

From: [Peter Mueller](#)
To: [Yu, Angelina \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Suzette Safdie](#); [Lisa Shaw](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Standalone or Grouped: Court Reservation Fee Legislation
Date: Friday, June 14, 2024 12:38:32 PM
Attachments: [Private Schools Revenue Opportunity.pdf](#)

Hi Connie,

It's great news that it'll be voted on a standalone basis.

We understand that if voted down that the city's deficit would increase.

That's why we have come up with an alternative, which is to charge private schools for court usage. RPD has let private schools use tennis courts for free for decades. These are schools that can well afford to pay a fee. As you know, they charge tuitions in the mid-five figures and have ample endowments. They regularly pay for the use of external sporting facilities. It's remarkable that RPD didn't look at this opportunity. We do know that children of a RPD executive staff attended one of these schools with a spouse employed at that school too.

Currently eight private schools use 36 tennis courts for 6 months out of the year for 3 hours each weekday afternoon. That's 14,040 hours per year. We calculate the value of the court usage to have a range between \$234K and \$702K (see attached file). That's substantial.

RPD has never been transparent about the revenue it estimates to earn from this proposal. I tried to get from them via a sunshine request but failed. If you have this information, would you share it with us?

Finally, we believe this alternate solution is more in line with the stated policies of RPD and the SF General Plan. Even if there is a budget crisis, We believe that RPD should not be rewarded for ignoring public engagement during this process or it will continue to do so in the future. We support looking for funds outside of RPD, particularly for programs with poor or immeasurable results.

Regards,

Peter

Peter Mueller
(M) 415-613-4926

On Friday, June 14, 2024 at 10:32:35 AM PDT, Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hello Peter, public comment opportunity specifically for court reservation fee legislation will be available to the public, and vote/action will be taken on this specific legislation, however, if voted down, it will have impact on the Mayor's overall budget proposal, meaning whatever revenue it projects to bring in, will now become a deficit. -- Connie

Connie Chan
陳詩敏 市參事
District 1 Supervisor
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Office Contact:
chanstaff@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7410
<https://sfbos.org/supervisor-chan-newsletter>

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mueller <pminsf@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 10:16 AM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>
Cc: Suzette Safdie <szsafdie@sbcglobal.net>; Lisa Shaw <l.t.shaw@comcast.net>
Subject: Standalone or Grouped: Court Reservation Fee Legislation

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

Good morning,

Has there been a determination as to whether #240603, the tennis and pickleball court reservation fee legislation, will be voted on as standalone legislation or will it be grouped with other legislation?

If grouped, I understand, Connie, as chair, you have can influence or direct it to be separated out. Would that be your plan?

Obviously, our group fears that lumping it with other legislation would be catastrophic to our efforts to stop the legislation. And our efforts in recruiting folks to come to the meeting on 6/20 would pointless and frustrating. Please advise.

Regards,

Peter Mueller
415-613-4926

Sent from my iPhone

**Missed Revenue Opportunity For RPD
For Not Charging Private Schools For Tennis Court Usage**

Current Situation:

8 private high schools use 36 tennis courts for 6 months out of the year for 5 days per week for 3 hours per day. RPD has let these schools use the courts for free for decades, yet RPD charges nonprofits for court usage. It's remarkable that RPD chooses to give a free ride to private schools that charge mid-five figure annual tuitions but now wants to San Franciscans to pay for reservations, which will create a barrier to entry for low income individuals, fixed income seniors, and students.

Some of these private schools use and pay private venues for using their golf courses, sailing equipment, and gymnasium spaces. Why should tennis be any different? This seems like an easy revenue source for RPD. Why is RPD ignoring it.

Below uses a recent example of 6 pickleball courts rented by RPD to a SF pickleball nonprofit for a day. The range below represents valuing the rental from a per court basis on the low end and a land equivalent basis on the high end. A per court basis means a tennis court equals a pickleball court. A land equivalent basis means tennis courts are valued as greater because a tennis court take up more land that a pickleball court.

Louis Sutter Day Use Example

Fee Paid By A Pickleball Nonprofit for Day Use	\$900.00
Number of Hours	9
Fee / Hour	\$100.00
# Pickleball Courts	6

	Per Court Basis	<----->	Land Equivalent Basis
Equivalent Cost For Tennis Court Usage By Private Schools			
Courts Used	36		36
Weeks / Year / Used	26		26
Days / Week Used	5		5
Hours / Day Used	3		3
Total Hours Used / Year	14040		14040
Land Use Equivalency (2 Tennis Courts = 6 Pickleball Courts)	NA		3
Fee / Hour /Court	\$16.67		\$50.00
Total Fee / Year	\$234,000	<----->	\$702,000

From: [Susan Ford](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Item 12 on meeting of appropriations
Date: Tuesday, June 18, 2024 6:58:36 AM

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

As a tennis player I want to register my disgust at this stupid idea. It will not fix the problem noted and is another Ginsberg quest for money to support another outside service.
Thanks for noting my objections at this meeting as I am not able to attend this meeting.
Susan Ford
San Francisco tax payer

From: [Rob Rossi](#)
To: [Julia Rom \(BOE\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOE\)](#)
Subject: Budget & Appropriations Committee, File 240603, Item12
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2024 11:40:49 AM

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

• Dear Budget/Appropriations Committee:

Regarding File #240603, Item 12, I and my colleagues are active tennis players and we strongly believe that charging \$5/for tennis or pickle ball reservations is not the problem with regard to the reservation system.

The use of tennis & now pickle ball teaching instructors that use the reservation system by having their pupils reserve courts for private lessons that are not park and rec authorized, plus the no show frustration (no penalty is permitted and the courts go unused) are the issues.

The plan for Park & Rec to license the tennis/pickle ball instructors is an attempt to gain control of the unauthorized instructors.

Most of them who I know personally will not want their fees compromised/split with the City, and they will even lie about their fees and take more under the table (100%) as they do now. Already non-SF resident instructors come from Marin, East Bay and Peninsula to ply their trade. If you think drug dealers flocking to SF to sell fentanyl is a problem, you'll get a lot more instructors doing the same.

If you restrict the instructors to one reservation per day at a location, so they will not monopolize the location, as they often do at Moscone or Mountain Lake tennis (without Park Rangers enforcing the current law), then that may justify the licensing of instructors. Lax enforcement is the issue, even when Park Rangers or Rec directors are called in.

You mention baseball and soccer fields are charging fees for private program reservations. Their size is larger than a tennis court(s) or even an outdoor basketball court. Would people/kids that use a basketball court for an informal team practice want to pay a fee to reserve an outdoor?

The no show frustration of people booking a reservation and not showing without a penalty may be eliminated by have a QR code at each reserved site for check in. If someone fails to cancel before or check in, then their account will be frozen for a week or so.

Furthermore, for decades that date back to the 1970's and beyond, the Twin Peaks reservoir on Clarendon used to be the site of a basketball court and 3 large tennis courts. People could teach their kids to ride bikes also, as the reservoir is quite large, even larger than the reservoir where Alice Marble Tennis courts are still located above the iconic top of Lombard's crooked street.

That was unfortunately closed in the last 10 years and fenced off. That could easily be up and running and restrict the hours to 8am -6 pm for general use or specifically pickleball (as the current game's noise issue is deafening—no pickleball player would want to live next door to one)

Thank you for what you allocated already for the quick resurfacing job at JP Murphy recently and continued work throughout the City.

Regards,

• Dave Lang

From: [Rob Rossi](#)
To: [Jalpa Brent \(BOA\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOA\)](#)
Subject: File Budget & Appropriations Committee, File 240603, Item12
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2024 11:51:09 AM

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

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Rob Rossi <rossi_rob@yahoo.com>
To: brent.jalpa@sfgov.org <brent.jalpa@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2024 at 11:40:28 AM PDT
Subject: Budget & Appropriations Committee, File 240603, Item12

• Dear Budget/Appropriations Committee:

Regarding File #240603, Item 12, I and my colleagues are active tennis players and we strongly believe that charging \$5/for tennis or pickle ball reservations is not the problem with regard to the reservation system.

The use of tennis & now pickle ball teaching instructors that use the reservation system by having their pupils reserve courts for private lessons that are not park and rec authorized, plus the no show frustration (no penalty is permitted and the courts go unused) are the issues.

The plan for Park & Rec to license the tennis/pickle ball instructors is an attempt to gain control of the unauthorized instructors.

Most of them who I know personally will not want their fees compromised/split with the City, and they will even lie about their fees and take more under the table (100%) as they do now. Already non-SF resident instructors come from Marin, East Bay and Peninsula to ply their trade. If you think drug dealers flocking to SF to sell fentanyl is a problem, you'll get a lot more instructors doing the same.

If you restrict the instructors to one reservation per day at a location, so they will not monopolize the location, as they often do at Moscone or Mountain Lake tennis (without Park Rangers enforcing the current law), then that may justify the licensing of instructors. Law enforcement is the issue, even when Park Rangers or Rec directors are called in.

You mention baseball and soccer fields are charging fees for private program reservations. Their size is larger than a tennis court(s) or even an outdoor basketball court. Would people/kids that use a basketball court for an informal team practice want to pay a fee to reserve an outdoor?

The no show frustration of people booking a reservation and not showing without a penalty may be eliminated by have a QR code at each reserved site for check in. If someone fails to cancel before or check in, then their account will be frozen for a week or so.

Furthermore, for decades that date back to the 1970's and beyond, the Twin Peaks reservoir on Clarendon used to be the site of a basketball court and 3 large tennis courts. People could teach their kids to ride bikes also, as the reservoir is quite large, even larger than the reservoir where Alice Marble Tennis courts are still located above the iconic top of Lombard's crooked street.

That was unfortunately closed in the last 10 years and fenced off. That could easily be up and running and restrict the hours to 8am - 6 pm for general use or specifically pickleball (as the current game's noise issue is deafening—no pickleball player would want to live next door to one)

Thank you for what you allocated already for the quick resurfacing job at JP Murphy recently and continued work throughout the City.

Regards,

• Dave Lang

From: [Rebecca Hanley](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pickleball Court Reservation Fee
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2024 4:03:26 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

As an avid pickleball player, I recently heard about a new proposal to charge \$5 for court reservations and I am strongly opposed to it.

The fee is flawed for multiple reasons:

- This is a regressive tax on recreation, which will affect less affluent individuals much more than wealthy individuals
- There was very little community involvement or due process involved. Everyone I know within the Pickleball community is strongly against this proposal, yet RPD continues to forge ahead with their plans without incorporating feedback from the pickleball community.
- Many details such as refunds during the rainy season, cancellation policies, etc. still need to be worked through

If rec and park wants to make sure courts are actually being utilized, there are other workarounds to that problem including having people share their location and checkin to a court at the time of reservation: Jumping to a financial incentive without due process or community involvement further erodes trust in rec and park, especially on the heels of the the decision to remove courts from Presidio Wall.

Thanks,
Rebecca

From: [Benjamin Alpers](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public comment on tennis courts proposed fee
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2024 6:51:03 PM

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

Hello,

Please see below for my comment on the proposed fees for public court reservations:

- I believe reserving courts should be free as they are a public park resource. Reserving public courts isn't a convenience or a luxury, it's necessary in a populous environment where there is a finite amount of facilities.
- The premise of charging a fee for court reservations has been stated as "reducing no-shows". However, other reasons have since been mentioned by Recs and Park, which makes it confusing as to the community why this fee should or should not be instituted. The commission needs to be more transparent about the reason for this proposal.
- If reducing no-shows is in fact the primary objective, a fee is not the best solution to implement. Simpler measures should be taken BEFORE resorting to fees across the board. Such as:
 - **Waitlists:** A waitlist where someone who wants an already-booked court is notified if the court opens up for reservation. This would teach players that there is often a queue of people waiting for popular courts - when their favorite court is booked, they know next time they book a court that others may want it. This would show reservation owners that they are preventing other people from reserving if they were to no-show. On the page it could show "3 people on waitlist" and/or show that number in the reminder email. If the spot is released, the waitlist could receive an email/text saying the court is now open to reserve.
 - **Reservation Limits or "Credits":** Limit the number of reservations a player can make per year for free - perhaps 2 per week instead of 3 per week as was the case in Spotery. This incentivizes players to only book courts they can show up to, because they would use up their credits by no-showing and not cancelling. Now that the new Rec reservation platform has improved the issue of uniqueness of profiles such that there aren't multiple accounts per user, this is feasible. Perhaps players could go OVER the limit by paying a \$5 fee per reservation if they wanted even more reservations.
 - **Refundable deposit fee:** collect a fee but refund it if they show up to the court. A fee should only be a penalty for reserving and no-showing. A link/QR code on the court that players use to "check in" to the court while they are present would incentivize people to show up or cancel beforehand. While a link could have loopholes where a player could save the link "check-in" from anywhere, that would require extra steps and would not be convenient - it would be more convenient to just cancel your reservation ahead of time, especially if given a reminder email. There are probably also simple ways to work around that loophole from a technical perspective.

- **Transparency:**
 - If there are other primary reasons for instituting a \$5 fee - those should be published for transparency. If the reservation system needs funding to be sustainable; if coaching and school practicing needs a way to be charged for their use; if court maintenance needs funding – all those would be reasonable issues that could be proposed to have a fee. But none of those benefits have been stated as the primary objective.
 - If fees are instituted, and then no-shows persist – then what? The above measures would then need to be considered anyway, which would be more effective to do BEFORE instituting a fee. A fee would perhaps reduce reservations across all types of players, not just players with a propensity to no-show. If reducing no-shows is the goal, then the measures taken should target that issue specifically.
- **Fundraising:**
 - If funds are needed to make the reservation system and/or court facilities more sustainable - there are other solutions that Recs and Park should pursue. For instance - the reservation website is prime real estate that very specific groups of people view regularly - this could be sold as advertising space either to local businesses, major brands, or used for public programs that otherwise would have to spend money on outside services.

Thanks,
Benjamin Alpers
SF resident, district 8

From: [Hal..Naph](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa. Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging NO vote on Rec and Park motion to charge a fee for reserving tennis/pickleball courts
Date: Thursday, June 13, 2024 4:41:18 PM

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

Hi, Supervisor Chan:

I'm writing to ask for your support in preventing the City from instituting fees for public park facilities that we already pay for with our tax dollars. It sets a bad precedent and like most fees of its kind, causes greatest harm to those who can least afford it. As often is the case, it is introduced with low fees, but it's only a matter of time before the fees spiral upward.

The reasoning of the Rec and Park Commission is flawed. They say they are doing this to ensure that our facilities are fully utilized, which is a noble goal. They claim however, with no proof, that folks have been reserving courts and not showing up, so they go unused. Those of us who use the facilities regularly have seen no evidence of this. On those courts that take both reservations and have open play, nothing goes unused!

Their solution to this "problem" is to charge a fee to ensure attendance. That will be of no significance to those who can easily afford the charge. In these high inflation times, the City should not be raising costs.

The principle evidence that Rec and Park is acting in bad faith is this: they claim their concern is underutilization. However, several months ago, they eliminated 6 of 12 pickleball courts from the very popular Presidio Wall Park (PWP) and converted them to dedicated tennis courts, which have remained underutilized or empty almost all the time.

I have been offended by Rec and Park's pretense at consulting the community. For example, when many of us showed up at their meeting to advocate against removing half of the courts at PWP, Phil Ginsburg announced before we had a chance to weigh in that it was a done deed and nothing we could say would make a difference! Likewise, when we filled the chamber to argue against fees, Ginsburg's staff were on their phones while we were testifying, not even pretending to listen. This behavior reflects badly on the City.

Please vote no at the Budget and Appropriations Committee on June 20 when the measure is before you.

Thanks a lot.

Naphtali Offen

From: [mary.gwynn](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fees for reservations for courts in San Francisco : Charging for Courts
Date: Monday, June 17, 2024 11:21:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Chan,

As a long time resident of San Francisco and an active member of the community, I wanted to ask for your support in preventing the City from instituting fees for public park facilities that we **already pay** for with our tax dollars. It sets a bad precedent and like most fees of its kind, causes greatest harm to those who can least afford it.

The reasoning of the Rec and Park Commission is flawed. They say they are doing this to ensure that our facilities are fully utilized, which is a noble goal. They claim however, with no proof or data that folks have been reserving courts and not showing up, so they go unused. Those of us who use the facilities regularly have seen no evidence of this. On those courts that take both reservations and have open play, nothing goes unused!

Their solution to this "problem" is to charge a fee to ensure attendance. There are other solutions which have been proven to work (e.g. penalize the "no shows" by not allowing them reservation rights for a period of time). This is a solution in search of a problem. The fees will affect folks **unequally**, as it will be of no significance to those who can easily afford the charge. In these high inflationary times, the City should not be raising costs.

The principle evidence that Rec and Park is acting in bad faith is this: they claim their concern is underutilization. However, several months ago, they eliminated 6 of 12 pickleball courts from the very popular Presidio Wall Park (PWP) and converted them to dedicated tennis courts, which have remained underutilized or empty almost all the time.

I have been offended by Rec and Park's pretense at consulting the community. For example, when many of us showed up at their meeting to advocate against removing half of the courts at PWP, Phil Ginsburg announced before we had a chance to weigh in that it was a done deed and nothing we could say would make a difference! Likewise, when we filled the chamber to argue against fees, Ginsburg's staff were on their phones while we were testifying, not even pretending to listen. This behavior reflects badly on the City.

Please vote no at the Budget and Appropriations Committee on June 20 when the measure is before you.

I would appreciate your support.

Regards,

Mary E. Gwynn

**Missed Revenue Opportunity For RPD
For Not Charging Private Schools For Tennis Court Usage**

Current Situation:

8 private high schools use 36 tennis courts for 6 months out of the year for 5 days per week for 3 hours per day. RPD has let these schools use the courts for free for decades, yet RPD charges nonprofits for court usage. It's remarkable that RPD chooses to give a free ride to private schools that charge mid-five figure annual tuitions but now wants to San Franciscans to pay for reservations, which will create a barrier to entry for low income individuals, fixed income seniors, and students.

Some of these private schools use and pay private venues for using their golf courses, sailing equipment, and gymnasium spaces. Why should tennis be any different? This seems like an easy revenue source for RPD. Why is RPD ignoring it.

Below uses a recent example of 6 pickleball courts rented by RPD to a SF pickleball nonprofit for a day. The range below represents valuing the rental from a per court basis on the low end and a land equivalent basis on the high end. A per court basis means a tennis court equals a pickleball court. A land equivalent basis means tennis courts are valued as greater because a tennis court take up more land that a pickleball court.

Louis Sutter Day Use Example

Fee Paid By A Pickleball Nonprofit for Day Use	\$900.00
Number of Hours	9
Fee / Hour	\$100.00
# Pickleball Courts	6

	Per Court Basis	<----->	Land Equivalent Basis
Equivalent Cost For Tennis Court Usage By Private Schools			
Courts Used	36		36
Weeks / Year / Used	26		26
Days / Week Used	5		5
Hours / Day Used	3		3
Total Hours Used / Year	14040		14040
Land Use Equivalency (2 Tennis Courts = 6 Pickleball Courts)	NA		3
Fee / Hour /Court	\$16.67		\$50.00
Total Fee / Year	\$234,000	<----->	\$702,000

From: [Amar Anand](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose the fees for Pickleball and Tennis reservations
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2024 8:45:41 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

As an avid pickleball player, I recently heard about a new proposal to charge \$5 for court reservations and I am strongly opposed to it. The fee is flawed for multiple reasons:

- This is a regressive tax on recreation, which will affect less affluent individuals much more than wealthy individuals
- There was very little community involvement or due process involved. Everyone I know within the Pickleball community is strongly against this proposal, yet RPD continues to forge ahead with their plans without incorporating feedback from the pickleball community
- Many details such as refunds during the rainy season, cancellation policies, etc. still need to be worked through. It would be unfair to charge someone and not be able to refund them if they cancel with sufficient time or poor weather prevents them from playing.

If rec and park wants to make sure courts are actually being utilized, there are other workarounds to that problem including having people share their location and checkin to a court at the time of reservation: Jumping to a financial incentive without due process or community involvement further erodes trust in rec and park, especially on the heels of the the decision to remove courts from Presidio Wall.

Thanks,
Amar Anand

From: [Shuangyan Li](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: [File No.240603] Submitting Written Public Comment for Budget & Appropriations Committee Hearing on June 20, 2024
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2024 10:19:32 AM

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

Hi Brent,

I am submitting a written public comment as a San Francisco resident for today's Budget & Appropriations Committee Hearing referencing File No. 240603 or [Park Code - Court Reservations].

Dear Budget & Appropriations Committee,

My name is Shuangyan Li, and I've been living in San Francisco since 2021. I'm hoping the committee could vote no on adding additional fee to the Tennis/Pickle Ball court reservations.

It is extremely important to have accessible outdoor spaces in a city like San Francisco, it give residents a place to enjoy the time with family, friends and other loved ones. With no doubt, adding any amount of fee to Pickleball and Tennis courts will damage the possibility of everyone who suppose to have equal access to public park. The current reservation system we are using already limited many folks why may not have stable internet or adjustable working schedule to book the court, please do not make this even harder for all the residents who have been living and contributing to the development of this city.

I enjoy using the public tennis court to practice tennis with my friends, and I hope there are more resources like this for others to use. I would not start playing tennis at the first place without the free tennis court in my neighborhood. In the last three years I'm in San Francisco, I have never seen a court being left on empty for a period of time, people here are willing to adept to the new booking system, respect the community agreement on playing, meet with new players and even help maintaining the court.

Again, this reservation fee will not only reduce the possibility the court being used, it could lead to further exacerbate the reluctance to use these court, so I strongly urge you to vote NO on this proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best,
Shuangyan Li

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding File No. 240603
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2024 12:38:21 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding File No. 240603.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding **File No. 240603:**

Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge a fee for reserving tennis and 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.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Shuangyan Li](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Vote NO to keep equal access to Public Court
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2024 10:27:27 AM

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

Dear Budget & Appropriations Committee,

My name is Shuangyan Li, and I've been living in San Francisco since 2021. I'm hoping the committee could stop adding additional fee to the Tennis/Pickle Ball court reservations by voting NO on file No.240603 [Park Code-Court Reservation] at the hearing today(June 20,2024).

It is extremely important to have accessible outdoor spaces in a city like San Francisco, it give residents a place to enjoy the time with family, friends and other loved ones. With no doubt, adding any amount of fee to Pickleball and Tennis courts will damage the possibility of everyone who suppose to have equal access to public park. The current reservation system we are using already limited many folks why may not have stable internet or adjustable working schedule to book the court, please do not make this even harder for all the residents who have been living and contributing to the development of this city.

I enjoy using the public tennis court to practice tennis with my friends, and I hope there are more resources like this for others to use. I would not start playing tennis at the first place without the free tennis court in my neighborhood. In the last three years I'm in San Francisco, I have never seen a court being left on empty for a period of time, people here are willing to adept to the new booking system, respect the community agreement on playing, meet with new players and even help maintaining the court.

Again, this reservation fee will not only reduce the possibility the court being used, it could lead to further exacerbate the reluctance to use these court, so I strongly urge you to vote NO on this proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

From: [Peg Stevenson](#)
Subject: Tennis Coalition San Francisco supports court reservation fee. File #240603, Item 12 on 6/20 Committee Agenda.
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2024 8:54:09 AM

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 Budget and Appropriations Committee
FR: Tennis Coalition San Francisco - Peg Stevenson and Nina Kim, Co-Chairs
DT: June 20, 2024
RE: Tennis Coalition San Francisco urges support of court reservation fee

Dear Committee Members,

- We urge your support of the Recreation and Park Department's proposal to charge a \$5/hour fee for tennis and pickleball reservations (Item 12, File 240603 on the Thursday 6/20 agenda).
- Tennis Coalition San Francisco (TCSF) supports the proposal for a reservation fee on a subset of public tennis and pickleball courts around the City. Public courts are a precious resource. There are individuals, families, teams and groups who are currently unable to find a place to play tennis, and demand is growing. We recognize the concerns of people who are opposed. However, on balance, we believe the fee will encourage efficient use of courts, free up hours of time, and better match resources to community needs. Overall, it will make public courts more accessible to more people.
- Reservations for public courts citywide have been popular since the Spotery system was introduced in 2019 during the construction of the Goldman Tennis Center. However, all players have observed the problems and abuses on Spotery. Courts were fully booked within seconds of becoming available. Many hours of court time were reserved but not used by no-shows. Users created multiple accounts and bots were used to book consecutive hours and to cheat

the limit of three reservations per week per person.

- The new REC reservation system, with an improved interface and verification measures, can prevent many of the Spotery problems. But it does not substantially address no-shows and late cancellations. The reservation fee is designed for this purpose. The cost, though small, can drive changes in behavior and open up many hours of court time.
- Even with the reservation fee on a subset of courts, there will still be thousands of hours of free walk-on court time and open play all over the city. Forty-five out of the 66 court locations in San Francisco will have walk-on courts, 28 will have reservable courts and five locations will have both.
- The fee is similar to reservation fees paid by other users of RPD facilities such as picnic tables, soccer fields, and baseball fields. All of these users pay for reservations to make scheduling possible.
- The fee is at the low end of the range compared to similar fees in other cities. It is comparable to the lowest discount fee paid at Goldman Tennis Center (weekday/senior/SF resident).
- Tennis and pickleball court users will pay the same fees. There are 50 courts in the City with both tennis lines and pickleball lines. Of these, 24 will be reservable, 16 will have both reservable and free open play time, and 10 will be free and walk-up. In addition, there are two sites with 14 courts which are dedicated, single use pickleball courts – all of these will remain free and open play. Pickleball players will have thousands of hours of free time and open play time. Like tennis, the reservation fee will help show how pickleball courts are used in the City and better match the resource to public demand.
- TCSF supports the professional tennis teaching pros module which RPD is developing in the REC system. It has been a weakness that the City never permitted or regulated the many teaching pros using public courts. The new system will address this gap. Players seeking lessons will benefit from the information and access to teaching pros who are licensed and made available through the REC system. Importantly, the system will fairly compensate the city for the private business use of a public resource.
- Tennis Coalition San Francisco urges the Board of Supervisors to support the

court reservation fee proposal. The fee is modest and the benefits to the community are significant. Overall, the REC system and the reservation fee are fair and reasonable ways to make the best use of a scarce and valuable public resource.

TENNIS COALITION SAN FRANCISCO champions public tennis by connecting, energizing and advocating for the tennis community. We are the nonprofit side of the public-private partnership that built the Goldman Tennis Center.

info@tenniscoalitionsf.org

Tennis Coalition San Francisco

c/o SF Parks Alliance

1074 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103