations Committee amended this duly noticed proposed ordinance. If Committee amended this duly noticed proposed ordinance. If this legislation, as amended passes, the fees that were noticed will further increase as follows: The Recreation and Park Department (Department) General Manager or the General Manager's designee may approve a temporary increase to any category Resident Rates and any category of Tournament Rates with increases of up to 50% for Resident Rates at Harding Park only during major City-wide special events. General Golf Fees will be established for Resident Golf Cards. The Department shall charge a fee of \$136 for a San Francisco Resident Golf Card, entitling the holder to discounts on the Golf Courses for two years from the date of issuance. Cards shall be available to San Francisco property owners only upon presentation of valid proof of residency or ownership. The Department shall charge a fee of \$300 for a Pacifica Resident Golf Card entitling the holder to discounts at the Sharp Park noticed proposed ordinance. entitling the holder to discounts at the Sharp Park Golf Course only, for two years from the date of issuance. Golf Cards shall be available to Pacifica residents only upon presentation of valid proof of residency. The Department shall charge a fee of \$38 for replacement of San Francisco Resident Golf Cards and Pacifica Resident Golf Cards. It a San Francisco or Pacifica If a San Francisco or Pacifica Resident Golf Card application is returned to the applicant because the information on the application is incorrect or incomplete, there shall be an additional administrative fee of \$6. The Department may

this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative-Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Thursday, July 3, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent, Jalipa (Brent, Jalipa (Brent, Jalipa (Brent, Jalipa (Start)) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

EXM-3943218#

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2025
-1:30 PM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT the Board of Supervisors
of the City and County of San
Francisco's Budget and
Appropriations Committee will
hold a public hearing to
consider the following
proposal and said public
hearing will be held as follows,
at which time all interested
parties may attend and be
heard: File No. 250592.
Ordinance amending the
Building, Subdivision, and
Administrative Codes to adjust
fees charged by the
Department of Building
Inspection Fund; and affirming
the Planning Department's
determination under the
California Environmental
Quality Act. On June 25, 2025,
the Budget and Appropriations
Committee amended this duly
noticed proposed ordinance. [f
this legislation, as amended,
asses the fees that were noticed proposed ordinance. I this legislation, as amended, passes, the fees that were noticed will further increase as follows: Building Code, Chapter 1A, will be amended to raise fees in the tables of Section 110A. Table 1A-A will be modified for Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$1 to \$2,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fee will be amended to increase from \$160 to \$161 for the first \$500 plus for each additional or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000; atterations to permit issuance fee will increase from \$168 to \$169 for the first \$500 plus for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000; and including \$2,000; and no plans permit issuance fee will increase from \$193 to \$195 for the first \$500 plus and including \$2,000; and no plans permit issuance fee will increase from \$6.33 to \$6.47 for each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$2,001 to \$50,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$237 to \$238 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$6.46 to \$6.54; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$223 to \$224 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$6.75 to \$6.83; and no plans permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$8.75 to \$6.83; and no plans permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$6.90 will increase from \$6.90 will increase from \$8.75 to \$6.83; and no plans permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$8.75 to \$6.83; and no plans permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$8.75 to \$6.83; pure additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$8.90 thereof will increase from \$9.31 to \$9.40. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$50,001 to \$200,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000 will increase from \$547 to \$552 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$5.81 to \$5.88; alterations to permit issuance fees for the permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000 will increase from first \$50,000 will increase from \$547 to \$552 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$5.81 to \$5.88; and no plans permit issuance fee for the first \$50,000 will increase from \$735 to \$743 plus each additional \$1,000 will increase from \$4.55 to \$4.61. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$200,001 to \$500,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000 will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000 will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase fees will incr from \$4.51 to \$4.55; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,434 for the first \$200,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000, will including \$500,000, will increase from \$4.51 to \$4.55 Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 will be as follows: \$1,000,000 will be as follows:
new construction permit
issuance fees for the first
\$500,000 will increase from
\$2,771 to \$2,798 plus each
additional \$1,000 or fraction
thereof will increase from
\$3.42 to \$3.46; alterations to
permit issuance fees for the \$3.42 to \$5.40, alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$2,771 to \$2,798 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$3.42 to \$3.46; and no plans permit issuance fees will fraction thereor Will increase from \$3.42 to \$3.46; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$2,771 to \$2,798 for the first \$500,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000, will increase from \$3.42 to \$3.46. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$4.479 to \$4,527 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.83 to \$2.87; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$4,479 to \$4,527 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.83 to \$2.87; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$2.83 to \$2.87; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$4,479 to \$4.479 to \$4,527 for the first \$1,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000, will increase from \$2.83 to \$2.87. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$5,000,001 to \$50,000,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$15,803 to \$16,000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$14.710 \$1.49; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$14.710 \$1.49; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$15,803 to \$16,000 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$15,803 to \$16,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$1.47 to \$1.49, Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$50,000,001 to \$10,000,000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$82,049 to \$83,121 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alteration to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; alteration to perm alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$82,049 to \$83,121 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$82,049 to \$83,121 will be established for the first \$50,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$1.69 to \$1.71. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$100,000,001 to \$200,000.000 will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$166,419 to \$168,553 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; alterations to permit issuance fees from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$166,419 to \$168,553 for the first \$100,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$166,419 to \$168,553 for the first \$100,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or faction thereof will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees \$100,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or faction thereof will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees \$100,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or faction thereof will increase from \$2.60 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees \$1.000 to and no plans permit issuance \$166,419 to \$168,553 for the first \$100,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$200,000,001 and up will be as follows: new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$432,116 to \$437,894 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.16 to \$2.69; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$432,116 to \$437,894 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69; and no plans permit issuance fees will increase from \$432,116 to \$437,894 for the first \$200,000,000 plus for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69. Table 1A-C will be modified to fraction thereof, will increase from \$2.66 to \$2.69. Table 1A-C will be modified to increase hourly permit issuance/inspection rates from \$399 to \$405 per hour for regular inspections and from \$457 to \$477 per hour (minimum of two hours) for off-hour inspections for plan review fee not covered in the table for Permit Issuance Fees by Category. Permit issuance Fees by Category. Permit issuance Fees for Category IP - Single Residential Unit — water service, sewer replacement, single plumbing fixture installation, shower pan installation, or kitchen or bathroom remodels will increase from \$273 to \$276; Category IM - Single Residential Unit — mechanical gas appliance (furnace. hydronic heat, heat pump) will increase from \$264 to \$267; Category 2PA - Plumbing installation for residential construction with 6 or less dwelling units or guest rooms; without underground plumbing installation (includes water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$477 to \$483; Category 2PB - Plumbing 1981 plumbing 1981 plumbing 1981 plumbing 2981 increase from \$477 to \$483; Category 2PB - Plumbing installation for residential construction with 6 dwelling units or guest rooms or less; with underground plumbing with underground plumbing installation (includes water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$692 to \$701; Category 2M - Mechanical gas appliances for residential construction with 6 dwelling appliānées for residential construction with 6 dwelling units or guest rooms or less will increase from \$395 to \$400; Category 3PA - 7-12 Dwelling Units will increase from \$977 to \$1,982; Category 3PB - 13-36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,977 to \$1,982; Category 3PC - Over 36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$7,887 to \$7,989; Category 3MA - 7-12 Dwelling Units will increase from \$987 to \$996; Category 3MC - Over 36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,957 to \$1,980; Category 3MC - Over 36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$8,293 to \$8,403; Category 4PA - Fire sprinklers - one and two family dwelling units will increase from \$264 to \$267; Category 4PB - Fire sprinklers - 3 or more dwelling units or guest rooms, commercial and office - per floor will increase from \$344 to \$348; Category SP/5M - Office, mercantile & retail buildings: New or Tenant Improvements; heating/cooling equipment to piping connected thereto - per feant

certificates issued online will increase from \$121 to \$122 and in-house will increase from \$207 to \$208; and connection to utility company-provided steam will increase from \$207 to \$208 per hour with a minimum of one-half hour. Table 1A-D will be modified to increase standard hourly rates for inspection rates from \$555 to \$571 per hour; off-hour inspections from \$680 to \$742; and a new standard hourly rate for housing inspection will be established for \$596 per hour. Table 1A-E will be modified to increase hourly issuance/inspection rates from \$399 to \$405 per hour for regular inspections and from \$457 to \$477 per hour (minimum of two hours) for off-hour inspections for installations not covered by the fee schedule. Category 1 - General Wiring: Residential Buildings up to 10,000 sq. ft. up to 10 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$270 to \$273; 11 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$270 to \$273; 11 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$421 to \$426; up to 40 outlets and or devices, includes up to 200 Amp service upgrade, will increase from \$527 to \$534; more than 40 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$725 to \$734; and buildings of 5,000 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,053 to \$1,066. Category 2 - General Wiring: Nonresidential Buildings & Residential Buildings over 10,000 sq. ft. up to 5 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$406 to \$410; 6 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$622 to \$630; areas up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,236 to \$1,251; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,236 to \$1,251; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$2,092 to \$2,119; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$4,122 to \$4,177; 30,001 to 500,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$4,122 to \$4,177; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$4,122 to \$4,177; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$2,505 to \$12,669; 100,001 to \$50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$2,505 to \$12,569; 100,001 to \$25,681; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$25,337 to \$25,681; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$25,307 to \$25,681; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$25,307 to \$25,681; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$25,307 to \$25,681; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$25,307 to \$25,681; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$25,000 to \$112,544 to \$113,993. Category 3 - Service Distribution and Utilization Equipment of 225 amps rating or less will increase from \$330 to \$397; 250 to 500 amps will increase from \$300 amps will increase increase from \$602 to \$609 600 to 1000 amps will increase from \$811 to \$822; 1,200 to 2,000 amps will increase from \$1,232 to \$1,248; more than 2,000 amps will increase from \$1,597 to \$1,619; 600 volts or more will increase from \$1,650 to \$1,672; 150 kva or less will increase from \$393 to \$398; 151 kva or more will increase from \$602 to \$609; and Fire Pump installations will increase from \$804 to \$609; and Fire Pump installations will increase from \$813 to \$824. Category 4 - Installations of Fire Warning and Controlled Devices up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$455 to \$461; 2,501 to 5,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$671 to \$680; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,236 to \$1,251; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$2,041 to \$2,067; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$4,157 to \$4,212; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$8,209 to \$8,319; 100,001 to 500,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$12,049 to \$12,211; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$27,376 to \$27,749; and more than 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$27,376 to \$27,749; and more than 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$58,95 for \$55,697. Fire Warning and Controlled Devices (Retrofit Systems) for buildings of not more than 6 dwelling units will increase from \$32,465 to \$55,697. Fire Warning and Controlled Devices (Retrofit Systems) for buildings of not more than 6 dwelling units will increase from \$32,465 to \$54,910 st. \$49,710 st. \$24,97; 10-20 floors will increase from \$2,465 to \$2,497; 10-20 floors will increase from \$4,148 to 151 kva or more will increase from \$602 to \$609; and Fire \$2,497; 10-20 floors will increase from \$4,148 to increase from \$4,148 to \$4,203; 21-30 floors will increase from \$8,209 to \$8,319; and more than 30 floors will increase from \$12,049 to \$12,211. Category - Miscellaneous Installation for a remodel/upgrade of existing hotel guest/SRO rooms up to 6 rooms will increase from \$519 to \$525, and each additional group of 3 rooms will increase from \$261 to \$264; data, communications, and wireless system of 11 to 500 cables will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional group of 100 cables will increase from \$67 to \$68; security systems of 10 components or less will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional group of 100 components will increase from \$42 to \$43; office workstations of 5 or less will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional group of 10 workstations of 5 or less will increase from \$95 to \$97; temporary exhibition wiring from 1 to 100 booths will increase from \$95 to \$97; temporary exhibition wiring from 1 to 100 booths will increase from \$67 to \$68; exterior/interior electrical signs will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional sign at the same address will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional sign at the same address will increase from \$281 to \$284; quarterly permits for a maximum of five outlets in any one location will increase from \$284 to \$284; quarterly permits for a maximum of five outlets in any one location will increase from \$284 to \$284; survey, research, and report preparation, per hour or fraction thereof will increase and wireless system of 11 to 500 cables will increase from research, and report preparation, per hour or fraction thereof will increase

Surveys and Reports will be modified to increase the standard hourly rate, and re-inspection fee from \$399 to \$405 per hour; off-hours inspection rate from \$457 to \$477 per hour with a minimum of two hours, plus permit fee; survey of nonresidential buildings will increase from \$399 to \$405 per hour, with a minimum two hours; survey of residential buildings for any purpose or Condo Conversions for a single unit will increase from \$3,656 to \$3,700; two to four units will increase from \$4,679 to \$4,738; and five plus units will increase from \$5,093 to \$5,159 plus Standard Hourly Inspection Rate; hotels including 10 guestrooms will increase from \$3,497 to \$4,068 plus an increase from \$113 to \$114 per guestroom over 10; and temporary certificate of occupancy will increase from \$629 to \$646; house moving permit fee will increase from wing permit fee will increase from \$399 to \$405 per hour with a three-hour minimum; re-roofing permit per hour with a three-hour minimum; re-roofing permit fees for single-family homes and duplexes will increase from \$306 to \$309 and for all and duplexes will increase from \$306 to \$309 and for all others the re-roofing permit fee will increase from \$504 to \$509; and night noise permits will increase from \$63 to \$670. Table 1A-K - Penalties, Hearings, Code Enforcement Assessments will be modified to increase the filling fee for an Abatement Appeals Board hearing from \$526 to \$534 per case; emergency order will increase from \$493 to \$497, with a minimum of two hours; and for vacant building – initial and annual registration will increase from \$1,825 to \$1,850. Table 1A-N - Energy Conservation will be modified for the initial inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings and two-family dwellings and residential hotels up to 20 rooms to increase from \$197 to \$200. Compliance inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family increase from \$197 to \$200. Compliance inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings and two-family dwellings and two-family dwellings will increase from \$197 to \$200. Compliance inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwelling to \$299 and each additiona 10 rooms, or portion thereof, will increase from \$153 to \$155; and certification of a qualified energy inspector will increase from \$444 to \$450. Table 1A-P - Residential Code

**FICTITIOUS** BUSINESS NAMES **FICTITIOUS BUSINESS** NAME STATEMENT
File No. 2025-0406773
Fictitious Business Name(s)/ lable 1A-P - Hesidential Code
Enforcement and License
Fees will be modified to
increase one and two-family
dwelling unit fees from \$136 to
\$140 per rental unit.
Apartment house license fees
of 3 to 12 units will increase
from \$514 to \$542 per year;
13 to 30 units will increase 13 to 30 units will increase from \$839 to \$863 per year, and apartment houses of more than 30 units will increase from \$1,011 to \$1,066 and \$153 to \$156 for each additional 10 units or shoe and \$1.50 to \$1. from \$933 to \$956; 60 to 149 rooms will increase from \$1,127 to \$1,154; 150 to 200 rooms will increase from \$1,127 to \$1,154; 150 to 200 rooms will increase from \$1,418 to \$1,454; and hotels with more than 200 rooms will increase from \$1,804 to \$1,849 and increase from \$1,804 to \$1,849 and increase from \$1,804 to \$1,849 and increase from \$153 to \$156 for each additional 25 rooms or portion thereof. Table 1A-Q — Hotel Conversion Ordinance fees will be modified to increase appeals of initial or annual status determination, inspection staff review of requests for hearing to exceed 25% tourist season rental limit, and inspection staff review of unsuccessful challenge of a usage report and standard hourly inspection or request for winter rental exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000). S/LISA J. GUTHRIE, This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 07/01/0005 winter rental from \$399 to \$405; claims of exemption based on low-income housing will increase from \$788 to \$799; claims of exemption based on partially completed conversion will increase from \$1,183 to \$1,199; initial unit usage report will increase from \$788 to \$799; permit to convert will increase from \$1,300 to \$1,317; and statement of exemption - Hearing Officer fee will increase from \$788 to \$729. exemption based on partially SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER \$799. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Thursday, July 3, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee. Brent Jalina \$799. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section

CIVIL

EXM-3943214#

the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa

(Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of

Supervisors, City and County

of San Francisc

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME Case No. CNC-25-559877 Superior Court of California, County of SAN FRANCISCO Petition of: KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR for Change of Name

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: PERSONS:
Petitioner KAYLENE SUE
MCCOLLAR filed a petition
with this court for a decree
changing names as follows:
KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR to KAYLENE SUE FLYING WHITEBIRD to KAYLENE SUE FLYING WHITEBIRD
The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:
Date: JULY 22, 2025, Time: 9700 A M Dept. 103N Room:

Date: JULY 22, 2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: 103N, Room:

103N
The address of the court is
400 MCALLISTER STREET,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(To appear remotely, check
in advance of the hearing for
information about how to do
so on the court's website. To
find your court's website, go
to www.courts.ca.gov/find-mycourt.htm.)
A copy of this Order to Show
Cause must be published at

Cause must be published at least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER EXAMINER
Date: JUNE 5, 2025
MICHELLE TONG
Judge of the Superior Court
6/15, 6/22, 6/29, 7/6/25
CNS-3937796# SAN FRANCISCO

**EXAMINER** 

Fictitious Business Name(s)/ Trade Name (DBA): LA TIERRA, 891 BEACH ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 County of SAN FRANCISCO Registered Owner(s): LISA J. GUTHRIE, 360 VIA APRAISO, MONTEREY, CA 93940 This business is conducted by: an Individual

an Individual
The registrant commenced to
transact business under the
fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A declare that all information in this statement is true and in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1.000.)

07/01/2025. NOTICE-In accordance with NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner A new in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictive Business Name of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code). 7/6, 7/13, 7/20, 7/27/25 CNS-3945127#

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300923
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
ALVIOR REAL ESTATE, 446
GRAND AVE., SOUTH SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94080
County of SAN MATEO
AMA CONSULTING TEAM,
418 AVALON DR., SOUTH
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
This business is conducted by A CORPORATION
STATE OF INCORPORATION: STATE OF INCORPORATION: CALIFORNIA

The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A. or names listed above on N/A.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.) S/ MARIO ALVIOR - CFO This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/23/2025. Mark Church, County (Clerk 6/29, 7/6, 7/13, 7/20/25 NPEN-3942918# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300852
The following person(s) is
(are) doing business as:
LUXBMUSIC, 3432 BAY
ROAD, REDWOOD CITY, CA
94063 County of SAN MATEO
LUXWIN BALA, 3432 BAY
ROAD, REDWOOD CITY,
CA94063
This business is conducted by

This business is conducted by AN INDIVIDUAL AN INDIVIDUAL
The registrant(s) commenced
to transact business under
the fictitious business name
or names listed above on
05/04/2020. I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.) S/ LUXWIN BALA - OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/10/2025. Mark Church, County Clerk 6/29, 7/6, 7/13, 7/20/25 NPEN-3942566#

EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT File No. 2025-0406703 Fictitious Business Name(s)/

File No. 2025-0406703
Fictitious Business Name(s)/
Trade Name (DBA);
CBP PROPERTIES, 566
COMMERCIAL ST., SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94111
County of SAN FRANCISCO
Registered Owner(s):
CAPITAL BRIDGE
PARTNERS, INC. (CA), 566
COMMERCIAL ST, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94111
This business is conducted by:
a Corporation
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 06/20/2025.
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true any material matter pursuant to Section 17913 of the Business and Professions code that the registrant knows to be false is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000).
CAPITAL BRIDGE
PARTNERS, INC.
S/DANIEL E. RABB, CEO
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Francisco County on 06/20/2025.
NOTICE-In accordance with

San Francisco County on 06/20/2025.

NOTICE-In accordance with Subdivision (a) of Section 17920, a Fictitious Name Statement generally expires at the end of five years from the date on which it was filed in the office of the County Clerk, except, as provided in Subdivision (b) of Section 17920, where it expires 40 days after any change in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section in the facts set forth in the statement pursuant to Section 17913 other than a change in the residence address of a registered owner. A new Fictitious Business Name Statement must be filed before the expiration. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a Fictitious Business Name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (See Section 14411 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

6/29, 7/6, 7/13, 7/20/25

CNS-3942394#

SAN FRANCISCO

EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300955
The following person(s) is
(are) doing business as:
JMR INTÉRNATIONAL, 425
CLARK DR, SAN MATEO, CA
94402 County of SAN MATEO
JOSEPH RYAN, 425 CLARK
DR, SAN MATEO, CA 94402
This business is conducted by This business is conducted by an Individual The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A. I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who

in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.) S/JOSEPH RYAN, This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/26/2025. Mark Church, County Clerk [Deputy], Deputy Original 7/6, 7/13, 7/20, 7/27/25 NPEN-3941400# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT File No. M-300959

File No. M-300959
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
RISER CONSTRUCTION, 1475 ROLLINS ROAD, BURLINGAME, CA 94010
County of SAN MATEO
SERGIY TSYGANCHUK, 1475 ROLLINS ROAD, BURLINGAME, CA 94010
This business is conducted by an Individual The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A. I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)

S/SERGIY TSYGANCHUK, This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/26/2025. Mark Church, County Clerk [Deputy], Deputy Original 7/6, 7/13, 7/20, 7/27/25

NPEN-3941399#

EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER The registrant(s) commenced

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS

NAME STATEMENT File No. M-300964 File No. M-300964
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
BAY AREA SPORTSHOUSE, 147 BEACON ST, SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
County of SAN MATEO
JUSLJ LLC, 1246 MISSION RD, SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
This business is conducted by a Limited Liability Company (CA)

Ihis business is conducted by a Limited Liability Company (CA)
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A. I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)
JJSLJ LLC,
S/ JASON CHAN, MANAGING MEMBER

S/ JASON CHAN, MAINAGING MEMBER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/27/2025. Mark Church, County Clerk Deputy], Deputy Original 7/6, 7/13, 7/20, 7/27/25 NPEN-3941334#

EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER



# Go ahead, start your new business here:

Improvements; heating/ cooling equipment to piping connected thereto - per tenant or per floor, whichever is less will increase from \$575 to \$582; Category 6PA -Restaurants (new and remodel) fee includes 5 or less drainage and or case outlets.

remodel) fee includes 5 or less drainage and or gas outlets -no fees required for public or private restroom will increase from \$537 to \$543; Category 6PB - Restaurants (new and

remodel) fee includes 6 or more drainage and/or gas outlets - no fees required for

public or private restroom will increase from \$1,507 to increase from \$1,507 to \$1,525; Category 8 - New boiler installations over 200

kbtu will increase from \$478 to \$484; Category 9P/M -Surveys will increase from \$500 to \$507; Category 10P/M

Condominium conversions will increase from \$609 to \$617; Category 11P/M - Miscellaneous will increase from \$302 to \$310; Boller Maintenance Program for permits to operate or renew

# **Examiner.DBAstore.com**

We will assist you in registering your new "Doing Business As" (DBA) aka Fictitious Business Name with the San Francisco or San Mateo County Registrar and promptly publish the mandated legal notice in **The Examiner**!

from \$532 to \$536; witness testing: life safety, fire warning, emergency, and energy management systems hourly rate will increase from \$424 to

\$430 and off-hour inspections

hourly rate, two hour minimum

will increase from \$457 to \$477; energy management, HVAC controls, and low-

voltage wiring systems for 1-10 floors will increase from \$850 to \$860, and each additional floor will increase from \$95 to \$97; and solar

photovoltaic systems with 10 KW rating or less will increase from \$279 to \$283, and each additional 10 KW rating will increase from \$235 to \$238. Table 1A-G - Inspections,



# BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

# **MEMORANDUM**

	Date:	June 25, 2025				
	To:	Planning Department / Commission				
	From:	Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Appropriations Committee				
	Subject:	Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250604-2 Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields; Golf Course Fees Generally				
$\boxtimes$	(Californi ⊠					
	(Planning	Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  (Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)  General Plan  Planning Code, Section 101.1  Planning Code, Section 302				
		Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning (Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)				
	(Charter, (Require subdivisi relocatio public he annu	General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments (Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2.4.53) (Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)				
		Preservation Commission  Landmark (Planning Code, Section 1004.3)  Cultural Districts (Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23)  Mills Act Contract (Government Code, Section 50280)  Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (Planning Code, Article 11)				

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org.

From: Navarrete, Joy (CPC)
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

Subject: Re: CEQA Determinations, as Amended Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 11:53:43 AM

# Our CEQA is still good. Thanks for checking.

## Joy Navarrete (she/her), Principal Environmental Planner

Environmental Planning Division

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 628.652.7561 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <a href="mailto:sfgov.org">brent.jalipa@sfgov.org</a>

**Sent:** Thursday, July 3, 2025 10:51 AM

To: Navarrete, Joy (CPC) <joy.navarrete@sfgov.org>

Subject: CEQA Determinations, as Amended

Hi Joy!

Checking in to see if the CEQA Determinations still held after File Nos. 250592, 250604, and 250605 were amended.

## Thanks, as always!

# **Brent Jalipa**

**Assistant Clerk** 

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163 brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

**(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS)** To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

# **BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



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

# **MEMORANDUM**

D	ate:	June 3, 2025					
То	o:	Planning Department / Commission  Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Appropriations Committee					
Fr	rom:						
Su	ıbject:	Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250604 Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields					
	(Californio	a Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Dete a Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.) Ordinance / Resolution Ballot Measure	Not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.  6/4/2025  Joy Wavarrete				
	Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  (Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)  General Plan  Planning Code, Section 302						
		Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning (Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)					
	(Charter, CRequires subdivision relocation public he annu	General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments (Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53) (Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)					
		Preservation Commission  Landmark (Planning Code, Section 1004.3)  Cultural Districts (Charter, Section 4.135 & B  Mills Act Contract (Government Code, Section 2)  Designation for Significant/Contributory B	50280)				

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at Brent Jalipa@sfgov.org.

From: ALEXI PAPALEXOPOULOS

To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 11:09:11 PM

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

Dear Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee:

My name is Alexi Papalexopoulos and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Best,

Alexi www.apdirector.com INSTAGRAM 
 From:
 V. Eristavi

 To:
 Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 9:46:37 PM

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

Public Comment - Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589) Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Vadim Victor Eristavi, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate. A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control. I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces. I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses. Thank you

Vadim Victor Eristavi

From: <u>Lisa Biasotti</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 4:46:48 PM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee. My name is Lisa Biasotti, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you

 From:
 | aura bottero |

 To:
 | Jalipa, Brent (BOS) |

**Subject:** Re: Privatization of our SF public golf courses **Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 4:32:24 PM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Laura Bottero Lewers, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you, and best, Laura

 From:
 Karen Tarantola

 To:
 Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 2:16:55 PM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Karen Tarantola, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

# **Karen Tarantola**

From: <u>rharrisjr1@gmail.com</u>

Date:

To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>; <u>Lurie, Daniel (MYR)</u>

Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Ketcham, Dana (REC)

Subject: Board of Supervisors Budget and Appropriations Committee / Budget Hearing June 12, 10 a.m. / Rec & Park Dept

/ SF Public Golf Alliance Letter, Petition Wednesday, June 11, 2025 11:53:20 AM

Attachments: Open.Letter.Petition.Save.SF.Public.Golf.Courses.Names.pdf

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

Board of Supervisors Budget and Appropriations Committee / Budget Hearing June 12, 10 a.m. / Rec & Park Dept / SF Public Golf Alliance Letter, Petition

Dear Mayor Lurie and Mr. Jalipa -

Enclosed above please find the Letter and Petition from the non-profit San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, for filing w/ Mayor's Budget Office and the Supervisors' Budget Committee in connection with its June 12 public hearing on the Recreation and Parks Department Budget for FY 2026-27.

Please circulate to the Committee and Board Members and appropriate City Offices regarding the Budget. And please confirm receipt.

Thank you for your service and courtesy.

Richard Harris, President San Francisco Public Golf Alliance 826 Stanyan St. San Francisco, CA. 94117 415-290-5718 From: <u>Isabella Frost</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 10:00:20 AM

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

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)
Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is Isabella Frost, and I'm a San Francisco resident of 28 years reaching out
today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as
it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Isabella Frost

From: <u>Jake</u>

To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589 Message:

**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 8:15:45 AM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Jennifer Jake Ibarra and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Jennifer Jake Ibarra

-Sent from Gmail Mobile

Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: <u>Jake</u>

To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

Subject: :Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589 Message:

**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 8:12:10 AM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Jennifer Jake Ibarra

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

 From:
 Brendan Frost

 To:
 Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

Subject: Subject line (optional): Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 8:23:14 PM

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

# Message:

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589) Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

As a Transit Operator for SFMTA, I am very opposed to the taking of public lands and amenities and handing them to a for profit company which will restrict access to city residents with costs increases.

Thank you

From: Monica Maresca
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 4:32:39 PM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Monica Maresca and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you in advance.

Best regards,

Monica Maresca SF resident 415.786.0006 From: Kevin Reynolds

To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Privatization of Golf Courses File No. 250589 **Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:34:18 PM

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

# DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN!

THESE ARE PUBLIC AMENITIES TO BE KEPT FOR THE ETERNITY OF TIME. DO NOT SQUANDER THEM FOR IMMEDIATE REWARDS!

Kevin Reynolds 70 Aquavista Way SF, 94131 From: <u>Jessica Johnson</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** File No. 250589- Opposing Privatization of public spaces

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:11:11 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Jessica Johnson and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thanks! Jessica Jessica Jung Johnson

Realtor

DRE# 02084004

Jessica@vanguardsf.com

Direct: 415-828-6224

<u>Jessicasellssf.com</u>

Vanguard Properties



Ranked Top 1% of TIC Sales in San Francisco

From: Robin Hubinsky
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:02:20 PM

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

### Message:

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)
Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

### Thank you

Robin Hubinsky San Francisco, Ca. 94110 415.939.4028 (cell) rhubinsky@hotmail.com

From: **Rodney Wertz** To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization - File No. 250589

Tuesday, June 10, 2025 2:59:01 PM Date:

Attachments: image001[11].png

image002.png

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

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589) Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you

## Contributing to your Success!

RODNEY WERTZ
Agent Success Manager
Office Manager
415.655.5600
rodney@vanguardsf.com
VANGUARDPROPERTIES.COM



From: Emilie Biasotti-Nystrom

To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Stop the Privatization of SF"s Public Golf Course! File No.250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 1:04:47 PM

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

### Good afternoon,

Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Emilie Biasotti-Nystrom, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses—Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Emilie Biasotti-Nystrom

(510) 703-7032

From: Stephen Gorski
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses, File#: 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 12:36:56 PM

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

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Stephen J Gorski and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. Further, I have held a resident card for golf for about 20 years and often play the referenced golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by

rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Stephen J. Gorski, D4 Resident and voter for over 45 years.

Sent from my iPad

From: <u>Aidan Downes</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 11:16:52 AM

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

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good morning, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Aidan, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you

From: Kevin Cassidy

To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 10:50:03 AM

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

Hello Brent,

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)
Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles— are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you Kevin Cassidy

Sent from my iPhone

 From:
 Valentina Osorio

 To:
 Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

 Subject:
 File no. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 9:17:46 AM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Valentina Osorio, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate. A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control. I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces. I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses. Thank you

 From:
 Jack Calonico

 To:
 Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

 Subject:
 File no. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 9:15:07 AM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Jack Calonico, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. San Francisco's public golf courses—Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate. A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control. I support exploring alternative revenue solutions —ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces. I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses. Thank you

 From:
 John Calonico

 To:
 Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 8:59:03 AM

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

## HELP STOP THE PRIVATIZATION

: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589 Message:

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589) Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is John Calonico, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you John Calonico Sent from my iPhone From: Gabriel Porter

To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 7:02:52 AM

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

Good morning, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Gabriel, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

I grew up in a low-income household in the Sunset district. The City's public courses allowed me affordable, accessible places to learn the game of golf. But moreover those courses became places to learn life lessons, meet people I otherwise never would have, and grow as a person. And all this was accessible to me (via a MUNI ride) because of affordable green fees and the City's youth golf programs. These experiences were invaluable to myself and my brothers and only existed because of the City's Public Courses.

Golf remains an important part of my life and I'm extremely impressed with the recent improvements at the City's public courses, GGPGC and Lincoln Park GC especially. Whenever I play any of the public courses in the city with visitors, they always remark about how cool it is to have quality PUBLIC courses within the city limits. I agree.

Residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

# Gabriel

From: <u>Max Rothstein</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 5:17:47 PM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Max Rothstein, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Max

From: Deirdre Connor

To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 5:04:12 PM

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

Hello Mr. Jalipa,

I'm writing to express concern about the proposed city budget that could lead to the privatization of San Francisco's public golf courses, including Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles.

As someone who actively uses and values these public courses, I've seen how vital they are to our city. They provide affordable access to green space, recreation, and a sense of community for people from all walks of life.

I also host a monthly golf group with local professionals, and many of our outings are held at these public courses. If they were to become private, we would likely be priced out or lose access altogether. These spaces are more than places to play—they're part of San Francisco's inclusive fabric.

Public golf courses are just as important as our parks. They offer open space, promote wellness, and bring people together. Programs like First Tee are doing incredible work to make golf more inclusive for underserved youth, and I believe the city should focus on expanding access through initiatives like that—not privatization.

Please consider the long-term consequences on accessibility, equity, and community life. I respectfully urge you and the Budget & Appropriations Committee to oppose any budget measures that would lead to the privatization of our public golf courses (File No. 250589).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Deirdre Connor** 

From: <u>Nikolas Eristavi</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 3:16:53 PM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Nikolas Eristavi, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you Regards,

Nikolas Eristavi

From: <u>Teka Eristavi</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 11:39:35 AM

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

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Téa Eristavi, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles— are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Téa Eristavi SF resident From: <u>Christina Haight</u>
To: <u>Jalipa, Brent (BOS)</u>

**Subject:** Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589

**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 10:31:21 AM

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

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Christina Haight and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles— are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you

 From:
 Mark Gonzales

 To:
 Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

 Cc:
 Mark Gonzales

**Subject:** Reference file number 250589. Keep SF golf Courses Public

**Date:** Sunday, June 15, 2025 9:32:51 PM

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

Hello Brent.

Could you pass this along to wherever it would matter most.

The privatization of San Francisco's public golf courses—including Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Golden Gate Park, Harding Park, and Gleneagles is not good for the City, the residents and visitors that golf at these courses, nor for the employees that work so hard to keep these courses as beautiful as they are.

My name is Mark Gonzales,

I am a retired City employee, I retired as a Deputy Chief from the SFFD over 6 years ago. I play all of the public courses regularly.

Privatizing these courses would mean higher fees, less community access, and a loss of good union jobs. These courses are more than places to play golf—they are open parkland, wildlife habitat, and affordable, accessible public golf courses.

The kids of the City and the Retired residents of the City use and love these courses as is. Please keep them public!!!

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be

a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you! Mark Gonzales Sent from my iPhone From: <u>Tom Radulovich</u>

To: Chan, Connie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS)

Cc: Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Bishop, Lamonte" (REC); Jalipa, Brent (BOS);

Madison.Tam@sfgov.org; Ildiko Polony; Peter Belden; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA); Eaken, Amanda (MTA)

Subject: Livable City supports Recreation and Parks" budget and revenue proposals, and R&P support community

stewardship

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 10:11:06 AM

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

## Dear Supervisors,

As the City budget shrinks, it's crucial to preserve essential services for San Franciscans. Access to green spaces for active recreation, socializing, and quiet enjoyment of nature is essential for our physical and mental health. Public parks allow us to exercise our bodies, relax and reduce stress, and connect with people. Research shows we are biophilic by nature, and being around trees and plants is essential to human well-being.

We have reviewed the Recreation and Parks budget proposals, and are impressed by how the department has sought to preserve essential services consistent with San Francisco's equity, health, and environmental goals.

We are municipalists, and believe that City government should play a robust role in providing the public infrastructure and services essential for human and biospheric well-being. However it is important to distinguish between public goods, which should be provided to equitably and at high quality free of charge, and services which ought to be publicly provided on a fee-for-service or cost-recovery basis. The latter include services which have high costs, generate negative externalities, make large demands on limited resources. Everyone should be able to access green and well-maintained parks and open spaces within a short walk of one's home, and enjoy ample opportunities for recreation, connection with nature, and structured and unstructured play. However storing one's private car in a public park is not a public good. Cars are large and space in parks is limited. Cars create health, safety, and environmental liabilities for other users of public space. Charging for parking is both fair and effective. It recovers some of the public cost of providing and maintaining automobile infrastructure, reduces conflicts over limited space, and encourages people to choose sustainable transportation alternatives more often. We have been urging SFMTA, which has chosen to cut essential transit and sustainable mobility while refusing to consider greater cost recovery for private car storage, to follow Recreation and Parks's equitable and sustainable approach. Greater cost-recovery for golf courses is also fair - golf courses require enormous amounts of public space, water, chemicals, and maintenance and serve relatively few users.

San Francisco's park system is excellent – something we should all be proud of, and a model for how we should deliver other public services. It is made possible by the diligence of Recreation and Parks staff, and R&P staffing should not be cut. Thousands of San Franciscans contribute their time and their money to caring for and improving parks and natural areas. Stewardship of public places is good for us individually - it gets us outdoors moving our bodies. It builds community. It is good for the city as a whole, including the native plants and animals we share this place with. Community stewardship of public places is far more effective with city support, including staff support (gardeners, natural resource specialists, and the community garden program, etc), design, planning, and administrative support from professional staff, and grants which can be matched with donations, philanthropy, and volunteer labor and expertise. Community stewardship has taken a hit in the last year from corruption in the Community Challenge Grant program and the collapse of San Francisco Parks Alliance. It's essential that the City continue supporting community stewardship through its programs, Recreation and Parks' partnership division, and making grants available to community groups with minimal rigamarole. Even though budget times are tough, the City should do more, not less, to support community stewardship, understanding that it's an investment rather than an expense.

The R&P budget proposal is equitable and sustainable, maintains essential services for San Franciscans, and preserves the jobs of hard-working and effective public employees. It deserves your full support.

Sincerely,

Tom Radulovich Livable City From: <u>Sonya Dreizler</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

Cc: ChenStaff

**Subject:** Budget Public Comment

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 3:06:57 PM

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

Hello Budget Committee, and CCing Supervisor Chen (my supervisor),

I came to the budget committee meeting today to voice my support for Rec & Park. I arrived at 10am and had to leave before 2pm so did not get to provide comment in person. Below is a copy of my 1 minute of remarks I prepared. Thank you for including them in your consideration.

Kindly, Sonya

My name is Sonya Dreizler and I'm here to urge full financial support for Rec & Park programs. I have lived in The City for 23 years and raised a family here for the last 15 of those. When my kids were little we saw lots of families leave for the suburbs because they wanted a backyard, or more community, or they wanted their kids to join a swim team.

Like many other families, my family stayed. And Rec & Park has offered all of those amenities - and more - to our kids.

- The parks offer a **collective backyard** for all city families.
- The programs from art classes to rock climbing, summer camps to sports teams (even a **swim team!**) are amazing for both kids and adults.
- And the sense of **community** though hard to articulate may be the most valuable thing Rec & Park provides. All over the city, my kids see people they know from Rec & Park baseball teams, art camp, swim lessons, or Camp Mather. And the instructors and park staff know and look out for all the kids.

In a busy and increasingly tech focused city, Rec & Park programs and people foster *in real life* community and a deep sense of belonging. Please fully fund these people, programs, and places that make The City a great place to live.

Sonya Dreizler

she/ her <a href="mailto:sonyadreizler.com">sonyadreizler.com</a>

From: <u>Tom Radulovich</u>

To: Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)

Cc: Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Bishop, Lamonte" (REC); Jalipa, Brent (BOS);

Madison.Tam@sfgov.org; Ildiko Polony; Peter Belden; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA); Eaken, Amanda (MTA)

Subject: Livable City supports Recreation and Parks" budget and revenue proposals, and R&P support community

stewardship

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 4:00:49 PM

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

## Dear Supervisors,

As the City budget shrinks, it's crucial to preserve essential services for San Franciscans. Access to green spaces for active recreation, socializing, and quiet enjoyment of nature is essential for our physical and mental health. Public parks allow us to exercise our bodies, relax and reduce stress, and connect with people. Research shows we are biophilic by nature, and being around trees and plants is essential to human well-being.

We have reviewed the Recreation and Parks budget proposals, and are impressed by how the department has sought to preserve essential services consistent with San Francisco's equity, health, and environmental goals.

We are municipalists, and believe that City government should play a robust role in providing the public infrastructure and services essential for human and biospheric well-being. However it is important to distinguish between public goods, which should be provided to equitably and at high quality free of charge, and services which ought to be publicly provided on a fee-for-service or cost-recovery basis. The latter include services which have high costs, generate negative externalities, make large demands on limited resources. Everyone should be able to access green and well-maintained parks and open spaces within a short walk of one's home, and enjoy ample opportunities for recreation, connection with nature, and structured and unstructured play. However storing one's private car in a public park is not a public good. Cars are large and space in parks is limited. Cars create health, safety, and environmental liabilities for other users of public space. Charging for parking is both fair and effective. It recovers some of the public cost of providing and maintaining automobile infrastructure, reduces conflicts over limited space, and encourages people to choose sustainable transportation alternatives more often. We have been urging SFMTA, which has chosen to cut essential transit and sustainable mobility while refusing to consider greater cost recovery for private car storage, to follow Recreation and Parks's equitable and sustainable approach. Greater cost-recovery for golf courses is also fair - golf courses require enormous amounts of public space, water, chemicals, and maintenance and serve relatively few users.

San Francisco's park system is excellent – something we should all be proud of, and a model for how we should deliver other public services. It is made possible by the diligence of Recreation and Parks staff, and R&P staffing should not be cut. Thousands of San Franciscans contribute their time and their money to caring for and improving parks and natural areas. Stewardship of public places is good for us individually - it gets us outdoors moving our bodies. It builds community. It is good for the city as a whole, including the native plants and animals we share this place with. Community stewardship of public places is far more effective with city support, including staff support (gardeners, natural resource specialists, and the community garden program, etc), design, planning, and administrative support from professional staff, and grants which can be matched with donations, philanthropy, and volunteer labor and expertise. Community stewardship has taken a hit in the last year from corruption in the Community Challenge Grant program and the collapse of San Francisco Parks Alliance. It's essential that the City continue supporting community stewardship through its programs, Recreation and Parks' partnership division, and making grants available to community groups with minimal rigamarole. Even though budget times are tough, the City should do more, not less, to support community stewardship, understanding that it's an investment rather than an expense.

The R&P budget proposal is equitable and sustainable, maintains essential services for San Franciscans, and preserves the jobs of hard-working and effective public employees. It deserves your full support.

Sincerely,

Tom Radulovich Livable City From: <u>frantz glasz</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:02:51 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: judith wing

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 11:42:22 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thank you,

Judy Wing
District 2 resident
159 Parker Ave
94118

From: Allison Stratton

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:48:20 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Allison Stratton

From: <u>ken garcia</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:10:18 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Mary DeVries

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 8:54:32 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Mary

Mary DeVries 415.307.6122

From: <u>angie.glielmi</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:54:55 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Angie Glielmi

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mary Kane

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:39:11 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Mary

From: Peter Mueller

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:20:25 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Peter Mueller

Sent from my iPad

From: Mary DeVries

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:51:39 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Mary

Mary DeVries 415.307.6122

From: Kelsey

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:30:34 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>debbie you</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 4:46:08 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Debbie

From: <u>Jennifer Leong</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 3:04:30 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Jennifer Leong

From: <u>Helen Vasquez</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 12:15:02 PM

**Attachments:** PastedGraphic-1.tiff

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

# BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Best, Helen Vasquez, RA, NCARB Associate | Project Manager



2325 3rd st. studio 426 san francisco, ca 94107 415.977.0194 x102 matthollis.com

From: Ellen Dai

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:35:01 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Ellen From: Margie Rogerson

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 9:51:26 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Margie Rogerson (415) 734-7305 cel (415) 921-4389 From: <u>Cyuaka Vu</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 6:13:06 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Cyuaka

From: Billy Volkmann

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 6:11:06 AM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Billy Volkmann 1 Locust. SF CA 94118

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Luisa Riccardi</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:53:14 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>Dave Hollenberg</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:06:15 PM

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

# Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, June 20, 2025, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between maintaining employment and fees (specifically, court fees for tennis and pickleball). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

The presentation by RPD was made after public comment, and there was no opportunity for the public to respond. We are not against all the fees. We are against RPD unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) compared to the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in public comments, an adjustment of just **thirty (30)** cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke on Friday, including golf course employees, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

I continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations] Better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented to the BOS.

Thank you,

Dave Hollenberg
District 7 Resident
david.g.hollenberg@gmail.com | (203) 984-9764

From: <u>Jimmy Lin</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:33:29 PM

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

#### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jimmy

From: <u>Jimmy Lin</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:32:46 PM

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

#### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jimmy

From: Nancy Jones

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:29:43 PM

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

To Members of the Board of Supervisors

During the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on linking employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

RPD's presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Please take a moment to really consider this request to not charge fees for one type of recreation facility—tennis/pickleball courts.

Thank you. Nancy Jones From: Springer Teich

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:28:09 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Tony Oliver</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 7:45:45 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Mein En Lee

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 6:58:32 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: ANN CAPITAN

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 6:24:52 PM

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

### **BOS Members:**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks & please don't charge us for the use of public courts; it will cost you more to keep track of the small amount of fees you'll collect.

Sincerely,

Ann V. Capitan Native San Franciscan & Tennis Player From: shwang34@mail.ccsf.edu

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:33:01 PM

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

# Hello,

I do not feel it is fair to charge fees for use of the public courts. Technically the courts at GGP are public, and they already charge fees albeit with a nicely maintained facility. Paying for court fees I think would only be anywhere remotely fair IF all of the public courts for reservations are in good condition; some would need to be resurfaced. Having to pay the same amount for older courts and recently resurfaced courts makes no sense, there would be such an enormous discrepancy. Those are my two cents. Growing up as a kid I played on free public courts, it's just normal to me. But I digress. I don't want to be charged any court fees, and would only consider it marginally justifiable if older courts are resurfaced and all maintained to a high standard across the board.

#### ~ Sara

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented. Thanks,

From: Kim Fleming

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:29:11 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>jennifer Lavins</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:28:00 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Jennifer Lavins 1926 47th Avenue, SF, CA 94116 415-753-1140 From: jennifer Lavins

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:26:30 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Jenn

From: <u>Carlo Wong</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 4:01:33 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Carlo

From: <u>maywcbb@gmail.com</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 3:57:32 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, May Chong

From: Louis Topper

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 3:10:39 PM

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

# BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Louis From: Suzette Safdie

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 2:55:13 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Carlos Casellas g</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:41:15 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Carlos Casellas Garza

From: Stacie Johnson

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:43:10 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Stacie

From: Sophia Luna

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:40:32 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Sophia

Envoyé de mon iPhone

From: Celina Fine

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

 $\underline{\text{MelgarStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{NorseyStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{MahmoodStaff; }} \underline{\text{EngardioStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{SauterStaff; }} \underline{\text{SherrillStaff}}$ 

Cc: sa207332@atsu.edu

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:31:39 AM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

# Thanks,

-Celina Fine PA-S 303-912-4580

Sa207332@atsu.edu or Celinafine@gmail.com

**Central Coast Physician Assistant Program** 

A.T. Still University School of Health Sciences Class of 2023

From: <u>Farah Shirzadi.</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:41:55 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Farah Shirzadi LinkedIn From: Amy Xu

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:37:31 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Marshall Lambertson</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:34:54 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Marshall lambertson

From: <u>Vivienne Chow</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:52:00 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Amadeia Rector

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:52:35 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Amadeia Rector

Resident of Potrero Hill

Frequenter of the Jackson Park tennis courts and Potrero Hill Recreation Center tennis courts

From: <u>Thejas Prasad</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:22:14 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Thejas From: Beth Bedel

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:08:31 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Beth From: Stacy Suen

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:06:56 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Best.

Stacy

From: <u>Erica Santos</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:48:34 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Jacob Anderson</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:47:45 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>Lance Zhou</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:45:01 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Lance Zhou

Lance Zhou

Email: lance.j.zhou@gmail.com | Phone: +1 857-210-6925 |

From: Brandon Martinez

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:41:55 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Brandon Martinez, District 8 citizen From: Andrés Barraza

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:36:03 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Andrés Barraza

From: devin.r.liu@gmail.com

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:15:41 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Devin

From: Akshay Jha

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:52:23 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Akshay Jha From: Raaghavv Devgon

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:46:07 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Arthur Lai

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:28:21 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>Hazel Sun</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:14:35 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Adriana Angelini

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:12:58 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Jatin Bhatia</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:10:25 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: Miranda Chen

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:07:55 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Vince Wong</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:06:04 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Clara Aguiar Benedett</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:22:06 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Clara Aguiar Benedett

claraabenedett@gmail.com

From: Riss D

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:04:55 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Peter Su

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 6:34:55 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Peter Su

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Jina Zhu</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 6:23:58 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jina From: Sean Lee

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:51:39 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Sean Lee From: Sophia Mola

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:41:18 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Stephen Chang</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:24:49 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Stephen Chang From: <u>Juliana</u>

Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff To:

(BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); FielderStaff; Engardio, Joel (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); Dorsey,

Matt (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrillStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:24:13 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Yajun Gao</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:06:01 PM

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

# Hi BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Yajun From: <u>Eva Sinha</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:02:12 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: PC

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 4:38:36 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Patrick Colville 3565 Market St, San Francisco 94131 From: Toby Sachs-Quintana

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie, Daniel

(MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff

(BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:56:04 PM

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

# To the Esteemed Board Of Supervisors

I noticed that in the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). The revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting.

The framing is misleading; these points are not mutually exclusive. The RPD presentation occurred after public comment, with no chance for response. This denied the public a fair opportunity to address or rebut their statements.

As noted in public comment, raising Golden Gate parking meter rates by just 30 cents would replace all lost court fee revenue. This solution would protect jobs and preserve recreational programs. Please reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations] and consider alternatives that support community recreation.

Thanks, Toby From: <u>Elizabeth Silvers</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:42:09 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

All my best, Elizabeth From: Chris Wilson

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:31:10 PM

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

# BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Chris Wilson

From: Flávia Oliveira

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:27:31 PM

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

# BOS Members,

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Flávia Oliveira Sent from my iPhone From: Danielle Fang

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:15:03 PM

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

#### Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Danielle Fang From: Benjamin Malone

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:47:21 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Ben

From: Mimi Dang

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:21:45 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Mimi From: <u>harris nash</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:17:53 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

harris nash

From: Kavya Ravikanti

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:21:37 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Kavya From: Anthony Bagnulo

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:19:05 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

-Anthony

From: <u>Vanessa C</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:14:10 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Morgan Scofield

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:05:49 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Morgan From: <u>Julie Calnero</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:36:38 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Czero100

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:19:30 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Margot

From: Andre Natal

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:18:47 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,
Best,
André Natal
andrenatal.com

Thanks

From: <u>Indra Rucker</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:05:29 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Indra Rucker

From: Lindsey Murphy

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:03:57 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: judy chow

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:03:26 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Magen Krage

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:01:49 PM

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

# Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Magen Krage From: <u>Jake Whinnery</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:48:27 AM

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

#### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jake From: <u>Danny</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:44:13 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Matthew Protacio</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:43:33 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Matthew Protacio Protac7@gmail.com From: westleyc30@gmail.com

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:37:10 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Westley Cho

Sent from my iPhone

From: Christine Mai

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:36:53 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael O"Reilly

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:34:19 AM

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

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday,

RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thank you,

Michael OReilly

From: Christi Warren

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:29:47 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christi Warren Noe Valley From: Christi Warren

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:29:12 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christi Warren Noe Valley From: <u>Victor Levin</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:28:51 AM

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

#### Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just the tennis and pickleball court fees.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance-250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Victor Levin From: <u>Collin Smith</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:23:18 AM

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

## BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond.

We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting.

As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,
Collin Smith

From: Sharon Wong

To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff

(BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); FielderStaff; Engardio, Joel (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); Dorsey,

Matt (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrillStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:20:49 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Anna Abrams

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:19:31 AM

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

# Dear Board of Supervisors,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Anna Abrams Inner Sunset From: Bianca Alexis Villegas

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:18:57 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Bianca From: <u>Christian Rhally</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:18:07 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christian

From: <u>Sanuja Das</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:41 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Sunny

From: Sanjay Prasad

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:19 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Billy Kurniawan** 

Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie, To:

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:03 AM

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

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented. Thanks,

From: <u>Daniel Dang</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:16:42 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Eric Jackson</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:16:35 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Nakul Chakrapani

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:11:02 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Nakul

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Arianna Aldebot</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:08:34 AM

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

Dear BOS Members.

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Arianna Aldebot, District 11

From: Arjun Rao

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:26:58 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke yesterday, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Arjun Rao



826 Stanyan St., San Francisco, CA. 94117 415-290-5718 info

info@sfpublicgolf.org

# OPEN LETTER: SAVE SAN FRANCISCO'S PUBLIC GOLF COURSES

# **Mayor Daniel Lurie and San Francisco Supervisors**

We are San Francisco public golfers, diverse in every way – of all ages. genders, persuasions, races, neighborhoods, jobs, and economic strata. We love our beautiful public golf courses - Harding, Sharp, Lincoln, Fleming, Gleneagles and Golden Gate -where we recreate and socialize with old friends and meet new ones. As a big and diverse community, we are dismayed that Rec & Park has proposed a Budget that would eliminate the Department's subsidy for the municipal golf courses in Fiscal Year 2026-27—effectively a 1/3 CUT in the Golf Budget. This is extreme and unfair to golfers and unwise for Rec & Park and the City. And we urge that you do not defund the golf subsidy in the Fiscal Year 26-27 Budget. Golf is physically and mentally healthful outdoor activity, a Rec-Park core service and historically popular in the City since John McLaren hired the architects, planted the trees, and oversaw construction of Lincoln, Harding and Sharp in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. San Francisco, the Peninsula and Greater Bay Area are very high-profile golf areas and frequent hosts of major U.S. and international golf events -- including in 2025, when San Francisco will host the United States Amateur Golf Championship in August, and the Monterey Peninsula will this Fall host both the international men's Walker Cup competition and the United States Women's Mid-Amateur Championship. We know these are times of budget crunch at Rec-Park and the City. And we will carry a fair share. But this is NOT FAIR and not a reason or excuse to single-out public golf as Rec -Park's only recreational service to be completely cut off from its General Fund subsidy. We respectfully object. Rec-Park and San Francisco can – and must – do better.

Very Truly Yours,

Richard Harris March 5, 2025

President, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

The undersigned have read and agree with this Open Letter

# Supervisorial District 1

Michelle Codyu, Guy Davidoff, Steven Garboden, Corbin Johnson, Aaron Katz, Mark Kelly, Paul Miller, Charles Oppenheimer, Jeremy Sasson, Margo Sims, Jeff Decker, Robert Elejorde, Eric Gordon, William Hill, Reuben Johnson, Erica Lee, Sylvia Lee, Paul Lord, Max Ortiz, Alex Roberts, Tom Snow, Michael Cookson, John Bird, Robert Kovash, Henry Lyford, Maureen Theberge, Tracie Grufman, M.A. Leroma, Brooks Marino, David Omega, Jonathan Bridges, Geoffrey Comfort, Christina Dean, Farshad Mashayekhi, Diego Ovalle, Joshua Smith, Michelle Williams, Albert Wong, Irene Woo, Chris Kaltreider, Catherine Boyd, Juan Hurtado, Randa Talbott, Brian Burgess, Weston Carew, Cameron Smith, Frank Bodadilla

# **District 2**

Melanie Raymundo, Richard Smith, Sai-Ling Cahn-Sew, Raphael Chan-Sew, B Lee, Camila Leon Perez, Jeronimo Leon, Connie Wu, Aaron Uh, Mitchell Algert, Harris Bernstein, David Tepper, John Kanellitsas, Lily Achatz, Harry Johnson, Kate Wineroth, Barbara Janney, Donald Gallaspie, Zachary Haitkin, Viet Nguyen, Joe Papadakis, Mark Schultz, John Crowther III, Justin Bates, Clay Carson, Griffin Chinn, Danny Diekrooger, Brenden Howard, Kendell Jenga, Julian Oelsner, Eshan Jain, Sean Vincent, Wilhelm Willie, Edric De Guzman, Robert Feyer, Rahul Kataria, Jett Uribe, Max Martinez, Sam Amrams, Nicholas Geraci, Mark Gonzales, Luis Reina, Graeme Black, Kyle Bell, Bart Klerkx, Dominic Guercio, Janny Munson, Robert O'Grady, Benjamin Berman, Daniel Caveney, Chris Johnson, Blair Lewis, Ryder Morford, Juna Reisacher, Jim Nguyen, Matt Preston, Naots DeSilva, Mike Franzago, Cole Hedges, Aditya Mehta, Charles Normandin, JoAnn Wong, Ryan Kelleher, Kathy Noordeh, Ryland Bauer, William Engel, Natalie Tatum, Wilhelm Willie, Philip Winter, Bill Wong, Emily Tatum, Stefaun Avakian, Aaron Boyd, Aubrey Gavello, Jake Hoffrman, Aidan Macaluso, Marcus Milazzo, John Murphy, Elliot Schaffer, Nicholas Shuster, Leo Tuchman, Michael Rogers, Peter Erickson, Jonathan Biermann, Cory McGee, Bilna Hu, Robb Crow, Stephen Brandy, Akshay Jetti, Steven Taunk, Sayoko Caproni, Pierson Souza, Jack Valinoti, Darius Collins, Will Dean, Dave Eriero, Doug Hopkins, Caitlyn McWilliams, Mark Schlifske, Victor Segure, Jason Case, Kristy Case, Oliver Dormoduy, John Moore, Evan Braicks, Zara Butte, Wilvin Chew, Kayla Choy, John Ward, Cameron Drake, Josh Stark, Taylor Culp, Nora O'Neill, MacKenzie Purcell, Alec Sanchez, John DeMoully, Noah Gold, Nathan Guskiewicz, Brewster Nolan

# District 3

Ali Salahi, Joe Bisson, Nicky Black, James Burke, Sam Gervolino, Rich Koury, Andrew Winter, Bryan Rawlinson, John Chisholm, Shane O'Connor, Tony Alsop, Jason Fukuyama, Vicente Llopis, Lauren Bennett, Alex Robles, Keith McWilliams, Dan Li, Ryan McWilliams, Ricardo Munguia Alba, Sean Pepper, John Wolff, Cameron Lee, Mike Wallach, Patrick Whelly, Mertay Deyanc, J. Yeo, Lex Perillat, Alexa Mironov

# **District 4**

Laura Boaz, Michael Ippolito, Esther Ippolito, Rudy Asercion, WR Hickox, Michelle M. Viguie-Hickox, Trim Wellbeloved, James Sterk, William Conaway, Randy Shirbroun, Anna Szefo, Peter Dale, Kevin Twibill, Ambra Wellbeloved, Sean Miller, Paul Normanly, Meyer Steckenberg, Dan Steckenberg, Ken Jiang, Thomas Shilosaka, Albert Vong, Roxanne Worthington, Ali Jamalocur, Rhonda Short, Airudh Bokka, Daniel Orozco, Claire Devaney, Oscar Geronimo, Seung-Hwan Kim, Brendan Knapp, Vadim Kitsis, Maureen Bowler,

## District 4, cont.

Rita M. Bray, Mary Brigid Ide, Patricia Magee, Bill Magee, Sheila McCarthy, Noreen McNomara, Carl J. Slattery, Alex Armstrong, Dave McCarthy, Noreen McEllistrim, Martina Walsh, Jamie Lewin, Sahin Olut, Jordan Westover, Ian Choy, Sam Lee, Geoff Moore, Lawrence Neyman, Nigel Satenstein, Eric Hamer, Jacob A. Meyers, Joseph O'Brien, Nigel Borromeo, Andre Wilkins, Donald Louie, Myonghui Yang, Richard Giller, Melana Jimenez, Khoi Nguyen, Kevin Sinclair, Kathleen N. Grogan, John Noenickx, Marie O'Connor, Daniel Petersen, Daniel Zhu, Gerard Knightley, George Ramirez, Allen Yu, Mary Bautista, Lennie Jabago, Jerry Simotas, Carolyn Cayabyab, Pao Chiu, Will Cody, Ryan Driesbach, Ryan McNabb, Joe Moriarty, Travis Payne, Emily Petersen, Jean-Francois Roy, James Baker, Alex Blanchard, Dan Carr, Albert Filice, Matt Gee, Gary Groff, Ana Martinez, Max Ramsay, Matt Rozen, Alo Scott, Karen Hipp, Galen Wong, Gary Salvatore Cimino, Brian McLain, San Miller, Michelle Pente, Winslow Perry, Kimberly Chitra, Edric Chitra, Scott Decker, Doug Dietz, Orla Petirs, Jackson Kerrigan, Chris Pratt, John Roberts, Yoshifumi Shimizu, Terrence Whitson, Ed Keenan, Bella Keenan, Tina Villacruz, Colin Daly, Nara Han, Mary Shanley, Al Hom, David Rabbitt, Sean Rugan, Carolina Lavelle, Wirt Lewis, Matt Rozen, Marc Bargary, Michael Clancy

# **District 5**

Wendy Wan, Ari Horwitz, Nakul Bhatnagar, Kieran allahan, Anna Donnelly, Paul Duatschek, Tom Howard, Lindsey Pollack, David Pollack, Chris Woodley, Richard Woodruff, Marios Leon, Kyle Cookson, Matthew Searing, Pamela Hofsass, Richard Woodruff

# **District 6**

Lam Nguyen, Gonzalo Vergara, Robert Bernie, Shawn Whalen, Michael Johnson, Tyler Alexander, Hem Singh, Hemzi Wood, Jeff Devoto, Ken Watson, Brian Ross

# District 7

Joseph Camacho, Trevor Geller, Paul Boyer, Katherine Clements, Gabriel Donohoe, John Formosa, Alexander Gibbs, Joe Hayes, Mark Hazelwood, Holland Ja, KC Murphy, Eoin O'Connor, John O'Connor, Don Papa, Alex Wong, Dave Mana, Geoege Bacigaluipi, Nessa Connor, Philip A. Parker, Jason Yip, Cathy Yip, David Cesare, Joseph Cremen, David Fowler, Gareth Fracchia, JK Hunt, Raymond Lee, Elizabeth Wong, Brian Franceschi, Sue Ballard, Cody Enger, Joe Healey, Mike Milstein, Richard Gyde, Brian Tsung, Michael Sgroi, Mike Reaka, Raula Reaka, Owen McKee, Lana Zumbrov, Tom Stephenson, Erin Byrne, Jim Enright, Owen Harrington, Brendan Heather, Julio Ramos, Gary Giubbini, Bernard P. Michela, Charles Pratt, Claire Pratt, Catharine Ryan, Tristan Handeland, Mike Lamson, Dan Howard, Tim Murphy, Julian Villareal, Dan Mackowski, David Cesare, James Clark, Andyu Kapelevich, Owen McKee, Lana Zumerov, Jay Pettigrew, Bryan Sakamoto, Tom Scott, Robert Cappa, Dominic Magri, Jimmy Hoag, Steven Lee, Mark Anderson, Matt Kearney, Larry McAuliff

## **District 8**

Helen Duffy, Robert Apfel, Dan James, Don Czerkies, Chris Czerkies, Ami Icanberry, Nathaniel Ma, Robert Mulder, Lydia Byres, Dominic Caccione, Carol Harris, Chad Ackerman, Howard DeNike, Richard Harris, Brad Eisenberg, Derek Lum, John Mahoney, Frances Osullivan, Nicole Ellis, Matt Snyder, Robert Stover, Marcelino Varona, James Allee, Kevin Cline, Robert Go, Emmett Berg, Kaushal Parikh, Scott Robertson, Wyatt Beserra, Freddie Hebert, Eli Smoot, George Murray, Loukas Stelyn, Drew Cattermole, Matthew Farwell, Michael Michela, Eileen Ridley, Lisa Wally, David Corner, Bagna Braestrup, Sandy Thomson, Jennifer Hwang, David Liang, George McCarthy, Matt Krawczyk, Scott Marousek, Chris Sater

# **District 9**

Arlo Furst, John McCauley, Jeff Phillips, Norberto Joya, Robert Vranizan, Grant Taillefer, Paul Ashby, Brittney Freed, Jessica Brkwoldt, Scott Gee, David Higgins, Mike Weingart, Matt Carlson, Pilan Chenhansa, Kim Smith, Sang Yun, Shannon Fields, T. Kevin Coker, Pete Manning, John Monson, Jak Yeadaker, Kevin Alonzo, Daniel Feldman, Ian Lordemann, Jenna Rousseau, Sal Hoffman, Enilda Rodriguez, Robert Reisenburger

# **District 10**

Virginia Nicholas Yee, Conor Falvey, Ethan Litmons, Colton Sankey, Nicholas Kinoshita, Thomas Prosek, Joaquin Borromeo, Graham Greene, Matt Strube, Cameron Coulter, Troy Davis, Adam Herrera, Lisa Rasmussen, Mark Olson, Dennis Ngo

# **District 11**

Anthony Brignetti, Steve Johnston, Natasha Parks, James Quirke, Kenneth Dawson, Tony Kitz, Belisa Amaro, Chris Ennis, Felipe Goggin, Ricardo Herrera, William L. Olinger, William D. Penrod, Michael Swoffer, Paul Tonelli, Patrick Goggin, Brendan Jenkins, Kipp Kennedy, Shane Kitchen, Andrew Perez, Rajan Edwards, Tim Albrecht, TK Thien, Matt Castagnola, Washington Chua, Lisa Ising, Reann Bialini, Nate Finny, Andy Hu



826 Stanyan St., San Francisco, CA 94117 • 415-290-5718

July 9, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget & Appropriations Committee Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Budget & Appropriations Hearing, July 9, 2025, 1:30 p.m., Agenda No. 2, Item 250604, Park Code, Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, etc., Golf Course Fees Generally. Comment of San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Dear Chair Chan and Supervisors,

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (the "SFPGA") is a San Francisco-based, 501(c)(3) public benefit organization representing over 7,000 public golfers of all ages, genders, persuasions, ethnicities, cultures and economic backgrounds.

The proposed legislation captioned "Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses... Golf Course Fees Generally," File No. 250604<sup>1</sup>, set for hearing July 9 before Your Committee, includes significantly increased greens fees plus maintenance & cost recovery fee surcharges which would collectively raise costs 16% to 51% for resident public golfers at the various courses – with much bigger price hikes for non-residents and visitors. The Resident Senior weekend rate is eliminated completely.

For additional perspective, the current \$136 cost for a San Francisco Resident card represents a more-than 50% cost increase since 2020. The Pacifica Resident card (for play at Sharp Park only) would jump over 300%, from \$91 to \$300.

The SFPGA, along with the 7,000-plus public golfers we represent, recognizes the need to respond to the serious budgetary pressures impacting our city. However, we are deeply concerned that the proposed fee and surcharge increases unfairly overburden the public golfers—without improving the courses and without addressing the deeper, systemic challenges that continue to undermine the long-term sustainability of municipal golf in our city.

As discussed in our previously submitted letter to Your Committee dated June 23, 2025<sup>2</sup>, San Francisco's public golf courses suffer from persistent challenges, including:

- Need for a sustainable funding model
- Ensuring affordability and equitable access for all
- Chronic deferred maintenance
- Lack of investment renovating golf infrastructure and clubhouses

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> File No. 250604, Park Code – Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses . . Golf Fees Generally <a href="https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14323698&GUID=17280D87-B045-4A9C-8042-191918B887CA">https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14323698&GUID=17280D87-B045-4A9C-8042-191918B887CA</a>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> SFPGA Letter to Budget and Appropriations Committee, June 23, 2025, at p. 2 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Dp4d9zOt7Oebg0K7ENv86DNINVYkXO92/view?usp=drive\_link



## 826 Stanyan St., San Francisco, CA. 94117 \* 415-290-5718 • info@sfpublicgolf.org

June 23, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget & Appropriations Committee Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA. 94102

# Supervisors' Budget & Appropriations Subcommittee / June 23, 2025 Public Comment / Rec-Park

Dear Chair Chan and Honorable Supervisors,

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance (SFPGA) is a San Francisco-based 501(c)(3) public benefit organization representing a diverse and growing community of 7,000-plus public golfers, dedicated to the promotion and preservation of affordable, environmentally friendly public golf for all.

## Restoring Rec & Park General Fund Support for Public Golf in FY 2026-27

We applaud the Recreation and Park Department's June 20 revision to its budget proposal, which (1) formally withdrew the Department's original plan to eliminate what it called a \$7.5 million General Fund "subsidy" to its Golf Fund, and (2) reaffirmed the Department's commitment to "maintaining affordable access to municipal golf for all." This is a crucial step, and we support it.

## Transparency, Collaboration, and Long-Term Strategy

The current budget process highlights a broader issue: the absence of a long-term, strategic plan for San Francisco's municipal golf courses. A clear and transparent roadmap is essential to address the following persistent challenges:

- Need a sustainable funding model
- Ensuring affordability and equitable access for all
- Chronic deferred maintenance
- Lack of investment in renovating golf infrastructure and clubhouses.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> SF Rec & Park Supplemental Report to Budget and Appropriations Committee, Jn. 20, 2025, at pp. 9-10 https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14312821&GUID=DDBE23FE-754A-474F-912F-A790055A1336

For example, a key concern is the longstanding lease structure at several of the municipal golf courses, which have remained on month-to-month holdover status — at Lincoln and Sharp for more than 20 years. These indefinite holdover arrangements reduce stability and discourage capital investment, accelerating deterioration of clubhouses, infrastructure, and course conditions.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Park Department to collaborate with key stakeholders — including the City's workforce and the public golf community — on a comprehensive strategy, based on transparent information, that protects and improves San Francisco's world-class municipal golf assets.

Philanthropic support was key for the renovations of the Harding Park and Fleming courses (2002–04) and the Golden Gate Park 9-hole course (2023–24). A meaningful public-private partnership can and should be part of the solution now.

## Public golf is important in San Francisco

Public golf is deeply rooted in San Francisco's civic and recreational legacy. From John McLaren's early 20th-century vision for inclusive, affordable golf—when he personally oversaw the construction of Lincoln, Harding, and Sharp Park—to today's programs for youth, seniors, women, and veterans, the City has been a pioneer and leader in public golf access and equity through initiatives like:

- Discount cards for residents
- Free or reduced-rate greens fees for children, school teams, and seniors
- The First Tee youth program
- Free lessons for women and wounded veterans
- Racial integration of golf in the mid-1950s.

In the post-COVID era, golf has seen a nationwide surge, with particularly strong growth in San Francisco. Golf fee and resident card revenues at the City's municipal courses have averaged **\$11.1** million annually over the past four fiscal years (FY 2020–21 through 2023–24)—a **54**% increase over the pre-pandemic annual average of \$7.2 million (FY 2016–17 through 2019–20).

In FY 2023–24, golf operations generated **\$16.1 million** in total revenue, including fees and concession income—making it the single largest source of earned revenue for Rec & Park, far outpacing income from garages, athletic fields, concerts, and aquatic facilities.<sup>2</sup>

Since the 1940s, San Francisco's public and private golf courses have also served as distinguished venues for national and international championships, boosting tourism and elevating the City's profile in the sporting world.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Recreation & Park Department Year-End Financial Report, Fiscal Year 2023-24, at pp. 2, 4-5 https://sfrecpark.org/DocumentCenter/View/24764/Item-3a-Financial-Report---Expenditure-and-Revenue-FY24-Year-End-Report-Final-101724?bidld=

We are optimistic about the future of public golf in San Francisco and remain committed to working in collaboration with Civic leaders, labor, Rec & Park, and the broader community to sustain and grow this vital recreational tradition. With thoughtful planning, transparency, and collaboration, public golf can continue to thrive as an inclusive, accessible, and sustainable civic asset.

Respectfully submitted,

# Richard Harris

President, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

cc: Mayor David Lurie, Mayor's Budget Office, Board of Supervisors, Controller's Office, Rec & Park Commission, Gen. Mgr. Phil Ginsburg, Dana Ketcham, Sarah Madland

# Office of the Mayor San Francisco



DANIEL LURIE MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director

Date: May 30, 2025

Re: Mayor's FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27 Budget Submission

RECEIVED AK
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 NAY 30 PNO4:18

#### Madam Clerk,

In accordance with City and County of San Francisco Charter, Article IX, Section 9.100, the Mayor's Office hereby submits the Mayor's proposed budget by May 30<sup>th</sup>, corresponding legislation, and related materials for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-26 and FY 2026-27.

In addition to the Mayor's Proposed FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27 Budget Book, the following items are included in the Mayor's submission:

- Proposed *Interim* Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO)
- Proposed Interim Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO)
- Proposed Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO)
- Proposed Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO)
- Administrative Provisions for both, but separate documents of the AAO and ASO, in tracked changes, and on pleading paper
- Proposed Budget for the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
- A Transfer of Function letter detailing the transfer of positions from one City department to another
- An Interim Exception letter to the ASO
- PUC Capital Amendment and Debt Authorization
- Prop J Certification Letters
- A letter addressing funding levels for consumer price index increases for nonprofit corporations or public entities for the coming two fiscal years
- 40 pieces of trailing legislation
- Memo to the Board President requesting for 30-day rule waivers on ordinances

Please note the following:

• Technical adjustments to the June 1 budget are being prepared, but are not submitted with this set

Sincerely,

Sophia Kittler

Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office

Controller

No	DEPT	Item	Description	Type of Legislation	File #
1	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to modify the fees for the use of City Hall	Ordinance	250591
2	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to transfer responsibilities for oversight of the collection of sexual orientation and gender identity data from the City Administrator to the Human Rights Commission and removing obsolete reporting requirements	RECEIVED AK D OF SUPERVISO AN FRANCISCO Ordinance AD4:1	250502
3	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to clarify the status of the Treasure Island Development Authority ("TIDA") as a City department	Ordinance	250594
4	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Convention Facilities Management	Resolution	250615
5	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Security Services for RED Buildings	Resolution	250615
6	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Custodial Services for RED Buildings	Resolution	250615
7	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Security Guard Service at Central Shops	Resolution	250615
8	BOS	Continuing Prop J	Budget and Legislative Analyst Services	Resolution	250615
9	CON	Access Line Tax	Resolution concurring with the Controller's establishment of the Consumer Price Index for 2025, and adjusting the Access Line Tax by the same rate.	Resolution	250612
10	CON	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to eliminate the Budget Savings Incentive Fund	Ordinance	250595
11	CON	Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax	Adopting the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean- up Fund Tax designation ceiling for tax year 2025	Ordinance	250596
12	DBI	DBI Fee Changes	Amending the Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes to adjust fees charged by the Department of Building Inspection and to establish Subfunds within the Building Inspection Fund; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Ordinance	250592
13	DEC	Early Care and Education	Modifying the baseline funding requirements for early care and	Ordinance	250597

		Commercial Rents Tax Baseline	education programs in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2025-2026 and 2026- 2027, to enable the City to use the interest earned from the Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax for those baseline programs		cont'd 250597
14	DPH	State Recurring Grants FY25-36	Authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of Recurring State grant funds by the San Francisco Department of Public Health for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026	Resolution	250618
15	DPH	CCE Expansion Grant	Grant Agreement - California Department of Social Services - Community Care Expansion Program - Anticipated Revenue to the City \$9,895,834	Resolution	250619
16	DPH	Code Amendment	Various Codes - Environmental Health Permit, Fee, and Penalties Revisions	Ordinance	250606
17	DPH	HHIP Grant	Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Housing and Homelessness Incentive Program ("HHIP") Expanding San Francisco Department of Public Health Recuperative Care Community Supports - \$2,489,698.63	Resolution	250620
18	DPH	IPP Grant	Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Incentive Payment Program ("IPP") San Francisco Department of Public Health Epic Enhancement Implementation Project - \$6,000,000	Resolution	250621
19	DPH	Patient Revenues	Amending the Health Code to set patient rates for services provided by the Department of Public Health (DPH), for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027; and authorizing DPH to waive or reduce fees to meet the needs of low-income patients through its	Resolution Ordinance	250607

			provision of charity care and other discounted payment programs		cont'd 250607
20	DPH	Continuing Prop J	Healthcare Security at Primary Care Clinics	Resolution	250615
21	DPW	DPW Fee Changes	Public Works, Subdivision Codes - Fee Modification and Waiver	Ordinance	250608
22	DPW	Continuing Prop J	Yard Operations and Street Tree Nursery	Resolution	250615
23	HOM	Continuing Prop J	Security Services	Resolution	250615
24	НОМ	Continuing Prop J	Homelessness and Supportive Housing security services	Resolution	250615
25	НОМ	Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund	Approving the FYs 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 Expenditure Plan for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund	Resolution	250613
26	НОМ	Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax	Funding Reallocation - Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax - Services to Address Homelessness - \$88,495,000 Plus Future Revenue Through FY 2027-28	Ordinance	250609
27	LIB	Friends of the Library A&E	Annual Accept & Expend legislation for the SFPL's Friends of the Library Fund	Resolution	250614
28	МОНСО	Continuing Prop J	Treeline Security Inc services for City-owned properties in predevelopment for affordable housing sites	Resolution	250615
29	OCII	OCII Budget Resolution	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget	Resolution	250611
30	OCII	OCII Interim Budget Resolution	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Interim Budget	Resolution	250610
31	PDR	Crankstart Foundation Grant A&E	Accept and Expend Grant - Retroactive - Immigration Defense Unit - Crankstart Foundation - Amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance for FYs 2024-25 and 2025-26 - \$3,400,000	Ordinance	250598
32	POL	Code Amendment	Registration Fees and Fingerprint ID Fund	Ordinance	250599
33	PUC	Fixed Budget Amendment	Continues waiving certain small business first-year permit, license, and business registration fees	Ordinance	250602

34	REC	Bobo Estate A&E	Accept and Expend Bequest - Estate of William Benjamin Bobo - Benches, Park Furnishings and Park Improvements Across San Francisco - \$3,600,000	Resolution	250616
35	REC	Code Amendment	Amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Ordinance	250603
36	REC	Authorizing Paid Parking in Golden Gate Park	Authorizing the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to set parking rates in Golden Gate Park in accordance with Park Code provisions that authorize SFMTA rate-setting on park property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Resolution	250617
37	REC	Code Amendment	PUC Cost Recovery Fee	Ordinance	250604
38	REC	Code Amendment	Scholarship Recovery Fee	Ordinance	250605
39	REG	Continuing Prop J	Assembly and mailing of vote-by-mail ballot packets	Resolution	250615
40	SHF	Continuing Prop J	Jail Food Service	Resolution	250615

# Office of the Mayor San Francisco



# DANIEL LURIE MAYOR

To: Rafael Mandelman, President of the Board of Supervisors

From: Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director

Date: May 30, 2025

Re: 30-Day Waiver Requests

RECEIVED ACTION OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 MAY 30 PM04:19

#### President Mandelman,

The Mayor's Office Respectfully requests 30-day hold waivers for the following pieces of trailing legislation:

- City Administrator's Office:
  - o Administrative Code City Hall Short Term License Fees
  - Administrative Code Transferring Data Collection Oversight Duties from the City
     Administrator to the Human Rights Commission
  - o Administrative Code Treasure Island Development Authority
- Controller's Office:
  - o Resolution Adjusting the Access Line Tax with the Consumer Price Index of 2025
  - o Administrative Code Eliminating Budget Savings Incentive Fund
  - o Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax Designation Ceiling
- Department of Building Inspection:
  - Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes Fee Adjustment and Building Inspection Fund Subfunds
- Department of Early Childhood:
  - Business and Tax Regulations Code Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax Baseline - FY 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
- Department of Public Health:
  - Accept and Expend Grants Recurring State Grant Funds Department of Public Health -FY2025-2026
  - o Grant Agreement California Department of Social Services Community Care Expansion Program Anticipated Revenue to the City \$9,895,834
  - o Various Codes Environmental Health Permit, Fee, and Penalties Revisions
  - Delegation of 9.118 Authority Accept and Expend Grant San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Housing and Homelessness Incentive Program ("HHIP") Expanding San Francisco Department of Public Health Recuperative Care Community Supports - \$2,489,698.63
  - Delegation of 9.118 Authority Accept and Expend Grant San Francisco Health
    Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan
    ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") Incentive Payment Program ("IPP") San Francisco
    Department of Public Health Epic Enhancement Implementation Project \$6,000,000
  - o Health Code Patient Rates for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
- Department of Public Works:
  - o Public Works, Subdivision Codes Fee Modification and Waiver
- Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing:
  - Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund FYs 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 Expenditure Plan

- Funding Reallocation Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Services to Address Homelessness - \$88,495,000 Plus Future Revenue Through FY 2027-28
- Public Library:
  - Accept and Expend Grant Friends of San Francisco Public Library Annual Grant Award - Up to \$1,072,600 of In-Kind Gifts, Services, and Cash Monies - FY2025-2026
- Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure:
  - Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget
  - o Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Interim Budget
- Office of the Public Defender:
  - Accept and Expend Grant Retroactive Immigration Defense Unit Crankstart
     Foundation Amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance for FYs 2024-25 and 2025-26
     \$3,400,000
- Police Department:
  - Administrative Code Vehicle Registration Fees and Police Fingerprint Identification
     Fund
- Public Utilities Commission:
  - De-appropriation San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Capital Projects Budget -\$86,916 - FY2025-2026
  - De-appropriation San Francisco Public Utilities Commission \$12,990,064 FY2025-2026
  - San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue Bond and Other Forms of Indebtedness Issuance - Not to Exceed \$1,054,138,857
- Recreation and Parks Department:
  - Accept and Expend Bequest Estate of William Benjamin Bobo Benches, Park Furnishings and Park Improvements Across San Francisco - \$3,600,000
  - o Park Code Court Reservations
  - o Authorizing Paid Parking in Golden Gate Park
  - o Park Code Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields
  - o Park Code Recreation Program Fees

Should you have any questions, please email Adam Thongsavat at adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Sophia Kittler Mayor's Budget Director

# President, District 8 BOARD of SUPERVISORS



# City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Tel. No. 554-6968 Fax No. 554-5163 TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

# RAFAEL MANDELMAN

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION							
Date:							
To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the B	oard of Supervisors						
Madam Clerk, Pursuant to Board Rules, I am hereby:							
Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)							
File No.							
Title.	(Primary Sponsor)						
Transferring (Board Rule No 3.3)							
File No.	(Primary Sponsor)						
Title.	(1 Illiary Spoilsof)						
From:	Committee						
To:	Committee						
Assigning Temporary Committee Appe	Dintment (Board Rule No. 3.1)						
Supervisor: Re	eplacing Supervisor:						
For:	Meeting						
(Date)	(Committee)						
Start Time: End Time:							
Temporary Assignment: Partial	Full Meeting						
	Rafael Mandelman, President Board of Supervisors						

# BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

# **MEMORANDUM**

	Date:	June 3, 2025					
	То:	Planning Department / Commission					
	From:	Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Appropriations Committee					
	Subject:	Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250604 Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields					
$\boxtimes$	(Californi	a Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination a Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.) Ordinance / Resolution					
		Ballot Measure					
	(Planning	Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  (Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)  General Plan Planning Code, Section 101.1 Planning Code, Section 302					
		Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning (Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)					
	(Charter, (Require subdivisi relocatio public he annu	General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments (Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53) (Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)					
		Preservation Commission  Landmark (Planning Code, Section 1004.3)  Cultural Districts (Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23)  Mills Act Contract (Government Code, Section 50280)  Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (Planning Code, Article 11)					

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org.

# Office of the Mayor SAN FRANCISCO

To:

Re:

From:



# DANIEL LURIE Mayor

RECEIVED AK

THE OF SIPE VISORS

SAM FRANCISCO 2025 NAY 30 PNO4:38

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director

Date: May 30, 2025

Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities,

Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields

Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Should you have any questions, please email Adam Thongsavat at adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org.