

From: [Andrew Pellman](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: General Obligation Bond Pass Through Legislations
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2024 11:26:59 AM

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

Please do not support the currently proposed legislation that would further reduce the general obligation bond passthrough. **Should the Board move forward with this legislation, I and many others will vote against all future bond proposals.** And further if this legislation passes, I will actively support any group that opposes future bond proposals. It is unfair to further restrict landlord rights, and to have property owners bear the burden of additional bond costs.

- All city residents should share in the cost of funding the public services and critical infrastructure improvements that General Obligation bonds pay for. This legislation unfairly pushes 90% of the burden of those costs onto property owners.
- Tom Ammiano negotiated a compromise in the form of a settlement agreement over an SFAA lawsuit over passthroughs more than twenty years ago. Ammiano's settlement agreement shares the costs of General Obligation bonds fairly between property owners and tenants.
- The City is looking at approving over \$1 Billion in General Obligation bonds over the next few years, including for critical items like waterfront safety, earthquake safety, and emergency response. Now is not the right time to approve this legislation and put future bonds at risk.
- If this legislation passes as currently written, I will be voting NO on all future bond measures and contributing to campaigns to defeat future bond measures.

- If the Board of Supervisors approves this legislation, they are putting the City's capital plan and future bond measures at risk.
- The existing General Obligation Bond passthrough amount for tenants is minimal, and there are currently financial hardship provisions for low-income tenants. Even so, it's important that tenants and property owners each contribute to civic improvements.
- Feel free to elaborate with your personal experiences or thoughts on this issue.

From: [Alicia Lo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File Number 240174, General Obligation Bond Passthroughs
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2024 2:06:36 PM

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

VOTE NO!

WE HAVE TO STOP MAKING THE CITY A PLACE FOR ONLY HOMELESS PEOPLE TO LIVE. THE MORE THAT BUSINESSES AND LANDLORDS HAVE TO PAY FOR EVERYONE THE MORE THEY WILL LEAVE SF! IT'S ALREADY A DISASTER.

- All city residents should share in the cost of funding the public services and critical infrastructure improvements that General Obligation bonds pay for. This legislation unfairly pushes 90% of the burden of those costs onto property owners.
- Tom Ammiano negotiated a compromise in the form of a settlement agreement over an SFAA lawsuit over passthroughs more than twenty years ago. Ammiano's settlement agreement shares the costs of General Obligation bonds fairly between property owners and tenants.
- The City is looking at approving over \$1 Billion in General Obligation bonds over the next few years, including for critical items like waterfront safety, earthquake safety, and emergency response. Now is not the right time to approve this legislation and put future bonds at risk.
- If this legislation passes as currently written, you will be voting NO on all future bond measures and contributing to campaigns to defeat future bond measures.

- If the Board of Supervisors approves this legislation, they are putting the City's capital plan and future bond measures at risk.
- The existing General Obligation Bond passthrough amount for tenants is minimal, and there are currently financial hardship provisions for low-income tenants. Even so, it's important that tenants and property owners each contribute to civic improvements.

Sincerely,

Alicia Lo

From: chung.rabin@comcast.net
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Bond Passthrough Legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2024 9:35:17 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Calvillo,

I live in San Francisco and have owned a four unit rental property for many years.

I am strongly opposed to Supervisor Peskin's proposed Bond Passthrough legislation for the following reasons:

- All city residents should share in the cost of funding the public services and critical infrastructure improvements that General Obligation bonds pay for. This legislation unfairly pushes 90% of the burden of those costs onto us property owners.
- Tom Ammiano negotiated a compromise in the form of a settlement agreement over an SFAA lawsuit over passthroughs more than twenty years ago. Ammiano's settlement agreement shares the costs of General Obligation bonds fairly between property owners and tenant
- The existing General Obligation Bond passthrough amount for tenants is minimal, and there are currently financial hardship provisions for low-income tenants. Even so, it's important that tenants and property owners each contribute to civic improvements.

If this proposed legislation passes, I will be voting no on all future bond measures and contributing to campaigns to defeat them.

I ask that you vote no on this measure.

Sincerely,

Richard Rabin

From: [Tim Slomer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No! On: General Obligation Bond Passthrough
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2024 6:35:40 PM

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

Hi Angela,

Please protect the property owners rights! All the people living in SF should share in the costs equally. If not, don't borrow the money.

We need supervisors to stand for fiscal responsibility.

Thx,

Tim Slomer

From: [Kram Leztie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: "General Obligation Bond Passthrough"
Date: Monday, April 15, 2024 9:09:08 AM

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

Here's another bill using property owners as a cash machine for political expediency. Unable to cover the loss of funds from a downtown you emptied you expect people like me to shoulder 90% of the burden for bonds that benefit everyone in the City. Added benefit for you: If the renters don't have to pay for the bonds they'll have no reason to deny them and you have ultimate power to spend and spend. Please let Tom Ammiano's bill stand as is. What you are doing is not fair. The board of Supes destroyed this city because it could not make hard choices - and now are putting the burden on a small group of people because its easier than doing what is right.

John Eitzel