FILE NO. 230984

Petitions and Communications received from September 14, 2023, through September 21, 2023, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on September 26, 2023.

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

From the Office of the Mayor, making appointments to the following bodies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.113:
- Recreation and Park Commission
  - Breanna Zwart - term ending June 27, 2025
  - Carey Wintroub - term ending June 27, 2026

Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.115:
- Airport Commission
  - Mark Buell - term ending August 31, 2027

Reappointment pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(8) and 5.103:
- Arts Commission
  - Seth Brenzel - term ending July 1, 2027

From the Office of the Mayor, submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Ahsha Safai at the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Planning Department, regarding the Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 6, Article IV, Section 6.60(d), submitting a Declaration of Emergency for a 16” water main break at the intersection of Fillmore and Green Streets. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Ordinance No. 11-15, File No. 141122, submitting the Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector (TTX), pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Pooled Investment Report for August 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 6 Contracts.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Department of Human Resources (DHR), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 16.82, submitting the Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to encourage housing production. File No. 230446. 16 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From ZK, regarding street conditions near Market and 6th Streets.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From K. Miller, regarding California Proposition 47, the Reduced Penalties for Some Crimes Initiative. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Wynship Hillier, regarding the Behavioral Health Commission.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From members of the public, regarding a Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole to hold a public hearing on the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative updates. File No. 230078. 51 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Remi Tan, regarding various topics. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Richard Youatt, regarding a proposed Resolution declaring September 21, 2023, as Armenian Independence Day in the City and County of San Francisco and commemorating the 32nd Anniversary of Armenian Independence Day on September 21, 2023. File No. 230979. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Resolution expressing the Board of Supervisors' concern regarding the development of the United Nations (UN) Activation Plan and displacement of the Heart of the City Farmers' Market from the UN Plaza. File No. 230951. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Regina Sneed, regarding the sculpture titled Monumental Reckoning by Dana King. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From members of the public, regarding a Hearing to discuss the City's comprehensive plan to address car break-ins. 2 Letters. File No. 230826. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Mike Regan, regarding the Lake Merced Quick-Build Project.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Dr. Teresa Palmer, regarding a Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole to hold a public hearing on Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan. File No. 230035. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Philip Cropp, regarding retail closures. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Department General Order (DGO) 5.25, Foot Pursuits. 2 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Department General Order (DGO) 9.07, Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops. 2 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for the study of drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel. 30 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Philip Kuttner, regarding homelessness on Bartlett Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Michael Meiktas, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Mira Martin-Parker, regarding various topics. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Monica D., regarding various topics. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From members of the public, regarding vehicular turns at red lights. 75 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From members of the public, regarding a Resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to delay implementing meter hour extension until the completion of an independent economic impact report that specifically analyzes the projected impact to San Francisco small businesses, City revenues, and the City's overall economic recovery and said report is reviewed by the Board of Supervisors and the SFMTA Board. Resolution No. 289-23; File No. 230587. 2 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From members of the public, regarding the landmarking of Sacred Heart Church.
3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From members of the public, regarding the hiring of San Francisco Patrol Special Police (SFPSP) officers. 35 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From members of the public, regarding street conditions. 3 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From members of the public, regarding window replacement standards. 3 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 96A, submitting the Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR) for Quarter 2, 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA), submitting recommendations from a San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission hearing on issues concerning LGBTQIA+ immigrants on May 8, 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From:	Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS-Operations; PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Paulino, Tom (MYR); Mainardi, Jesse (MYR)
Subject:	TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Reappointment 3.100(18) - Arts Commission
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 4:47:58 PM
Attachments:	Clerk"s Memo 9.21.23.pdf image001.png 2023 Brenzel Reappointment.pdf seth brenzel - résumé - September 2023 - final.pdf Seth Brenzel Form 700 Submit.PDF

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete reappointment to the Arts Commission. Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instruction.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org| www.sfbos.org

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

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

Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 21, 2023

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Reappointment - Arts Commission

On September 19, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete reappointment package pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18) and 5.103. This reappointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (October 19, 2023).

Reappointment to the Arts Commission:

- Seth Brenzel - Representative of the Visual Arts - term ending July 1, 2027

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by timely notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the reappointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the transmittal letter as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you wish to hold a hearing on this reappointment, please let me know in writing by Wednesday, September 27, 2023.

c: Matt Dorsey- Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Reappointment

September 19, 2023

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Charter Sections 3.100(18) and 5.103, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following reappointment:

Seth Brenzel to the Arts Commission as a representative of the visual arts, for the four-year term ending July 1, 2027.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Boards and Commissions, Jesse Mainardi, at 415.554.6588.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Somera, Alisa (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Mainardi, Jesse (MYR); Paulino, Tom (MYR); BOS-Operations
Subject:	TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointments 3.100(18) - REC & AIR
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 2:34:44 PM
Attachments:	COB Memo 09.15.23.pdf B Zwart.pdf C Wintroub.pdf M Bell.pdf

---

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete Mayoral Appointments, pursuant to Charter Section 3.100(18). Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instructions.

Alisa Somera
Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

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

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

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

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 15, 2023

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Mayoral Appointments - Recreation and Park Commission
Airport Commission

On September 12, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment packages pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). These appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (October 12, 2023).

Appointments to Recreation and Park Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.113:

- **Breanna Zwart** - term ending June 27, 2025
  (Breanna Zwart's Letter of Resignation from the Commission on the Status of Woman has been received.)

- **Carey Wintroub** - term ending June 27, 2026

Appointment to the Airport Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.115:

- **Mark Buell** - term ending August 31, 2027
  (Mark Buell's Letter of Resignation from the Recreation and Park Commission has been received.)

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by timely notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the transmittal letter as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you wish to hold a hearing on any of the above matters, please let me know in writing, by September 20, 2023. Please be advised that the due to Italian American Heritage Day and Indigenous Peoples Day the final Board meeting to hear this matter is October 3, 2023.

c: Matt Dorsey- Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Safai
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:51:00 PM
Attachments:	Response to Letter of Inquiry from Sup Safai_09.19.23.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Mayor in response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Safai at the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

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

From: Duning, Anna (MYR) <anna.duning@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 5:08 PM
To: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS) <jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <tom.paulino@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Safai

Please find the response from the Mayor's Office attached.

Thank you,

Anna Duning

Anna Duning (she/her)
Budget Director
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
anna.duning@sfgov.org | 415.554.6216 (o)

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, September 8, 2023 4:01 PM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Jenkins, Brooke (DAT)

<brooke.jenkins@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Duning, Anna (MYR) <anna.duning@sfgov.org>
Cc: Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS) <jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <tom.paulino@sfgov.org>; Power, Andres (MYR) <andres.power@sfgov.org>; Ortiz, Lisa (POL) <lisa.ortiz@sfgov.org>; Gamero, Lili (POL) <lili.gamero@sfgov.org>; Malouf, Rima (POL) <rima.malouf@sfgov.org>; Aroche, Diana (POL) <diana.aroche@sfgov.org>; Gonzalez, Ana (DAT) <ana.gonzalez@sfgov.org>; Clendinen, Eugene (DAT) <eugene.clendinen@sfgov.org>; McCaffrey, Edward (DAT) <edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org>; Hang, Xang (MYR) <xang.hang@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Safai

Dear Mayor Breed, District Attorney Jenkins, Chief Scott, and Director Duning,

Please see the attached memo from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors regarding a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Ahsha Safai at the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Tuesday, September 19, 2023

Supervisor Asha Safaí
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Response to Letter of Inquiry

I am requesting that Mayor London Breed and her Budget Director provide an explanation for the denial of the requested Assistant District Attorney position to be dedicated to increased retail theft.

Dear Supervisor Safaí,

As a member of the Budget and Finance and the Budget Appropriations Committees, you understand the size of the City's deficit projections and the budget instructions the Mayor issued to departments last year.

As part of that process, the Mayor's Office reviewed budget requests by all departments. Ultimately, we had to make General Fund reductions in many, while making some targeted investments in others. The District Attorney's budget was subject to the same review.

In conversation with their office, we decided to prioritize new General Fund for three new positions, dedicated to drug arrests, and ensure the Department had adequate financial resources to remain fully staffed. Additionally, the Department planned to apply for a state grant specifically for retail theft. On September 14, 2023 we learned that the District Attorney was successful with this grant application and will receive state funding as part California Organized Retail Theft Vertical Prosecution Grant Program. These funds will enable the Office to hire a full-time dedicated Assistant District Attorney and a full-time dedicated District Attorney Investigator to prosecute retail theft crimes. You can read more about that program here: https://www.bscc.ca.gov/organized-retail-theft-vertical-prosecution-grant-program.

The Board of Supervisors also had an opportunity to amend this budget. After making additional budget cuts, the Board ultimately added over $40 million in FY 23-24, including 12 new FTE in the Public Defender's Office, 3 new FTE in the Board of Supervisors as well as staff in the Ethics Commission. No additional FTE were added to the District Attorney's Office during the Board's phase of budget deliberations.

Sincerely,

Anna Duning
Budget Director
Office of Mayor London N. Breed

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

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

September 8, 2023

The Honorable London Breed, Mayor
Office of the Mayor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

William Scott, Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Via Email: William.Scott@sfgov.org

The Honorable Brooke Jenkins, District Attorney
Office of the District Attorney
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Via Email: Brooke.Jenkins@sfgov.org

Anna Duning, Budget Director
Mayor's Office of Finance
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 288
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Anna.Duning@sfgov.org

Dear Mayor Breed, Chief Scott, District Attorney Jenkins, and Director Duning,

At the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Ahsha Safai issued the attached inquiry to Mayor London Breed and the Mayor's Budget Office (MYR), the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), and the District Attorney's Office (DAT). Please review the attached letter of inquiry and introduction form, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests data on the current state of retail theft in San Francisco, the structure of law enforcement response, and prevention of retail theft and allocation of resources to stop retail theft, as follows from the respective agencies:

SFPD:
1. Number of arrests for commercial retail theft from 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023
2. Officers and staff member responsible for responding to, reviewing cases, and presenting the case to the District Attorneys and how many average cases they are responsible for
3. How many reports are made versus how many cases are presented to the District Attorney?

DAT:
1. Number of cases filed, prosecuted, and convicted for commercial retail theft and comparative analysis for calendar years 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023
2. Staff responsible for prosecuting these cases and the average case load per attorney and paralegal staff

MYR:
1. An explanation for the denial of the requested Assistant District Attorney position to be dedicated to increase retail theft

Please contact Lila Carrillo, Lila.Carrillo@sfgov.org, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Safai, for any questions related to this request, and copy BOS@sfgov.org on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than September 22, 2023.

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

Very Truly Yours,

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/JA

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Tom Paulino, MYR, Tom.Paulino@sfgov.org
Andres Power, MYR, Andres.Power@sfgov.org
Lisa Ortiz, SFPD, Lisa.Ortiz@sfgov.org
Lili Gamero, SFPD, Lili.Gamero@sfgov.org
Rima Malouf, SFPD, Rima.Malouf@sfgov.org
Diana Oliva-Aroche, SFPD, Diana.Aroche@sfgov.org
Ana Gonzalez, DAT, Ana.Gonzalez@sfgov.org
Eugene Clendinen, DAT, Eugene.Clendinen@sfgov.org
Edward McCaffrey, DAT, Edward.McCaffrey@sfgov.org
Xang Hang, MYR, Xang.Hang@sfgov.org

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2023 SEP 18 PM 12:52

BOS - 11

Item 3

MEMORANDUM

Date:	September 14, 2023
Case No.:	**2019-020115ENV**
Project Title:	**Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project**
To:	Members of the Planning Commission and Interested Parties
From:	Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
Re:	Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project

The San Francisco Planning Department has published the Responses to Comments document the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-referenced project on the San Francisco Planning Department's website at sfplanning.org/sfceqadocs. **This document, along with the Draft EIR, will be before the planning commission for Final EIR certification on September 28, 2023**. The planning commission will receive public testimony on the Final EIR certification at the September 28th hearing. Please note that the public review period for the draft EIR ended on January 24, 2022; any comments received after that date, including any comments provided orally or in writing at the final EIR certification hearing, may not be responded to in writing.

The planning commission does not conduct a hearing to receive comments on the responses to comments document, and no such hearing is required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Interested parties, however, may always write to commission members or to the president of the commission at commissions.secretary@sfgov.org (preferred) or 49 South Van Ness Avenue and express an opinion on the responses to comments document, or the commission's decision to certify the completion of the Final EIR for this project.

Please note that the responses to comments document in addition to the draft EIR is the final EIR. If you have any questions concerning the responses to comments document or the environmental review process, please contact Julie Moore at CPC.OceanBeachEIR@sfgov.org or at 628.652.7566.

Thank you for your interest in this project and your consideration of this matter.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Declaration of Emergency – Fillmore and Green 16" Water Main Break
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 1:29:40 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png 9.14.23 Emergency Declaration Fillmore-Green Water Main Break Signed.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached regarding the water main break at Fillmore and Green.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

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: Spitz, Jeremy M <JSpitz@sfwater.org>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2023 12:22 PM
To: Rosenfield, Ben (CON) <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; English, Jack (MYR) <john.english@sfgov.org>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <tom.paulino@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Herrera, Dennis (PUC) <DJHerrera@sfwater.org>; BREGMAN, SHERYL (CAT) <Sheryl.Bregman@sfcityatty.org>; Hom, Nancy (PUC) <NHom@sfwater.org>; Busch, Laura (PUC) <LBusch@sfwater.org>; Fine, Ivy (PUC) <IFine@sfwater.org>; Lyman, Greg (PUC) <GLyman@sfwater.org>; Sandler, Risa (CON) <risa.sandler@sfgov.org>; Ritchie, Steve (PUC)

<SRitchie@sfwater.org>; Ordikhani, Masood (PUC) <MOrdikhani@sfwater.org>; Feitelberg, Brittany (PUC) <BFeitelberg@sfwater.org>; Rydstrom, Todd (CON) <Todd.Rydstrom@sfgov.org>; Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer (PUC) <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>; McPartland, Frank (PUC) <fmcpartland@sfwater.org>
Subject: Declaration of Emergency – Fillmore and Green 16" Water Main Break

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached declaration of emergency pursuant to Section 6.6(d) of the Administrative Code.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Spitz
Local and Regional Policy and Government Affairs Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Cell: 415-214-5296
Pronouns: he, him, his
sfpuc.org

San Francisco Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.554.3155
F 415.554.3161
TTY 415.554.3488

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: September 14, 2023

To: Commissioner Newsha Ajami
President, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

From: Dennis J. Herrera DJH
General Manager

Subject: **Declaration of Emergency – Fillmore and Green 16" Water Main Break**

In accordance with Chapter 6, Article IV, Section 6.60(d) of the San Francisco Administrative Code, I am declaring an emergency on behalf of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).

In the early morning hours of September 11, 2023, a 16" water transmission main installed in 1949 in the intersection of Fillmore and Green Streets failed. The resulting release of water damaged the 8" water distribution main in Fillmore, and subsequent failure of the street base and pavement on Fillmore from the intersection with Green down to the crosswalk of the Union Street intersection. The displacement of sand and mud caused complete collapse of sections of Fillmore with voids of up to 10 feet in depth and failure of the sewer main and sewer laterals from the Fillmore and Green intersection along Fillmore to the Union intersection. The flow of water from the Fillmore and Green intersection buckled sidewalks on Fillmore near Union and inundated a number of resident garages and basements, as well as businesses along Green, Steiner, Fillmore, and Union with displaced sand and mud.

Under Administrative Code section 6.60, an "actual emergency" means a sudden, unforeseeable, and unexpected occurrence involving a clear and imminent danger, demanding immediate action to prevent or mitigate loss of or damage to, life, health, property, or essential public services. The water main break resulted in disruption of water and sewer services as well as interruption of gas service to customers on Fillmore Street. Restoration of Fillmore Street between Green and Union will likely take weeks. In addition, properties downhill from the main break on several other blocks were damaged.

London N. Breed
Mayor

Newsha K. Ajami
President

Sophie Maxwell
Vice President

Tim Paulson
Commissioner

Anthony Rivera
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

This request for an emergency declaration is for contract resources to perform sewer main, water main, and street repairs on Fillmore Street. The work must be completed as soon as possible and is beyond the capabilities of City forces. We currently estimate the cost of the remediation work not-to-exceed $5,000,000.

I am therefore declaring the existence of an emergency. I trust that this meets with your concurrence and approval.

CONCUR AND APPROVE:

Newsha Khodatalab Ajami

Newsha Ajami – President
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

cc: S. Maxwell
T. Paulson
T. Rivera
K. Stacy
R. Flynn
S. Ritchie
S. Robinson
N. Hom

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Legislative Services; Jalipa, Brent (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year 2022-2023
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 11:37:00 AM
Attachments:	09-14-23_Evictions Data Letter.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023, submitted by the Department of Public Health pursuant to Ordinance No. 11-15 (File No. 141122).

Sincerely,

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

From: Validzic, Ana (DPH) <ana.validzic@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 7:45 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>
Cc: Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>; Kunins, Hillary (DPH) <hillary.kunins@sfdph.org>
Subject: Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Good morning President Peskin and Sunny -

On behalf of Dr. Kunins, attached is the report required by Article XIV, the Tenant Eviction Annual Reports Ordinance File No. 141122. The report documents evictions from the subsidized housing programs that were funded by the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Human Services Agency (HSA) for the fiscal year from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023. Most of these programs have moved into the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and they will report separately on the sites that they oversee.

Including @BOS-Operations to track completion.

Best, Ana

****

Ana Validzic (she/her)

Government Affairs Manager

San Francisco Department of Public Health

ana.validzic@sfdph.org | 650.503.9536 (cell)

****

** CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE** This email message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of the information included in this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete or otherwise destroy the information.

San Francisco Department of Public Health

San Francisco Health Network
Behavioral Health Services

City and County of San Francisco
London N. Breed
Mayor

Hillary Kunins, MD, MPH, MS
Director, Behavioral Health Services and Mental Health SF
1380 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94108
Phone: (415) 255-3400 Fax: (415) 255-3567
hillary.kunins@sfdph.org

September 14, 2023

Mayor London Breed
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Dear Mayor Breed and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Attached is the report required by Article XIV, the Tenant Eviction Annual Reports Ordinance File No. 141122. The report documents evictions from the subsidized housing programs that were funded by the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Human Services Agency (HSA) for the fiscal year from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023.

Most of these programs have moved into the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and they will report separately on the sites that they oversee.

The report is separated by department as required by the legislation and documents the number of written notices of eviction, unlawful detainer filings, and evictions completed within the City's permanent supportive housing portfolio. Below is a basic overview of our findings for FY 22-23.

		# of Sites	# of Households who lived in the housing facility at any time during this period	# of Households who were issued one or more written Notices of Eviction	# of Unlawful Detainer Filings	Total # of Households Evicted	% of Households Evicted
DPH		11	401	33	19	7	1.75%
HSA		4	144	1	1	1	0.69%
TOTALS		15	545	34	20	8	1.47%

Sincerely,

Hillary Kunins

Hillary Kunins, MD, MPH

cc: Angelica Almeida, Director, Adult/Older Adult SOC
Janis O'Meara, Program Manager, Adult/Older Adult SOC

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2023
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:36:00 PM
Attachments:	CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2023.pdf image002.png

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the Pooled Investment Report for August 2023, submitted by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646.

Sincerely,

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

From: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:23 PM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2023

All-

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

Ichieh C. Dion
Investment Settlement Operations/Reporting
Investments
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
Office: 415.554.5433
San Francisco only, **call 311**
sftreasurer.org

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco

Tajel Shah, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Hubert R White, III CFA, CTP, Chief Investment Officer

José Cisneros, Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of August 2023

September 15, 2023

The Honorable London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Franicsco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of August 31, 2023. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of August 2023 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics *

	Current Month		Prior Month	
(in $ million)	Fiscal YTD	August 2023	Fiscal YTD	July 2023
Average Daily Balance	$ 15,510	$ 15,362	$ 15,658	$ 15,658
Net Earnings	80.39	40.31	40.07	40.07
Earned Income Return	3.06%	3.10%	3.02%	3.02%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

(in $ million) **Investment Type**	**% of Portfolio**	**Book Value**	**Market Value**	**Wtd. Avg. Coupon**	**Wtd. Avg. YTM**	**WAM**
U.S. Treasuries	22.18%	$ 3,520.1	$ 3,292.3	0.90%	0.99%	661
Federal Agencies	46.25%	7,082.9	6,865.0	2.52%	3.01%	600
Public Time Deposits	0.27%	40.0	40.0	5.47%	5.47%	118
Negotiable CDs	14.34%	2,130.0	2,128.8	5.53%	5.53%	175
Commercial Paper	1.45%	215.8	215.8	0.00%	5.70%	153
Money Market Funds	11.38%	1,688.7	1,688.7	5.25%	5.25%	1
Supranationals	4.13%	638.3	613.7	2.38%	2.02%	515
Totals	100.0%	$ 15,315.8	$ 14,844.3	2.87%	3.18%	478

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

Respectfully,

José Cisneros
Treasurer

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

Portfolio Summary
Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 2023

(in $ million) Security Type	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value	Market/Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	$ 3,525.0	$ 3,520.1	$ 3,292.3	93.53	22.98%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	7,088.7	7,082.9	6,865.0	96.92	46.25%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	40.0	40.0	40.0	100.00	0.26%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	2,130.0	2,130.0	2,128.8	99.94	13.91%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	221.0	215.8	215.8	100.03	1.41%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	-	-	-	-	0.00%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds - Government	1,688.7	1,688.7	1,688.7	100.00	11.03%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	636.2	638.3	613.7	96.14	4.17%	30%	Yes
TOTAL	**$ 15,329.6**	**$ 15,315.8**	**$ 14,844.3**	**96.92**	**100.00%**	**-**	**Yes**

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

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

Totals may not add due to rounding.

City and County of San Francisco
Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics

For the month ended August 31, 2023

Average Daily Balance	$15,362,111,413
Net Earnings	$40,314,180
Earned Income Return	3.10%
Weighted Average Maturity	478 days

Investment Type	*($ million)*	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries		$ 3,525.0	$ 3,520.1	$ 3,292.3
Federal Agencies		7,088.7	7,082.9	6,865.0
Public Time Deposits		40.0	40.0	40.0
Negotiable CDs		2,130.0	2,130.0	2,128.8
Commercial Paper		221.0	215.8	215.8
Money Market Funds		1,688.7	1,688.7	1,688.7
Supranationals		636.2	638.3	613.7
Total		**$ 15,329.6**	**$ 15,315.8**	**$ 14,844.3**



Asset Allocation by Market Value

Portfolio Analysis
Pooled Fund





Yield Curves



Source: Bloomberg



	7/31/23	8/31/23	Change
3 Month	5.400	5.435	0.0353
6 Month	5.448	5.496	0.0477
1 Year	5.378	5.384	0.0065
2 Year	4.877	4.863	-0.0137
3 Year	4.525	4.554	0.0293
5 Year	4.177	4.254	0.0767

Source: Bloomberg

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 2023

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAK7	U.S. Treasury Note	8/10/2021	9/15/2023	0.13	$ 50,000,000	$ 49,886,719	$ 49,997,930	$ 49,899,000
U.S. Treasuries	912797HC4	U.S. Treasury Bill	6/27/2023	10/24/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,137,250	49,615,750	49,612,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	U.S. Treasury Note	12/17/2019	11/15/2023	2.75	50,000,000	51,960,938	50,102,918	49,724,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/19/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,767,578	49,975,620	49,258,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,402,344	49,914,737	49,258,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	U.S. Treasury Note	12/15/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,443,359	49,919,935	49,258,000
U.S. Treasuries	9128285Z9	U.S. Treasury Note	10/4/2021	1/31/2024	2.50	50,000,000	52,511,719	50,449,683	49,400,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/23/2022	1/31/2024	0.88	50,000,000	49,390,625	49,868,989	49,078,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2022	1/31/2024	0.88	50,000,000	48,605,469	49,678,835	49,078,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2022	2/15/2024	2.75	50,000,000	50,250,000	50,061,852	49,386,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/8/2022	3/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	48,708,984	49,657,129	48,642,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCC3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	5/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,931,029	48,222,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828XT2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/6/2021	5/31/2024	2.00	50,000,000	52,263,672	50,583,002	48,746,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,998,047	49,999,422	47,881,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/9/2021	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,960,938	49,988,402	47,881,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	U.S. Treasury Note	4/12/2022	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	47,572,266	49,064,219	47,881,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	U.S. Treasury Note	3/30/2021	7/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,210,938	50,605,786	48,381,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	U.S. Treasury Note	8/25/2021	8/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,898,438	49,967,362	47,681,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	U.S. Treasury Note	4/15/2021	10/31/2024	1.50	50,000,000	51,746,094	50,574,391	47,886,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	U.S. Treasury Note	3/9/2021	11/15/2024	2.25	50,000,000	53,160,156	51,034,617	48,238,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	U.S. Treasury Note	3/12/2021	11/15/2024	2.25	50,000,000	53,228,516	51,059,357	48,238,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	U.S. Treasury Note	3/15/2021	12/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,226,563	50,781,785	47,795,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	U.S. Treasury Note	3/30/2021	1/31/2025	1.38	50,000,000	51,515,625	50,559,582	47,443,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	U.S. Treasury Note	4/15/2021	1/31/2025	1.38	50,000,000	51,507,813	50,563,120	47,443,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/15/2021	2/28/2025	1.13	50,000,000	51,011,719	50,382,018	47,156,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/31/2021	2/28/2025	1.13	50,000,000	50,998,047	50,381,072	47,156,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	U.S. Treasury Note	4/15/2021	3/31/2025	0.50	50,000,000	49,779,297	49,911,932	46,564,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	U.S. Treasury Note	4/19/2021	3/31/2025	0.50	50,000,000	49,839,844	49,935,915	46,564,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	U.S. Treasury Note	5/18/2021	4/30/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,615,234	49,838,148	46,324,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	U.S. Treasury Note	9/2/2021	5/15/2025	2.13	50,000,000	52,849,609	51,311,959	47,660,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	3/8/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,140,625	49,635,516	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	3/9/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,042,969	49,593,839	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,281,250	49,682,036	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,183,594	49,638,596	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/18/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,253,906	49,668,623	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,310,547	49,682,157	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/5/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,500,000	49,765,614	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,406,250	49,721,471	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	48,628,906	49,296,010	45,941,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	U.S. Treasury Note	8/5/2021	7/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,458,984	49,740,268	45,793,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	7/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,363,281	49,694,112	45,793,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/7/2022	9/15/2025	3.50	50,000,000	48,968,750	49,284,654	48,691,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/12/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,109,375	49,577,481	45,545,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/26/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,281,250	49,642,272	45,545,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,675,467	45,381,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/2/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,078,125	49,572,064	45,381,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	U.S. Treasury Note	3/4/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,048,828	49,557,945	45,381,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/25/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,455,078	49,737,699	45,297,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	U.S. Treasury Note	2/26/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,271,484	49,649,126	45,297,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/28/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,662,109	49,814,131	45,213,000

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,730,469	49,851,399	45,213,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	7/23/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	52,203,125	51,237,612	46,234,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	U.S. Treasury Note	8/27/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	51,890,625	51,083,651	46,234,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,931,641	49,961,286	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,070,313	50,040,084	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,345,703	50,197,955	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,328,125	50,187,890	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,406,250	50,234,576	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/10/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,240,234	50,139,026	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	9/24/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,937,500	49,962,895	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	10/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,593,750	49,756,014	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	1/4/2022	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,027,344	49,386,597	45,193,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	U.S. Treasury Note	9/28/2021	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,664,569	44,758,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,807,830	44,861,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,796,952	44,861,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/19/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,575,625	44,861,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/3/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,047,014	45,150,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,076,407	45,150,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	47,969,922	45,150,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	47,974,530	45,086,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	U.S. Treasury Note	4/6/2022	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,826,077	23,422,750
Subtotals					**0.90**	**$ 3,525,000,000**	**$ 3,523,877,485**	**$ 3,520,123,490**	**$ 3,292,257,750**
Federal Agencies	313384LJ6	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	11/7/2022	9/6/2023	0.00	$ 50,000,000	$ 48,055,750	$ 49,967,917	$ 49,964,500
Federal Agencies	3130AJXD6	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/14/2021	9/8/2023	0.13	20,975,000	20,806,361	20,973,135	20,954,445
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/27/2022	9/8/2023	3.38	25,000,000	25,071,750	25,001,231	24,990,000
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/27/2022	9/8/2023	3.38	25,000,000	25,070,000	25,001,201	24,990,000
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/28/2022	9/8/2023	3.38	40,000,000	40,102,000	40,001,754	39,984,000
Federal Agencies	3135G0U43	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/9/2021	9/12/2023	2.88	29,648,000	30,793,302	29,667,624	29,624,578
Federal Agencies	313384LR8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	5/26/2023	9/13/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,602,778	24,956,667	24,957,500
Federal Agencies	313384LY3	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/21/2023	9/20/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,969,778	49,871,222	49,865,500
Federal Agencies	313384MD8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/24/2023	9/25/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,475,438	24,918,250	24,915,000
Federal Agencies	313384MD8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/24/2023	9/25/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,475,438	24,918,250	24,915,000
Federal Agencies	3133EM6N7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/27/2021	9/27/2023	0.17	50,000,000	49,950,000	49,998,219	49,811,500
Federal Agencies	313384MH9	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/20/2023	9/29/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,448,750	24,904,722	24,900,750
Federal Agencies	313384MH9	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/20/2023	9/29/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,448,750	24,904,722	24,900,750
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/24/2023	10/6/2023	0.00	30,000,000	29,326,250	29,857,083	29,850,300
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/24/2023	10/6/2023	0.00	36,000,000	35,191,500	35,828,500	35,820,360
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	5/5/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,456,750	24,863,333	24,857,500
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	5/5/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	25,000,000	24,456,750	24,863,333	24,857,500
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/12/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	40,000,000	39,029,333	39,786,667	39,772,000
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/12/2023	10/11/2023	0.00	60,000,000	58,544,000	59,680,000	59,658,000
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/21/2023	10/20/2023	0.00	35,000,000	34,132,972	34,766,569	34,755,700
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	6/6/2023	10/20/2023	0.00	40,613,000	39,807,509	40,322,786	40,329,521
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/21/2023	10/20/2023	0.00	54,113,000	52,772,501	53,752,096	53,735,291
Federal Agencies	313384NK1	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	6/21/2023	10/25/2023	0.00	43,944,000	43,154,216	43,605,521	43,606,071
Federal Agencies	313384NX3	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	6/20/2023	11/6/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,008,660	49,529,292	49,529,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	25,000,000	24,963,750	24,995,469	24,685,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	25,000,000	24,963,750	24,995,469	24,685,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	75,000,000	74,891,250	74,986,406	74,056,500
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/10/2021	12/8/2023	2.25	10,000,000	10,301,000	10,040,519	9,908,900

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/10/2021	12/8/2023	2.25	30,000,000	30,903,000	30,121,558	29,726,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	25,000,000	24,987,600	24,998,132	24,643,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	25,000,000	24,988,000	24,998,192	24,643,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	62,000,000	61,970,488	61,995,553	61,114,640
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	1/8/2024	4.80	11,000,000	10,998,900	10,999,642	10,966,340
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	1/8/2024	4.80	25,000,000	24,987,500	24,995,928	24,923,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/3/2022	1/18/2024	0.90	11,856,000	11,738,815	11,832,256	11,648,757
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/1/2022	1/18/2024	0.90	50,000,000	49,701,000	49,941,954	49,126,000
Federal Agencies	313384ST7	Federal Home Loan Bank DN	4/21/2023	2/6/2024	0.00	10,650,000	10,236,780	10,425,640	10,409,204
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/12/2021	2/13/2024	2.50	39,010,000	40,648,810	39,338,559	38,483,755
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/18/2020	2/14/2024	1.43	20,495,000	20,950,604	20,547,962	20,134,288
Federal Agencies	3130AUYG3	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/16/2023	2/16/2024	5.10	25,000,000	24,996,500	24,998,389	24,946,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	5,000,000	4,998,200	4,999,707	4,876,650
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	5,000,000	4,998,200	4,999,707	4,876,650
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	100,000,000	99,964,000	99,994,148	97,533,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/25/2022	2/28/2024	2.13	11,000,000	10,987,460	10,996,798	10,826,310
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/25/2022	2/28/2024	2.13	25,000,000	24,971,500	24,992,723	24,605,250
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/15/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	10,000,000	10,013,300	10,005,248	9,965,400
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	20,000,000	20,000,800	20,000,318	19,930,800
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	25,000,000	24,982,000	24,992,539	24,913,500
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	30,000,000	30,001,800	30,000,715	29,896,200
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/8/2022	3/8/2024	4.75	30,000,000	29,978,400	29,991,047	29,896,200
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/18/2021	3/18/2024	0.30	50,000,000	49,939,500	49,989,015	48,657,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/18/2021	3/18/2024	0.30	50,000,000	49,939,450	49,989,006	48,657,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	16,545,000	16,549,633	16,546,000	16,023,998
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	29,424,000	29,432,239	29,425,778	28,497,438
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	39,000,000	39,010,920	39,002,357	37,771,890
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/16/2022	5/16/2024	2.63	45,000,000	44,939,250	44,978,559	44,174,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/16/2022	5/16/2024	2.63	50,000,000	49,932,500	49,976,176	49,083,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENYH7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2022	6/10/2024	2.63	100,000,000	99,871,000	99,950,059	97,810,000
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/18/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	15,955,000	16,008,449	15,975,237	15,654,408
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/18/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	17,980,000	18,043,829	18,004,167	17,641,257
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/12/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	25,500,000	25,552,530	25,519,733	25,019,580
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/16/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	50,000,000	50,204,000	50,077,037	49,058,000
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/22/2022	6/14/2024	3.13	28,000,000	27,904,520	27,960,458	27,515,600
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/22/2022	6/14/2024	3.13	28,210,000	28,114,932	28,170,629	27,721,967
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/17/2022	6/17/2024	3.25	25,000,000	24,970,500	24,988,297	24,583,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/17/2022	6/17/2024	3.25	25,000,000	24,970,750	24,988,396	24,583,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/17/2022	6/17/2024	3.25	50,000,000	49,970,000	49,988,098	49,166,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2022	6/28/2024	3.10	25,000,000	24,987,500	24,994,853	24,547,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2022	6/28/2024	3.10	25,000,000	24,986,500	24,994,441	24,547,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2022	6/28/2024	3.10	50,000,000	49,973,000	49,988,882	49,095,500
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/8/2022	7/8/2024	3.00	10,000,000	9,980,600	9,991,746	9,795,900
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/8/2022	7/8/2024	3.00	15,000,000	14,970,900	14,987,620	14,693,850
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/8/2022	7/8/2024	3.00	17,500,000	17,466,050	17,485,556	17,142,825
Federal Agencies	3130AWFH8	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2023	7/12/2024	5.51	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,842,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/6/2021	7/23/2024	0.45	50,000,000	50,092,000	50,027,719	47,898,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/21/2023	8/21/2024	4.88	10,000,000	9,995,700	9,997,209	9,948,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/21/2023	8/21/2024	4.88	20,000,000	19,992,000	19,994,808	19,897,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/21/2023	8/21/2024	4.88	25,000,000	24,990,000	24,993,510	24,872,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ84	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/26/2022	8/26/2024	3.38	50,000,000	49,916,500	49,958,878	49,014,000

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130ATVD6	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/10/2022	9/13/2024	4.88	50,000,000	50,062,000	50,034,823	49,783,500
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	25,000,000	24,974,750	24,991,061	23,759,250
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	50,000,000	49,949,500	49,982,122	47,518,500
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	50,000,000	49,949,500	49,982,122	47,518,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENP79	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/26/2022	9/26/2024	4.25	50,000,000	49,996,000	49,997,860	49,452,000
Federal Agencies	3130ATT31	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/1/2022	10/3/2024	4.50	50,000,000	49,860,500	49,920,910	49,554,500
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/3/2023	10/3/2024	5.32	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,881,750
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/3/2023	10/3/2024	5.32	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,881,750
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/3/2023	10/3/2024	5.32	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,763,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/28/2023	10/28/2024	4.50	20,000,000	19,968,400	19,975,652	19,799,200
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/28/2023	10/28/2024	4.50	25,000,000	24,959,000	24,968,410	24,749,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	10,000,000	9,988,500	9,995,341	9,485,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	10,000,000	9,988,500	9,995,341	9,485,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	50,000,000	49,942,500	49,976,706	47,428,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ94	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2022	11/18/2024	4.50	25,000,000	24,973,500	24,983,904	24,799,000
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/3/2019	12/3/2024	1.63	25,000,000	24,960,000	24,989,951	23,916,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/9/2021	12/9/2024	0.92	50,000,000	49,985,000	49,993,636	47,151,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/9/2021	12/9/2024	0.92	50,000,000	49,963,000	49,984,302	47,151,000
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2022	12/20/2024	4.25	10,000,000	9,982,900	9,988,865	9,873,700
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2022	12/20/2024	4.25	25,000,000	24,954,500	24,970,372	24,684,250
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2022	12/20/2024	4.25	25,000,000	24,954,500	24,970,372	24,684,250
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,857,000
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,857,000
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,857,000
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/30/2023	12/30/2024	5.38	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,857,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	20,000,000	19,955,000	19,979,665	18,929,400
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,974,582	23,661,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,974,582	23,661,750
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	4/21/2021	1/7/2025	1.63	39,060,000	40,632,556	39,632,470	37,276,520
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/10/2022	1/10/2025	4.88	10,000,000	9,999,400	9,999,623	9,947,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/10/2022	1/10/2025	4.88	20,000,000	19,998,800	19,999,247	19,895,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/10/2022	1/10/2025	4.88	20,000,000	19,999,580	19,999,736	19,895,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/10/2023	2/10/2025	4.25	10,000,000	9,947,200	9,961,863	9,863,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/10/2023	2/10/2025	4.25	29,875,000	29,716,065	29,760,202	29,466,011
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,998,882	4,747,150
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,998,882	4,747,150
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,998,882	4,747,150
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	15,000,000	14,988,450	14,996,646	14,241,450
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	50,000,000	49,961,500	49,988,819	47,471,500
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	4/21/2021	2/12/2025	1.50	53,532,000	55,450,052	54,261,768	50,824,887
Federal Agencies	3130AUVZ4	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/13/2023	2/13/2025	4.50	50,000,000	49,921,500	49,942,977	49,542,000
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/3/2023	2/28/2025	5.00	25,000,000	24,967,000	24,975,250	24,990,250
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/3/2023	2/28/2025	5.00	35,000,000	34,953,800	34,965,350	34,986,350
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/23/2020	3/3/2025	1.21	16,000,000	15,990,720	15,997,179	15,080,000
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/23/2020	3/3/2025	1.21	24,000,000	23,964,240	23,989,129	22,620,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMWT5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/21/2021	4/21/2025	0.60	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,989,153	46,443,000
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	37,938,000	37,367,792	37,660,539	35,330,521
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	7/12/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	50,000,000	50,108,000	50,046,878	46,563,500
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	50,000,000	49,243,950	49,632,109	46,563,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2022	5/23/2025	2.85	6,000,000	5,991,600	5,995,172	5,776,380
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2022	5/23/2025	2.85	20,000,000	19,972,000	19,983,905	19,254,600

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,992,627	9,923,700
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	15,000,000	14,987,550	14,988,941	14,885,550
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	25,000,000	24,979,250	24,981,568	24,809,250
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2023	6/6/2025	4.63	52,000,000	51,956,840	51,961,662	51,603,240
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/4/2022	6/13/2025	3.38	11,940,000	12,000,178	11,977,525	11,601,620
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/3/2022	6/13/2025	3.38	12,700,000	12,806,045	12,766,062	12,340,082
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	3,000,000	3,012,270	3,010,442	2,965,470
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/8/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	9,915,000	9,975,878	9,966,671	9,800,878
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/8/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	10,000,000	10,065,000	10,055,169	9,884,900
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/11/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	10,000,000	10,036,000	10,030,675	9,884,900
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	24,000,000	24,079,440	24,068,226	23,723,760
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/9/2023	6/13/2025	4.38	25,500,000	25,624,695	25,605,974	25,206,495
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/25/2023	6/13/2025	5.13	10,800,000	10,818,036	10,817,041	10,812,636
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/25/2023	6/13/2025	5.13	48,150,000	48,241,967	48,236,894	48,206,336
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/13/2022	6/13/2025	4.25	15,000,000	14,988,383	14,991,716	14,770,950
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/13/2022	6/13/2025	4.25	15,000,000	14,989,800	14,992,727	14,770,950
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/13/2022	6/13/2025	4.25	15,000,000	14,989,050	14,992,192	14,770,950
Federal Agencies	3133ENYQ7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/13/2022	6/13/2025	2.95	50,000,000	49,975,500	49,985,448	48,289,500
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	6/17/2025	0.50	4,655,000	4,556,640	4,604,941	4,301,080
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	12/8/2021	6/17/2025	0.50	10,000,000	9,789,600	9,892,920	9,239,700
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.70	17,680,000	17,734,631	17,705,185	16,341,624
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	25,000,000	24,982,000	24,984,318	24,571,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	26,500,000	26,483,835	26,485,917	26,045,260
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/18/2023	8/18/2025	4.00	30,000,000	29,981,700	29,984,057	29,485,200
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	3/4/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	25,000,000	24,684,250	24,860,182	22,850,750
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Federal National Mortgage Assoc	2/25/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	72,500,000	71,862,000	72,218,689	66,267,175
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/2/2021	9/12/2025	1.75	10,295,000	10,575,333	10,442,523	9,662,475
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	3/4/2021	9/23/2025	0.38	22,600,000	22,295,352	22,462,139	20,612,330
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/15/2023	10/1/2025	4.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,857,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	39,675,000	39,622,232	39,645,817	36,489,098
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	55,000,000	54,923,000	54,957,415	50,583,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	45,000,000	44,954,100	44,973,704	41,468,850
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	50,000,000	49,949,000	49,970,782	46,076,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	15,000,000	14,954,700	14,964,868	14,741,100
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	20,000,000	19,939,600	19,953,157	19,654,800
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/29/2022	12/29/2025	4.00	25,000,000	24,923,750	24,940,865	24,568,500
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026	4.00	20,000,000	19,982,400	19,986,109	19,653,800
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/13/2023	1/13/2026	4.00	30,000,000	29,977,200	29,982,005	29,480,700
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	Federal Home Loan Bank	2/9/2023	2/6/2026	4.01	21,100,000	20,985,427	21,006,811	20,681,376
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,928,500	24,936,097	24,333,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/17/2023	2/17/2026	3.63	30,000,000	29,905,500	29,915,541	29,199,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,953,500	24,961,561	24,779,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	28,000,000	27,954,080	27,962,041	27,753,320
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	2/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,918,000	49,932,215	49,559,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/25/2022	2/25/2026	3.32	35,000,000	34,957,650	34,969,958	33,789,350
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/9/2021	4/6/2026	0.69	15,500,000	15,458,150	15,476,676	13,983,015
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	20,000,000	19,961,200	19,974,771	18,940,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	30,000,000	29,941,800	29,962,156	28,410,000
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	17,045,000	16,991,479	16,996,883	16,646,317
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	20,000,000	19,939,200	19,944,998	19,532,200
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	10,000,000	9,934,300	9,939,760	9,830,800

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,899,350	14,907,715	14,746,200
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2023	6/12/2026	4.75	50,000,000	49,856,000	49,863,146	50,134,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	20,000,000	19,969,200	19,971,392	19,779,400
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	24,700,000	24,640,226	24,644,480	24,427,559
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	30,000,000	29,951,400	29,954,859	29,669,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,987,596	24,825,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,987,596	24,825,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,975,193	49,651,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,453,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,453,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,453,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,453,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,441,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,441,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,441,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,441,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,398,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,398,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,398,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,398,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/14/2023	8/14/2026	4.50	50,000,000	49,885,000	49,886,889	49,817,500
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,370,250
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,370,250
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,370,250
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,370,250
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,565,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,565,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,565,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,565,000
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,750
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,750
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,750
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	5/9/2023	11/2/2026	5.29	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,674,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,674,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,674,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,674,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,661,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,661,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,661,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	22,661,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,013,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,013,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,013,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,013,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/16/2022	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	47,766,791	44,019,281
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	22,500,000	22,392,338	22,422,601	21,035,925
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	24,500,000	24,377,010	24,411,582	22,905,785
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	25,000,000	24,804,000	24,859,095	23,373,250
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	4,650,000	4,646,792	4,647,354	4,579,739
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,996,550	4,997,155	4,924,450

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,987,001	20,989,281	20,682,690
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,750	24,985,776	24,622,250
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	10,000,000	10,141,500	10,109,132	9,636,400
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	12,375,000	12,552,829	12,512,151	11,925,045
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/20/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	21,725,000	22,016,550	21,949,984	20,935,079
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2027	4.13	28,940,000	28,911,928	28,913,427	28,577,382
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2022	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	28,044,833	26,585,997
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	6/29/2023	6/29/2027	5.94	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,856,250
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	6/29/2023	6/29/2027	5.94	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,856,250
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	6/29/2023	6/29/2027	5.94	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,712,500
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	8/16/2023	8/16/2027	6.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,971,750
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	8/16/2023	8/16/2027	6.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,971,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,977,009	9,888,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/7/2023	8/7/2028	4.25	19,500,000	19,412,250	19,413,451	19,407,960
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	10,000,000	9,979,100	9,979,146	10,071,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,962,800	14,962,881	15,107,400
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	25,000,000	24,943,500	24,943,624	25,179,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	33,000,000	32,904,960	32,905,168	33,236,280
Subtotals					**5.25**	**$ 7,088,706,000**	**$ 7,073,552,707**	**$ 7,082,860,076**	**$ 6,864,995,951**
Public Time Deposits	PPG62B630	Bank of San Francisco	6/5/2023	12/4/2023	5.46	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPG42YDZ6	Bridge Bank NA	6/19/2023	12/18/2023	5.37	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPG24NBE1	Bank of San Francisco	7/10/2023	1/8/2024	5.54	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPG250Y96	Bridge Bank NA	7/17/2023	1/16/2024	5.49	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotals					**5.47**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**
Negotiable CDs	78015JFJ1	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	9/20/2022	9/20/2023	4.75	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,000,000	$ 49,978,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CY27	Bank of Montreal/CHI	10/3/2022	9/22/2023	4.80	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,976,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JHJ9	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	9/30/2022	9/22/2023	4.81	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,978,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CXX0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/28/2022	9/25/2023	4.82	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,973,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JH67	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	9/28/2022	9/25/2023	4.76	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,973,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CYA9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	10/6/2022	10/6/2023	4.97	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,966,500
Negotiable CDs	78015JMJ3	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	11/16/2022	10/23/2023	5.46	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,983,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BC73	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	11/2/2022	10/23/2023	5.57	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,995,000
Negotiable CDs	06367D4E2	Bank of Montreal/CHI	3/1/2023	10/24/2023	5.42	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,970,000
Negotiable CDs	13606KRZ1	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	1/10/2023	11/6/2023	5.32	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,977,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BJX9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	12/2/2022	11/20/2023	5.51	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,975,500
Negotiable CDs	06417MN84	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	12/5/2022	11/21/2023	5.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,976,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JPE1	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	12/19/2022	12/18/2023	5.37	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,931,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JRE9	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	1/5/2023	12/29/2023	5.43	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,882,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BPB0	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/5/2023	1/3/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,940,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BPF1	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/5/2023	1/5/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,937,500
Negotiable CDs	06367D3V5	Bank of Montreal/CHI	1/13/2023	1/12/2024	5.24	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	69,852,300
Negotiable CDs	89115BQB9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/17/2023	1/17/2024	5.24	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,889,000

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Negotiable CDs	89115BST8	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/30/2023	1/29/2024	5.21	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,731,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BY79	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/8/2023	1/29/2024	5.75	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,979,500
Negotiable CDs	06417MT47	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	2/10/2023	2/9/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,904,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BWK2	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/1/2023	2/22/2024	5.58	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,931,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BXF2	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/6/2023	3/6/2024	5.60	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,928,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BNG1	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	6/27/2023	6/5/2024	5.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,965,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DBJ3	Bank of Montreal/CHI	7/17/2023	6/7/2024	5.89	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,994,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DAU9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	6/27/2023	6/21/2024	5.87	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,955,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JXW2	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	6/28/2023	6/28/2024	5.89	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,001,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DAX3	Bank of Montreal/CHI	7/5/2023	7/1/2024	6.00	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,062,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DBR5	Bank of Montreal/CHI	7/24/2023	7/1/2024	5.93	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,010,500
Negotiable CDs	13606KZR0	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	8/7/2023	7/1/2024	5.89	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,010,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BRG7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	7/6/2023	7/1/2024	6.05	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,043,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BS84	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	7/17/2023	7/1/2024	5.91	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,992,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BSQ4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	7/24/2023	7/1/2024	5.93	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,002,500
Negotiable CDs	89115BV80	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	8/2/2023	7/3/2024	5.90	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,994,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DBW4	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/1/2023	7/29/2024	5.97	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,030,000
Negotiable CDs	13606KZN9	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	8/2/2023	7/29/2024	5.92	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,022,200
Negotiable CDs	06367DCF0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/28/2023	8/14/2024	6.01	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,060,000
Subtotals					**5.53**	**$ 2,130,000,000**	**$ 2,130,000,000**	**$ 2,130,000,000**	**$ 2,128,770,500**
Commercial Paper	03785EW59	Apple	8/22/2023	9/5/2023	0.00	$ 11,000,000	$ 10,977,499	$ 10,993,571	$ 10,991,860
Commercial Paper	89233HY65	Toyota Motor Credit	6/26/2023	11/6/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,987,722	49,497,667	49,500,000
Commercial Paper	89233HY81	Toyota Motor Credit	8/2/2023	11/8/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,250,028	49,479,611	49,485,000
Commercial Paper	89233GE36	Toyota Motor Credit	8/8/2023	5/3/2024	0.00	60,000,000	57,489,333	57,713,333	57,748,200
Commercial Paper	89233GE69	Toyota Motor Credit	8/15/2023	5/6/2024	0.00	50,000,000	47,938,889	48,071,111	48,100,000
Subtotals					**0.00**	**$ 221,000,000**	**$ 214,643,471**	**$ 215,755,293**	**$ 215,825,060**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	8/31/2023	9/1/2023	5.24	$ 20,639,985	$ 20,639,985	$ 20,639,985	$ 20,639,985
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	8/31/2023	9/1/2023	5.24	538,038,800	538,038,800	538,038,800	538,038,800
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fı	8/31/2023	9/1/2023	5.23	11,969,130	11,969,130	11,969,130	11,969,130
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Manageme	8/31/2023	9/1/2023	5.22	14,960,809	14,960,809	14,960,809	14,960,809
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MM	8/31/2023	9/1/2023	5.25	546,167,400	546,167,400	546,167,400	546,167,400
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity F	8/31/2023	9/1/2023	5.25	556,939,908	556,939,908	556,939,908	556,939,908
Subtotals					**5.25**	**$ 1,688,716,031**	**$ 1,688,716,031**	**$ 1,688,716,031**	**$ 1,688,716,031**
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	Inter-American Development Bank	12/15/2021	10/4/2023	3.00	$ 25,756,000	$ 26,837,752	$ 25,810,252	$ 25,705,003
Supranationals	45906M3B5	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	3/23/2022	6/14/2024	1.98	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	97,181,000
Supranationals	4581X0EE4	Inter-American Development Bank	7/1/2022	7/1/2024	3.25	80,000,000	79,992,000	79,996,673	78,519,200
Supranationals	459056HV2	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	11/2/2021	8/28/2024	1.50	50,000,000	50,984,250	50,345,921	48,154,500
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	Inter-American Development Bank	11/4/2021	9/23/2024	0.50	50,000,000	49,595,500	49,851,095	47,490,500
Supranationals	45950VQG4	International Finance Corp	10/22/2021	9/23/2024	0.44	10,000,000	9,918,700	9,970,436	9,455,700
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	Inter-American Development Bank	4/26/2021	1/15/2025	2.13	100,000,000	105,676,000	102,095,112	95,911,000
Supranationals	459058JB0	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	7/23/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	40,000,000	40,086,000	40,037,629	37,207,200
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	Inter-American Development Bank	11/1/2021	7/15/2025	0.63	28,900,000	28,519,098	28,707,577	26,679,613
Supranationals	45950VRU2	International Finance Corp	1/26/2023	1/26/2026	4.02	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	97,867,000
Supranationals	45818WDG8	Inter-American Development Bank	8/25/2021	2/27/2026	0.82	19,500,000	19,556,907	19,531,442	17,574,570
Supranationals	45906M4C2	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	5.75	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	31,962,240
Subtotals					**2.38**	**$ 636,156,000**	**$ 643,166,207**	**$ 638,346,137**	**$ 613,707,526**
Grand Totals					**2.87**	**$ 15,329,578,031**	**$ 15,313,955,901**	**$ 15,315,801,028**	**$ 14,844,272,818**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	T 2.750 11/15/2023	$ 50,000,000	115,829	(42,540)		$ 73,289
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	50,000,000	15,795	9,544		25,339
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	12,719		23,249
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	T 0.375 12/31/2025	50,000,000	15,795	12,767		28,561
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	16,771		27,301
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	T 0.250 10/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	17,325		27,854
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	16,915		27,445
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	18,849		29,379
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	T 2.250 11/15/2024	50,000,000	94,769	(72,728)		22,041
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	T 2.250 11/15/2024	50,000,000	94,769	(74,467)		20,302
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	T 1.750 12/31/2024	50,000,000	73,709	(49,765)		23,945
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	T 1.125 02/28/2025	50,000,000	47,401	(21,690)		25,712
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	T 0.125 12/15/2023	50,000,000	5,294	7,198		12,492
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	T 1.375 01/31/2025	50,000,000	57,914	(33,489)		24,426
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	T 1.750 07/31/2024	50,000,000	73,709	(56,226)		17,484
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	T 1.125 02/28/2025	50,000,000	47,401	(21,636)		25,765
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	T 1.375 01/31/2025	50,000,000	57,914	(33,700)		24,214
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	T 1.500 10/31/2024	50,000,000	63,179	(41,798)		21,381
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	T 0.500 03/31/2025	50,000,000	21,175	4,732		25,906
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	T 0.500 03/31/2025	50,000,000	21,175	3,443		24,618
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	50,000,000	10,587	17,234		27,822
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	14,756		25,286
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	16,772		27,302
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	15,378		25,908
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	T 0.375 04/30/2025	50,000,000	15,795	8,266		24,061
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	31,590	5,928		37,518
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	T 0.750 04/30/2026	50,000,000	31,590	4,739		36,329
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	1,162		38,016
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCC3	T 0.250 05/15/2024	50,000,000	10,530	8,319		18,849
U.S. Treasuries	912828XT2	T 2.000 05/31/2024	50,000,000	84,699	(66,202)		18,498
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	14,750		25,280
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(1,203)		35,652
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(5,941)		30,914
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(5,639)		31,216
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	68,444	(38,871)		29,573
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	T 0.250 09/30/2025	50,000,000	10,587	14,592		25,179
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	10,877		21,407
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	11,519		22,049
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	12,926		23,456
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(7,040)		29,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	T 0.250 07/31/2025	50,000,000	10,530	13,566		24,096
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	T 0.375 07/15/2024	50,000,000	15,795	56		15,851
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	T 0.375 07/15/2024	50,000,000	15,795	1,131		16,926
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAK7	T 0.125 09/15/2023	50,000,000	5,265	4,584		9,849
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	(4,172)		32,682
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	T 0.375 08/15/2024	50,000,000	15,913	2,899		18,812
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	50,000,000	68,444	(34,036)		34,409
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	T 2.125 05/15/2025	50,000,000	89,504	(65,387)		24,117

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	1,114		37,968
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	50,000,000	31,601	9,496		41,097
U.S. Treasuries	9128285Z9	T 2.500 01/31/2024	50,000,000	105,299	(91,712)		13,587
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	5,295		42,351
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	5,595		42,651
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	7,322		44,177
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	11,694		48,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	52,937	(1,229)		51,708
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	52,937	(1,997)		50,940
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	T 0.250 06/30/2025	50,000,000	10,530	32,670		43,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	T 0.125 12/15/2023	50,000,000	5,294	25,173		30,467
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	T 0.125 12/15/2023	50,000,000	5,294	23,638		28,932
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	36,855	18,408		55,263
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	T 0.875 01/31/2024	50,000,000	36,855	26,719		63,574
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	T 0.250 03/15/2024	50,000,000	10,530	54,230		64,760
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	50,000,000	52,649	51,594		104,243
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	52,937	53,063		106,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	25,000,000	52,937	4,125		57,062
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	T 2.750 02/15/2024	50,000,000	116,696	(11,481)		105,214
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	T 0.875 01/31/2024	50,000,000	36,855	65,501		102,355
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	T 0.375 07/15/2024	50,000,000	15,795	91,224		107,019
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	T 3.500 09/15/2025	50,000,000	147,418	29,766		177,185
U.S. Treasuries	912797HC4	B 0.000 10/24/2023	50,000,000		224,750		224,750
Subtotals			**$ 3,525,000,000**	**$ 2,646,680**	**$ 258,146**	**$ -**	**$ 2,904,825**
Federal Agencies	3133EM2E1	FFCB 0.160 08/10/2023		$ 2,000	$ 370		$ 2,370
Federal Agencies	3133EM6N7	FFCB 0.170 09/27/2023	50,000,000	7,083	2,123		9,207
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	5,000,000	1,042	51		1,093
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	5,000,000	1,042	51		1,093
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	100,000,000	20,833	1,019		21,853
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024	50,000,000	12,500	1,711		14,211
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024	50,000,000	12,500	1,713		14,213
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024	39,000,000	11,375	(312)		11,063
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024	29,424,000	8,582	(236)		8,346
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024	16,545,000	4,826	(132)		4,693
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	25,000,000	8,958	714		9,673
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	50,000,000	17,917	1,428		19,345
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024	50,000,000	17,917	1,428		19,345
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	FFCB 0.450 07/23/2024	50,000,000	18,750	(2,636)		16,114
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023	25,000,000	10,417	1,544		11,960
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023	75,000,000	31,250	4,631		35,881
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023	25,000,000	10,417	1,544		11,960
Federal Agencies	3133EMWT5	FFCB 0.600 04/21/2025	50,000,000	25,000	562		25,562
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023	62,000,000	35,133	1,253		36,387
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023	25,000,000	14,167	527		14,693
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023	25,000,000	14,167	510		14,676
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FFCB 0.690 04/06/2026	15,500,000	8,913	763		9,675
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024	50,000,000	36,458	1,626		38,085
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024	10,000,000	7,292	325		7,617

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024	10,000,000	7,292	325		7,617
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FFCB 0.900 01/18/2024	50,000,000	37,500	12,946		50,446
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FFCB 0.900 01/18/2024	11,856,000	8,892	5,296		14,188
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FFCB 0.920 12/09/2024	50,000,000	38,333	424		38,758
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FFCB 0.920 12/09/2024	50,000,000	38,333	1,047		39,380
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	55,000,000	48,125	1,634		49,759
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025	39,675,000	34,716	1,120		35,835
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025	20,000,000	18,750	1,279		20,029
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025	25,000,000	23,438	1,598		25,036
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025	25,000,000	23,438	1,598		25,036
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	45,000,000	43,875	974		44,849
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025	50,000,000	48,750	1,082		49,832
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025	24,000,000	24,200	614		24,814
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025	16,000,000	16,133	159		16,293
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	FFCB 1.430 02/14/2024	20,495,000	24,423	(9,891)		14,533
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	FFCB 1.625 12/03/2024	25,000,000	33,854	679		34,533
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	48,573,000	68,002	19,434		87,436
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	24,500,000	53,083	2,089		55,172
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	22,500,000	48,750	1,829		50,579
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	25,000,000	54,167	3,329		57,496
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FFCB 2.625 05/16/2024	45,000,000	98,438	2,576		101,014
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FFCB 2.625 05/16/2024	50,000,000	109,375	2,863		112,238
Federal Agencies	3133ENYH7	FFCB 2.625 06/10/2024	100,000,000	218,750	5,471		224,221
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	20,000,000	44,000	823		44,823
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026	30,000,000	66,000	1,235		67,235
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FFCB 2.850 05/23/2025	6,000,000	14,250	238		14,488
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FFCB 2.850 05/23/2025	20,000,000	47,500	792		48,292
Federal Agencies	3133ENYQ7	FFCB 2.950 06/13/2025	50,000,000	122,917	693		123,610
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024	25,000,000	64,583	530		65,113
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024	50,000,000	129,167	1,145		130,312
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024	25,000,000	64,583	573		65,156
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	27,865,000	75,236	(3,993)		71,242
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024	50,000,000	135,417	1,272		136,689
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024	25,000,000	67,708	1,251		68,959
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024	25,000,000	67,708	1,240		68,949
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026	35,000,000	96,833	1,026		97,859
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ84	FFCB 3.375 08/26/2024	50,000,000	140,625	3,541		144,166
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	30,000,000	90,625	2,909		93,534
Federal Agencies	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	25,000,000	75,521	2,201		77,722
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	30,000,000	100,000	645		100,645
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026	20,000,000	66,667	498		67,164
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	26,500,000	88,333	609		88,942
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	30,000,000	100,000	689		100,689
Federal Agencies	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	25,000,000	83,333	678		84,011
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	15,000,000	50,000	1,281		51,281
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	25,000,000	83,333	2,157		85,490
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025	20,000,000	66,667	1,708		68,375
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	21,000,000	72,188	245		72,433
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	5,000,000	17,188	65		17,253

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	4,650,000	15,984	61		16,045
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	25,000,000	85,938	326		86,263
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	28,940,000	99,481	596		100,077
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	10,000,000	34,375	491		34,866
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025	29,875,000	105,807	6,740		112,547
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025	10,000,000	35,417	2,239		37,656
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025	15,000,000	53,125	394		53,519
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025	15,000,000	53,125	346		53,471
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025	15,000,000	53,125	372		53,497
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	30,000,000	106,250	1,375		107,625
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	20,000,000	70,833	871		71,705
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	24,700,000	87,479	1,691		89,170
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	19,500,000	55,250	1,201		56,451
Federal Agencies	3133ENP79	FFCB 4.250 09/26/2024	50,000,000	177,083	170		177,253
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024	25,000,000	88,542	1,930		90,471
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024	10,000,000	35,417	725		36,142
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024	25,000,000	88,542	1,930		90,471
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	2,319		184,611
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	1,315		92,461
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	28,000,000	102,083	1,299		103,382
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	750		183,041
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375		91,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375		91,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	50,000,000	106,250	1,889		108,139
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	10,000,000	3,750	46		3,796
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	25,000,000	9,375	124		9,499
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	15,000,000	5,625	81		5,706
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	33,000,000	12,375	208		12,583
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	FFCB 4.500 10/28/2024	20,000,000	75,000	1,784		76,784
Federal Agencies	3133EPHD0	FFCB 4.500 10/28/2024	25,000,000	93,750	2,315		96,065
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ94	FFCB 4.500 11/18/2024	25,000,000	93,750	1,124		94,874
Federal Agencies	3133EPDL6	FFCB 4.850 10/01/2025	50,000,000	202,083			202,083
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025	20,000,000	81,250	47		81,297
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025	10,000,000	40,625	23		40,648
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025	20,000,000	81,250	16		81,266
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	10,000,000	40,625	244		40,869
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	25,000,000	101,563	567		102,129
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	20,000,000	81,250	453		81,703
Federal Agencies	313384ST7	FHDN 0.000 02/06/2024	10,650,000		44,020		44,020
Federal Agencies	313384KF5	FHDN 0.000 08/10/2023			90,375		90,375
Federal Agencies	313384KP3	FHDN 0.000 08/18/2023			35,488		35,488
Federal Agencies	313384KU2	FHDN 0.000 08/23/2023			31,778		31,778
Federal Agencies	313384LJ6	FHDN 0.000 09/06/2023	50,000,000		198,917		198,917
Federal Agencies	313384LR8	FHDN 0.000 09/13/2023	25,000,000		111,944		111,944
Federal Agencies	313384LY3	FHDN 0.000 09/20/2023	50,000,000		210,111		210,111
Federal Agencies	313384MD8	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023	25,000,000		105,594		105,594
Federal Agencies	313384MD8	FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023	25,000,000		105,594		105,594
Federal Agencies	313384MH9	FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023	25,000,000		105,486		105,486
Federal Agencies	313384MH9	FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023	25,000,000		105,486		105,486

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	FHDN 0.000 10/06/2023	30,000,000		126,583		126,583
Federal Agencies	313384MQ9	FHDN 0.000 10/06/2023	36,000,000		151,900		151,900
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	60,000,000		248,000		248,000
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	40,000,000		165,333		165,333
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	25,000,000		105,917		105,917
Federal Agencies	313384MV8	FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023	25,000,000		105,917		105,917
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023	35,000,000		147,681		147,681
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023	54,113,000		228,327		228,327
Federal Agencies	313384NE5	FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023	40,613,000		183,605		183,605
Federal Agencies	313384NK1	FHDN 0.000 10/25/2023	43,944,000		194,312		194,312
Federal Agencies	313384NX3	FHDN 0.000 11/06/2023	50,000,000		221,090		221,090
Federal Agencies	3130AJXD6	FHLB 0.125 09/08/2023	20,975,000	2,185	8,259		10,444
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	FHLB 0.700 06/30/2025	17,680,000	10,313	(1,169)		9,145
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875			21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292			22,292
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396			22,396
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792			29,792
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438			33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271			34,271
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025	10,295,000	15,014	(6,163)		8,850
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024	25,000,000	44,271	1,253		45,524
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024	11,000,000	19,479	551		20,031
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FHLB 2.250 12/08/2023	30,000,000	56,250	(38,452)		17,798
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FHLB 2.250 12/08/2023	10,000,000	18,750	(12,817)		5,933
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958			48,958
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	FHLB 2.500 02/13/2024	39,010,000	81,271	(61,729)		19,542
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	25,500,000	61,094	(2,131)		58,962
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	50,000,000	119,792	(8,321)		111,471
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	17,980,000	43,077	(2,610)		40,467
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024	15,955,000	38,226	(2,186)		36,040
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024	15,000,000	37,500	1,234		38,734
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024	17,500,000	43,750	1,440		45,190
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024	10,000,000	25,000	823		25,823
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	FHLB 3.125 06/14/2024	28,000,000	72,917	4,271		77,188
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	FHLB 3.125 06/14/2024	28,210,000	73,464	4,253		77,716
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	FHLB 3.375 06/13/2025	12,700,000	35,719	(3,146)		32,573
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	FHLB 3.375 06/13/2025	11,940,000	33,581	(1,787)		31,794
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	25,000,000	70,313	(5,452)		64,861
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	25,000,000	70,313	(5,319)		64,994
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023	40,000,000	112,500	(7,769)		104,731
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	12,375,000	36,094	(3,083)		33,011
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	10,000,000	29,167	(2,453)		26,713
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	21,725,000	63,365	(5,058)		58,307
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	17,045,000	53,266	1,470		54,735
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	20,000,000	62,500	1,680		64,180
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	15,000,000	50,000	2,819		52,819
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	10,000,000	33,333	1,840		35,173
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026	21,100,000	70,509	3,250		73,759
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	10,000,000	36,458	(2,627)		33,831
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	9,915,000	36,148	(2,461)		33,688
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	25,500,000	92,969	(5,046)		87,922
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	3,000,000	10,938	(497)		10,440
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	10,000,000	36,458	(1,461)		34,998
Federal Agencies	3130ATST5	FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025	24,000,000	87,500	(3,249)		84,251
Federal Agencies	3130AUVZ4	FHLB 4.500 02/13/2025	50,000,000	187,500	3,329		190,829
Federal Agencies	3130ATT31	FHLB 4.500 10/03/2024	50,000,000	187,500	6,160		193,660
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	25,000,000	96,354	887		97,241
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	15,000,000	57,813	532		58,345
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	52,000,000	200,417	1,845		202,262
Federal Agencies	3130AWER7	FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025	10,000,000	38,542	355		38,897
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	10,000,000	39,583	(861)		38,723
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	20,000,000	79,167	(52)		79,115
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	30,000,000	118,750	(117)		118,633
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	30,000,000	118,750	1,468		120,218
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024	25,000,000	98,958	1,224		100,182
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	50,000,000	197,917	4,180		202,096
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	FHLB 4.800 01/08/2024	11,000,000	44,000	86		44,086
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	FHLB 4.800 01/08/2024	25,000,000	100,000	979		100,979
Federal Agencies	3130ATVD6	FHLB 4.875 09/13/2024	50,000,000	203,125	(2,856)		200,269
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025	25,000,000	104,167	1,405		105,572
Federal Agencies	3130AV7L0	FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025	35,000,000	145,833	1,967		147,801
Federal Agencies	3130AUYG3	FHLB 5.100 02/16/2024	25,000,000	106,250	297		106,547
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	FHLB 5.125 06/13/2025	48,150,000	205,641	(4,138)		201,503

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AWLY4	FHLB 5.125 06/13/2025	10,800,000	46,125	(811)		45,314
Federal Agencies	3130AWFH8	FHLB 5.510 07/12/2024	50,000,000	229,583			229,583
Federal Agencies	3137EAEV7	FHLMC 0.250 08/24/2023		6,513	8,569		15,082
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025	22,600,000	7,063	5,676		12,738
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	15,000,000	18,750	196		18,946
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	5,000,000	6,250	65		6,315
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	5,000,000	6,250	65		6,315
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	5,000,000	6,250	65		6,315
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	50,000,000	62,500	654		63,154
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	53,532,000	66,915	(42,685)		24,230
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3134GYRY0	FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026	25,000,000	110,208			110,208
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027	50,000,000	247,500			247,500
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027	25,000,000	123,750			123,750
Federal Agencies	3134GYUV2	FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027	25,000,000	123,750			123,750
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027	25,000,000	62,500			62,500
Federal Agencies	3134GYYG1	FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027	25,000,000	62,500			62,500
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	72,500,000	22,656	12,045		34,701
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	25,000,000	7,813	5,987		13,799
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FNMA 0.500 06/17/2025	10,000,000	4,167	5,068		9,235
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FNMA 0.500 06/17/2025	4,655,000	1,940	2,369		4,309
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025	50,000,000	26,042	(2,426)		23,616
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025	37,938,000	19,759	14,359		34,119
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025	50,000,000	26,042	19,039		45,081
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	FNMA 1.625 01/07/2025	39,060,000	52,894	(35,924)		16,969
Federal Agencies	3135G0U43	FNMA 2.875 09/12/2023	29,648,000	71,032	(55,303)		15,729
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024	50,000,000	221,667			221,667
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024	25,000,000	110,833			110,833
Federal Agencies	3135GAFY2	FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024	25,000,000	110,833			110,833
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Federal Agencies	3135GAG39	FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024	25,000,000	111,979			111,979
Subtotals			**$ 7,088,706,000**	**$ 14,197,887**	**$ 2,965,225**	**$ -**	**$ 17,163,112**
Public Time Deposits	PPG62B630	BKSANF 5.460 12/04/2023	$ 10,000,000	$ 47,017			$ 47,017
Public Time Deposits	PPG24NBE1	BKSANF 5.540 01/08/2024	10,000,000	47,706			47,706
Public Time Deposits	PPG42YDZ6	BRIDGE 5.370 12/18/2023	10,000,000	45,608			45,608
Public Time Deposits	PPG250Y96	BRIDGE 5.490 01/16/2024	10,000,000	46,627			46,627
Subtotals			**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 186,958**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 186,958**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Negotiable CDs	06367CXR3	BMOCHG 4.230 08/28/2023		$ 158,625			$ 158,625
Negotiable CDs	78015JFJ1	RY 4.750 09/20/2023	50,000,000	204,514			204,514
Negotiable CDs	06367CXX0	BMOCHG 4.820 09/25/2023	50,000,000	207,528			207,528
Negotiable CDs	78015JH67	RY 4.760 09/25/2023	50,000,000	204,944			204,944
Negotiable CDs	78015JHJ9	RY 4.810 09/22/2023	50,000,000	207,097			207,097
Negotiable CDs	06367CY27	BMOCHG 4.800 09/22/2023	50,000,000	206,667			206,667
Negotiable CDs	06367CYA9	BMOCHG 4.970 10/06/2023	50,000,000	213,986			213,986
Negotiable CDs	89115BC73	TDNY 5.570 10/23/2023	50,000,000	239,819			239,819
Negotiable CDs	78015JMJ3	RY 5.460 10/23/2023	50,000,000	235,083			235,083
Negotiable CDs	89115BJX9	TDNY 5.510 11/20/2023	50,000,000	237,236			237,236
Negotiable CDs	06417MN84	BNSHOU 5.500 11/21/2023	50,000,000	236,806			236,806
Negotiable CDs	78015JPE1	RY 5.370 12/18/2023	50,000,000	231,208			231,208
Negotiable CDs	78015JRE9	RY 5.430 12/29/2023	100,000,000	467,583			467,583
Negotiable CDs	89115BPB0	TDNY 5.430 01/03/2024	50,000,000	233,792			233,792
Negotiable CDs	89115BPF1	TDNY 5.430 01/05/2024	50,000,000	233,792			233,792
Negotiable CDs	13606KRZ1	CIBCNY 5.320 11/06/2023	50,000,000	229,056			229,056
Negotiable CDs	06367D3V5	BMOCHG 5.240 01/12/2024	70,000,000	315,856			315,856
Negotiable CDs	89115BQB9	TDNY 5.240 01/17/2024	50,000,000	225,611			225,611
Negotiable CDs	89115BST8	TDNY 5.210 01/29/2024	100,000,000	448,639			448,639
Negotiable CDs	65602Y7E4	NORNY 5.050 08/16/2023		105,208			105,208
Negotiable CDs	06417MT47	BNSHOU 5.430 02/09/2024	50,000,000	233,792			233,792
Negotiable CDs	06367D4E2	BMOCHG 5.420 10/24/2023	100,000,000	466,722			466,722
Negotiable CDs	89115BWK2	TDNY 5.580 02/22/2024	50,000,000	240,250			240,250
Negotiable CDs	89115BXF2	TDNY 5.600 03/06/2024	50,000,000	241,111			241,111
Negotiable CDs	89115BY79	TDNY 5.750 01/29/2024	50,000,000	247,569			247,569
Negotiable CDs	06367DAU9	BMOCHG 5.870 06/21/2024	100,000,000	505,472			505,472
Negotiable CDs	89115BNG1	TDNY 5.850 06/05/2024	50,000,000	251,875			251,875
Negotiable CDs	78015JXW2	RY 5.890 06/28/2024	50,000,000	253,597			253,597
Negotiable CDs	06367DAX3	BMOCHG 6.000 07/01/2024	100,000,000	516,667			516,667
Negotiable CDs	89115BRG7	TDNY 6.050 07/01/2024	50,000,000	260,486			260,486
Negotiable CDs	89115BS84	TDNY 5.910 07/01/2024	50,000,000	254,458			254,458
Negotiable CDs	06367DBJ3	BMOCHG 5.890 06/07/2024	50,000,000	253,597			253,597
Negotiable CDs	06367DBR5	BMOCHG 5.930 07/01/2024	50,000,000	255,319			255,319
Negotiable CDs	89115BSQ4	TDNY 5.930 07/01/2024	50,000,000	255,319			255,319
Negotiable CDs	06367DBW4	BMOCHG 5.970 07/29/2024	50,000,000	257,042			257,042
Negotiable CDs	13606KZN9	CIBCNY 5.920 07/29/2024	60,000,000	296,000			296,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BV80	TDNY 5.900 07/03/2024	50,000,000	245,833			245,833
Negotiable CDs	13606KZR0	CIBCNY 5.890 07/01/2024	50,000,000	204,514			204,514
Negotiable CDs	06367DCF0	BMOCHI 6.010 08/14/2024	50,000,000	33,389			33,389
Subtotals			**$ 2,130,000,000**	**$ 10,116,064**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 10,116,064**

Monthly Investment Earnings
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Accured Interest Earned	(Amortization) / Accretion	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Total Earnings
Commercial Paper	03785EW59	APPINC 0.000 09/05/2023	$ 11,000,000		$ 16,072		$ 16,072
Commercial Paper	62479MV26	MUFGBK 0.000 08/02/2023			6,903		6,903
Commercial Paper	62479MV75	MUFGBK 0.000 08/07/2023			41,417		41,417
Commercial Paper	62479MVE0	MUFGBK 0.000 08/14/2023			88,833		88,833
Commercial Paper	62479MVU4	MUFGBK 0.000 08/28/2023			186,750		186,750
Commercial Paper	89233GE36	TOYCC 0.000 05/03/2024	60,000,000		224,000		224,000
Commercial Paper	89233GE69	TOYCC 0.000 05/06/2024	50,000,000		132,222		132,222
Commercial Paper	89233HVB7	TOYCC 0.000 08/11/2023			69,444		69,444
Commercial Paper	89233HVW1	TOYCC 0.000 08/30/2023			201,792		201,792
Commercial Paper	89233HY65	TOYCC 0.000 11/06/2023	50,000,000		235,944		235,944
Commercial Paper	89233HY81	TOYCC 0.000 11/08/2023	50,000,000		229,583		229,583
Subtotals			**$ 221,000,000**	**$ -**	**$ 1,432,961**	**$ -**	**$ 1,432,961**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	$ 20,639,985	$ 91,472			$ 91,472
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	538,038,800	3,003,107			3,003,107
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	11,969,130	52,876			52,876
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	14,960,809	65,798			65,798
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	546,167,400	1,465,823			1,465,823
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	556,939,908	2,772,871			2,772,871
Subtotals			**$ 1,688,716,031**	**$ 7,451,946**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 7,451,946**
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	IADB 2.125 01/15/2025	$ 100,000,000	$ 177,083	$ (129,379)		$ 47,704
Supranationals	459058JB0	IBRD 0.626 04/22/2025	40,000,000	20,867	(1,947)		18,919
Supranationals	45818WDG8	IADB 0.820 02/27/2026	19,500,000	13,325	(1,071)		12,254
Supranationals	45950VQG4	IFC 0.440 09/23/2024	10,000,000	3,667	2,362		6,029
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	IADB 0.625 07/15/2025	28,900,000	15,052	8,734		23,786
Supranationals	459056HV2	IBRD 1.500 08/28/2024	50,000,000	62,500	(29,623)		32,877
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	IADB 0.500 09/23/2024	50,000,000	20,833	11,897		32,730
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	IADB 3.000 10/04/2023	25,756,000	64,390	(50,964)		13,426
Supranationals	45906M3B5	IBRD 1.980 06/14/2024	100,000,000	165,000			165,000
Supranationals	4581X0EE4	IADB 3.250 07/01/2024	80,000,000	216,667	339		217,006
Supranationals	45950VRU2	IFC 4.023 01/26/2026	100,000,000	335,250			335,250
Supranationals	45906M4C2	IBRD 5.750 06/15/2026	32,000,000	153,333			153,333
Subtotals			**$ 636,156,000**	**$ 1,247,967**	**$ (189,653)**	**$ -**	**$ 1,058,314**
Grand Totals			**$15,329,578,031**	**$ 35,847,501**	**$ 4,466,678**	**$ -**	**$ 40,314,180**

Investment Transactions
Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
57710	Buy	06367DBW4	BMOCHG 5.970 07/29/2024	$ 100.00	8/1/23	8/1/23	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,000,000	$ -	$ 50,000,000
57711	Buy	89233HY81	TOYCC 0.000 11/08/2023	98.50	8/2/23	8/2/23	50,000,000	49,250,028	-	49,250,028
57713	Buy	13606KZN9	CIBCNY 5.920 07/29/2024	100.00	8/2/23	8/2/23	60,000,000	60,000,000	-	60,000,000
57714	Buy	89115BV80	TDNY 5.900 07/03/2024	100.00	8/2/23	8/2/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57712	Buy	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	99.55	8/7/23	8/7/23	19,500,000	19,412,250	-	19,412,250
57715	Buy	13606KZR0	CIBCNY 5.890 07/01/2024	100.00	8/7/23	8/7/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57716	Buy	89233GE36	TOYCC 0.000 05/03/2024	95.82	8/8/23	8/8/23	60,000,000	57,489,333	-	57,489,333
57717	Buy	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	99.77	8/14/23	8/14/23	50,000,000	49,885,000	-	49,885,000
57718	Buy	89233GE69	TOYCC 0.000 05/06/2024	95.88	8/15/23	8/15/23	50,000,000	47,938,889	-	47,938,889
57719	Buy	3134GYYG1	FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027	100.00	8/16/23	8/16/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
57720	Buy	3134GYYG1	FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027	100.00	8/16/23	8/16/23	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
57721	Buy	03785EW59	APPINC 0.000 09/05/2023	99.80	8/22/23	8/22/23	11,000,000	10,977,499	-	10,977,499
57729	Buy	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	99.79	8/28/23	8/28/23	10,000,000	9,979,100	-	9,979,100
57730	Buy	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	99.77	8/28/23	8/28/23	25,000,000	24,943,500	-	24,943,500
57731	Buy	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	99.75	8/28/23	8/28/23	15,000,000	14,962,800	-	14,962,800
57732	Buy	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	99.71	8/28/23	8/28/23	33,000,000	32,904,960	-	32,904,960
57733	Buy	06367DCF0	BMOCHI 6.010 08/14/2024	100.00	8/28/23	8/28/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
Activity Total				**$ 99.09**			**$ 633,500,000**		**$ -**	**$ 627,743,359**
57579	Maturity	62479MV26	MUFGBK 0.000 08/02/2023	$ 100.00	8/2/23	8/2/23	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,000,000	$ -	$ 50,000,000
57580	Maturity	62479MV75	MUFGBK 0.000 08/07/2023	100.00	8/7/23	8/7/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57617	Maturity	313384KF5	FHDN 0.000 08/10/2023	100.00	8/10/23	8/10/23	75,000,000	75,000,000	-	75,000,000
47108	Maturity	3133EM2E1	FFCB 0.160 08/10/2023	100.00	8/10/23	8/10/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57588	Maturity	89233HVB7	TOYCC 0.000 08/11/2023	100.00	8/11/23	8/11/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57577	Maturity	62479MVE0	MUFGBK 0.000 08/14/2023	100.00	8/14/23	8/14/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57584	Maturity	65602Y7E4	NORNY 5.050 08/16/2023	100.00	8/16/23	8/16/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57667	Maturity	313384KP3	FHDN 0.000 08/18/2023	100.00	8/18/23	8/18/23	15,000,000	15,000,000	-	15,000,000
57669	Maturity	313384KU2	FHDN 0.000 08/23/2023	100.00	8/23/23	8/23/23	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	10,000,000
47227	Maturity	3137EAEV7	FHLMC 0.250 08/24/2023	100.00	8/24/23	8/24/23	40,776,000	40,776,000	-	40,776,000
47459	Maturity	06367CXR3	BMOCHG 4.230 08/28/2023	100.00	8/28/23	8/28/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57574	Maturity	62479MVU4	MUFGBK 0.000 08/28/2023	100.00	8/28/23	8/28/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57586	Maturity	89233HVW1	TOYCC 0.000 08/30/2023	100.00	8/30/23	8/30/23	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
Activity Total				**$ 100.00**			**$ 590,776,000**		**$ -**	**$ 590,776,000**

Interest Received
Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
57583	Interest Income	3130AUTC8	FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026	8/7/2023	$ 420,705	$ 4,701	$ 416,004
57581	Interest Income	3133EPAG0	FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025	8/10/2023	634,844		634,844
57582	Interest Income	3133EPAG0	FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025	8/10/2023	212,500		212,500
47108	Interest Income	3133EM2E1	FFCB 0.160 08/10/2023	8/10/2023	40,000		40,000
46426	Interest Income	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	8/14/2023	375,000		375,000
46451	Interest Income	3133ELNE0	FFCB 1.430 02/14/2024	8/14/2023	146,539		146,539
57585	Interest Income	3130AUVZ4	FHLB 4.500 02/13/2025	8/14/2023	1,125,000		1,125,000
47022	Interest Income	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	8/14/2023	401,490		401,490
47201	Interest Income	3130AFW94	FHLB 2.500 02/13/2024	8/14/2023	487,625		487,625
46422	Interest Income	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	8/14/2023	112,500		112,500
46423	Interest Income	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	8/14/2023	37,500		37,500
46424	Interest Income	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	8/14/2023	37,500		37,500
46425	Interest Income	3137EAEP0	FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025	8/14/2023	37,500		37,500
47145	Interest Income	91282CCT6	T 0.375 08/15/2024	8/15/2023	93,750		93,750
47347	Interest Income	912828B66	T 2.750 02/15/2024	8/15/2023	687,500		687,500
57584	Interest Income	65602Y7E4	NORNY 5.050 08/16/2023	8/16/2023	1,325,625		1,325,625
57593	Interest Income	3130AUYG3	FHLB 5.100 02/16/2024	8/16/2023	637,500		637,500
57660	Interest Income	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	8/17/2023	271,875		271,875
57661	Interest Income	3133EPJX4	FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026	8/17/2023	226,563		226,563
57662	Interest Income	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	8/18/2023	265,000		265,000
57663	Interest Income	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	8/18/2023	300,000		300,000
57664	Interest Income	3133EPKA2	FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025	8/18/2023	250,000		250,000
57589	Interest Income	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	8/21/2023	243,750		243,750
57590	Interest Income	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	8/21/2023	609,375		609,375
57591	Interest Income	3133EPBF1	FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024	8/21/2023	487,500		487,500
57594	Interest Income	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	8/23/2023	1,093,750		1,093,750
57595	Interest Income	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	8/23/2023	546,875		546,875
57596	Interest Income	3133EPBJ3	FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026	8/23/2023	612,500		612,500
57597	Interest Income	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	8/23/2023	206,250		206,250
47227	Interest Income	3137EAEV7	FHLMC 0.250 08/24/2023	8/24/2023	50,970		50,970
46937	Interest Income	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	8/25/2023	135,938		135,938
46955	Interest Income	3135G05X7	FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025	8/25/2023	46,875		46,875
47433	Interest Income	3133ENJ35	FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026	8/25/2023	581,000		581,000
57602	Interest Income	3130AV7L0	FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025	8/28/2023	607,639		607,639
57603	Interest Income	3130AV7L0	FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025	8/28/2023	850,694		850,694
46934	Interest Income	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	8/28/2023	6,250		6,250
46935	Interest Income	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	8/28/2023	6,250		6,250
46936	Interest Income	3133EMRZ7	FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024	8/28/2023	125,000		125,000
47194	Interest Income	459056HV2	IBRD 1.500 08/28/2024	8/28/2023	375,000		375,000
47326	Interest Income	3130ARHG9	FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024	8/28/2023	265,625		265,625
47327	Interest Income	3130ARHG9	FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024	8/28/2023	116,875		116,875
47441	Interest Income	3133ENJ84	FFCB 3.375 08/26/2024	8/28/2023	843,750		843,750
47459	Interest Income	06367CXR3	BMOCHG 4.230 08/28/2023	8/28/2023	2,120,875		2,120,875
47144	Interest Income	45818WDG8	IADB 0.820 02/27/2026	8/29/2023	79,950		79,950
46977	Interest Income	912828ZC7	T 1.125 02/28/2025	8/31/2023	281,250		281,250
46994	Interest Income	912828ZC7	T 1.125 02/28/2025	8/31/2023	281,250		281,250
47166	Interest Income	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	8/31/2023	187,500		187,500

Interest Received
Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
	Activity Total				**$ 18,889,206**	**$**	**18,884,505**

Money Market Fund Activity
Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

Ticker	Description	Activity Date	Transaction Type		Transaction Amount
TSTXX	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	8/1/23	Interest Received	$	114,932
Activity Total				**$**	**114,932**
FRGXX	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	8/28/23	Withdrawal	$	(95,000,000)
FRGXX	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	8/30/23	Withdrawal		(60,000,000)
FRGXX	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	8/31/23	Interest Received		3,003,107
Activity Total				**$**	**(151,996,893)**
GOFXX	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	8/31/23	Interest Received	$	52,876
Activity Total				**$**	**52,876**
DGCXX	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	8/31/23	Interest Received	$	65,798
Activity Total				**$**	**65,798**
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/1/23	Withdrawal	$	(80,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/3/23	Withdrawal		(11,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/4/23	Withdrawal		(27,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/7/23	Withdrawal		(22,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/8/23	Withdrawal		(62,000,000)
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/9/23	Deposit		10,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/10/23	Deposit		125,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/11/23	Deposit		38,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/15/23	Deposit		15,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/21/23	Deposit		19,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/22/23	Deposit		55,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/23/23	Deposit		17,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/24/23	Deposit		35,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/25/23	Deposit		44,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/29/23	Deposit		40,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/31/23	Deposit		22,000,000
OPGXX	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	8/31/23	Interest Received		1,465,823
Activity Total				**$**	**219,465,823**
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	8/2/23	Withdrawal	$	(140,000,000)
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	8/14/23	Withdrawal		(74,000,000)
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	8/16/23	Withdrawal		(52,000,000)
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	8/17/23	Withdrawal		(17,000,000)
IMPXX	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	8/31/23	Interest Received		2,772,871
Activity Total				**$**	**(280,227,129)**

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	6 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:38:00 PM
Attachments:	6 Approved Requested to Waive 12B Requirements.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 6 approved requests to waive 12B requirements.

Sincerely,

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

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0002944 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:49:04 AM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002944 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Joanna Li
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000039424
Requested total cost: $1,200,000.00
Short Description: SFDPH Pharmacy Adjudication Vendor to Bill for Medications Dispensing for Patients in Long Term Care and Ambulatory Settings

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4512670_sEl5k0aZ5qEeYTIls8yk

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0002956 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:25:38 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002956 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Nathaniel Wong
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000012358
Requested total cost: $87,031,676.00
Short Description: UCSF: Citywide ZSFGH Psychiatry Department services

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4510731_PmFGQEQVXXWoTqdEFXw5

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0002930 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (HRD) Department Head (Carol Isen)
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:50:44 AM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002930 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (HRD) Department Head (Carol Isen).

Summary of Request

Requester: Samaki Banks
Department: HRD
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000018762
Requested total cost: $11,775.15
Short Description: Q-80 Exam Rater Lodging

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4505510_TxDhKGVJyPJrfgRZILwO

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0002942 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 1:40:41 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002942 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Sean Feeney
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000012559
Requested total cost: $9,800.00
Short Description: Radiation monitoring rings and badges

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4503455_lmPk8iTa5o6SqeRLiW2y

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0002935 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert)
Date:	Thursday, September 14, 2023 4:25:05 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002935 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert).

Summary of Request

Requester: Feng Ling Jiang
Department: LIB
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000019169
Requested total cost: $5,500.00
Short Description: various music supplies

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4496744_PAxEjcffqhoCuVmOIPPQ

From:	CCSF IT Service Desk
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	CMD12B0002934 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert)
Date:	Thursday, September 14, 2023 4:25:05 PM
Attachments:	ccsfLogoPic.png

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002934 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert).

Summary of Request

Requester: Feng Ling Jiang
Department: LIB
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000050671
Requested total cost: $5,000.00
Short Description: Art supplies for SFPL youth programs

Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4496742_u17ZoALjWmIqtvPGqSKw

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 12:30:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png Annual Report to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment - Admin code 16.82 2023 final.pdf

From: Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRD) <mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:48 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Isen, Carol (HRD) <carol.isen@sfgov.org>; Robinson, Julian (HRD) <julian.e.robinson@sfgov.org>; Buick, Jeanne (HRD) <jeanne.buick@sfgov.org>
Subject: Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment

Dear Madam Clerk –

Pursuant to Admin code 16.82 2023, I am submitting the Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment to the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the Human Resources Director, Carol Isen.

Please see the attached and do not hesitate to let us know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Mawuli Tugbenyoh 杜 本 樂
[He, Him, His]
Deputy Director, Policy and External Affairs
Department of Human Resources
One South Van Ness Ave., 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: (415) 551-8942
Website: www.sfdhr.org

City and County of San Francisco
Carol Isen
Human Resources Director

Department of Human Resources
Connecting People with Purpose
www.sfdhr.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 29, 2023

TO: Aaron Peskin, President San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Connie Chan
Supervisor Catherine Stefani
Supervisor Joel Engardio
Supervisor Dean Preston
Supervisor Matt Dorsey
Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor Hillary Ronen
Supervisor Shamann Walton
Supervisor Ahsha Safaí

FROM: Carol Isen, Human Resources Director

SUBJECT: Annual Report to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment

---

Section 16.82 of the San Francisco Administrative Code provides authority to the Human Resources Director to administer the City's workers' compensation program and to arrange for hospitalization and medical services necessary and appropriate for those employees who have been injured on the job. This section requires the Human Resources Director to submit an annual report to the Board of Supervisors no later than September 30 of each year to include the costs of hospitals and other medical providers.

Program Overview

The Department of Human Resources (DHR) Workers' Compensation Division administers a Medical Provider Network (CCSF MPN) approved by the State Division of Workers' Compensation. The network includes participating hospitals, clinics, and physicians to provide medical treatment to employees who become injured or ill in the course of employment. Medical provider networks are an employer's primary tool for ensuring that medical treatment is consistent with best occupational health practices and that employees are returned to work as quickly as possible after an injury. The DHR Workers' Compensation Division administers the CCSF MPN according to state

requirements. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency joined the CCSF MPN in 2013, and the San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD) joined the CCSF MPN in 2018.

Hospital and medical service fees are regulated by the State of California's Division of Workers' Compensation. DHR contracts with a bill review company to ensure that billed charges are consistent with the State's Official Medical Fee Schedule by comparing the billable service codes to the maximum allowable fee for those codes. Charges that exceed the fee schedule are repriced accordingly.

Medical treatment is also regulated by, and must conform to, state medical treatment guidelines. Treatment requests are subject to a mandatory review process to ensure that the treatment meets with applicable guidelines, primarily those adopted from the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM). The City contracts with a utilization review company to perform this service. Only a physician can legally deny care as "medically unnecessary".

Pharmacy Benefit Program

The City has maintained a Pharmacy Benefit Program since February 2018. Eligible employees receive a pharmacy benefit card that allows for a faster delivery of necessary medications while the City benefits from network discounts and improved oversight of medications as required under the state's formulary.

The following chart contains a breakdown of pharmacy benefit cards issued per Fiscal Year since inception of the Pharmacy Benefit Program. Since launching a pharmacy benefit program with Optum, DHR has enrolled 14,194 CCSF claims, and a further 3,050 SFMTA claims, for a total of 17,244 citywide claims participating in the program and an average penetration rate of 63% of all claims with pharmacy payments. Since launching a pharmacy benefit program with Optum, 71% of total pharmacy spending has been processed under the program, accounting for $11.48 million of $16.25 million total spending on prescription drugs between 1/1/2018 and 6/30/23. Penetration declined in 2020 - 2022 due to high incidence of COVID-19 claims which increased volume of claims, however, mostly did not require prescription drug benefits.

Pharmacy Benefit Cards issued by Year

Year	CCSF	SFMTA	Grand Total	Penetration Rate
2018	5325	930	6255	85%
2019	1802	755	2557	64%
2020	1444	354	1798	47%
2021	1958	318	2276	50%
2022	2473	436	2909	64%
2023	1192	257	1449	51%
Grand Total	14194	3050	17244	63%

**source - Optum*

2023 Hospitalization and Total Medical Costs

The following chart contains the costs for hospitalization and total medical expenditures (which include hospitalization) for the last five fiscal years. Total medical costs were relatively flat, increasing by 1.2% in FY2022-23 compared to the prior year. However, overall, medical treatment overall increased by 16% over the past 5 years due to inflation and increased costs due to several catastrophic claims over the past few years. It is noted that during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in FY2019-20 through FY2021-22, hospitalization slowed due to delays or postponement in non-emergency care. However, such treatment did resume in 2022. The hospitalization numbers below include both in-patient and out-patient hospitalization costs.

Hospitalization Expense and Total Medical Cost by Year

		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Payment Reserve Transaction Desc	**Medical Payments**	Payment Amount	Payment Amount	Payment Amount	Payment Amount	Payment Amount
Medical	Hospital (Inpatient/Outpatient)	13,765,966.08	10,804,863.60	10,556,995.70	11,229,004.78	12,296,950.98
	Other Med. Payments	24,330,893.34	24,974,959.31	26,217,005.68	32,476,602.48	31,934,934.85
Totals	**Totals**	**38,096,859.42**	**35,779,822.91**	**36,774,001.38**	**43,705,607.26**	**44,231,885.83**

** Source Claims Enterprise*

2023 Cost Savings Performance

The Workers' Compensation Division entered into a new contract for bill review and utilization review services with Allied Managed Care (AMC) as of February 28, 2022. Bills are first repriced to the state fee schedule and then further reduced via discount available through detailed review and through Preferred Provider Organization agreements available through AMC. Further savings are achieved through the identification (audited savings) of duplicate billings and bills for unauthorized care. The following table reflects a 70% savings from billed charges produced through the first year of this partnership through June 30, 2023.

Bill Review Statistics FY22-23

Bills Reviewed	Total Billed	Fee Schedule Reductions	PPO and Audited Reductions	Total Savings	% of Savings	Total Paid
112,093	$143,477,330.25	$98,499,512.64	$2,447,813.13	$100,947,325.77	70.36%	42,500,004.48

Benchmarked Performance – Annual Medical Costs per Claim in Calendar Year 2022

The City & County of San Francisco submits de-identified workers' compensation claims data to the California Workers' Compensation Institute (CWCI) which allows DHR to benchmark its performance to other workers' compensation claims administrators in California. Benchmarking occurs after claims have matured over a 12-month period. The most recent data available is for 2021 claims valued as of December 31, 2022.

Historically, the City's medical costs per claim were below industry average, but since 2018, the City's medical costs per claim have mostly been above the industry average:

- Average medical costs as of December 31, 2022, for claims filed in 2021 for the City was $1912 compared to the industry average of $1760, which represents an 8.6% increase over the industry average.
- The spread becomes more pronounced for prior injury years as medical costs accumulate by injury year, with City costs 18.5% higher than the industry average for the 2019 injury year.

Causes for increases in City medical costs compared to industry benchmarks are multi-faceted and are impacted by multiple factors.

- Beginning in 2020, additional injury presumptions for posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and COVID-19 were passed by the legislature, making it presumed that such injuries are deemed work related. Both injuries are primarily sustained by public personnel such as sworn officers and firefighters, which are usually employed by public agencies like the City.

- The City experienced a series of very severe and catastrophic level injuries over the past few years, as well as an increase in cancer claims requiring substantial treatment, which is often not covered by fee schedule. Such treatment has impacted the City's average medical spend compared with the rest of the industry.

Program Improvements in 2022-2023

- The Workers' Compensation Division expanded the "Fast Track" program which has been working since 2015, to add additional participating occupational health clinics in the CCSF Medical Provider Network to preauthorize common medical treatments for the first 180 days of a claim. The program was successful in speeding common treatments to workers and was expanded to add three new clinics recently added to the CCSF MPN as well as add cardiac testing to the list of treatment items approved under Fast Track. This was to further expedite and provide faster access to care for injured City employees.

- A CCSF Medical Provider Network Committee representing DHR, SFMTA, City Attorney, and the contracted workers' compensation third party administrator (Intercare) continues to meet quarterly to review needed changes to the CCSF MPN, including terminating providers for under-performing physicians and the identification and addition of necessary specialists. The committee has terminated several providers from our MPN due to underperformance in terms of return-to work, failure to meet medical treatment guidelines, and consistent billing issues. The committee has also added several providers to our MPN, including a roster of over 30 psyche providers through a nationwide provider Ascellus, in order to provide access to care to injured and ill City employees. The committee further added four additional designated occupational health clinics – three in or near San Francisco and one in Roseville, CA to further expand immediate access to care for injured city employees.

- Expanded the Nurse Triage Hotline, launched in October 2017, to also include injury reporting and nurse advice for incidents and injuries citywide. The Nurse Triage Hotline is a hotline available for injured City employees to report injuries or illnesses, or incidents that do not rise to the level of an injury claim; as well as get real-time medical advice of immediate treatment needed when injured on the job. The

Hotline is available 24 hours/day, 7 days per week, and also specifically tracks COVID-19 claims as well as workplace assaults on City employees when reported through the Hotline.

- Developed and implemented an Alternate Dispute Resolution Program (ADR) between the City and the San Francisco Police and Fire Labor Organizations. The ADR program is an alternative to resolving workers compensation disputes as authorized by Labor Code Section 3201.7, as opposed to resolving disputes through the traditional state-mandated system. The program was launched in July 2019 and is effective for all claims filed on or after July 1, 2019, and is now in its fourth year. As part of this program, injured employees subject to this program may select treating providers as approved under the jurisdiction of the program; expanding access to care outside the parameters of the MPN and more dedicated to First Responders. Also, as part of the ADR program, medical treatment disputes are resolved using Independent evaluators, rather than the Independent Medical Review (IMR) process as it exists in the state system. The goal is to resolve disputes at a faster rate to bring injured members to work, generating cost savings.

Goals for 2023-24

1. Reassess the medical treatment authorization protocols for claims adjusters based on an analysis of the utilization review data over the last year.

2. Further expand and market the Nurse Triage Hotline for better Citywide utilization, supporting faster injury reporting and further support of immediate medical services that may be challenging to perform internally.

3. Further expand access to care in the CCSF MPN by accessing gaps in hard to access specialties.

4. Partner with Allied Managed Care to further control medical spend costs in order to better align the City with industry average medical costs going forward.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	6 Letters regarding File No. 230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 1:17:00 PM
Attachments:	6 Letters regarding File No. 230446.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 6 letters regarding File No. 230446, which is Item No. 5 on today's Land Use & Transportation Committee agenda.

File No. 230446 - Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production (Mayor, Engardio, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

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

From: Karin Payson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Board File 230446
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 6:57:36 AM
Attachments: 23_0918 Housing for All to BOS.pdf

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

Attached please find my letter in support of this proposed legislation, to be heard at today's Land Use Committee hearing.
Thank you.
Regards,

Karin Payson, AIA LEED AP
www.kpad.com

1714 Stockton Street
San Francisco, CA. 94133
(o) 415-277-9500
(m) 415-260-0675

Karin Payson | architecture + design
1714 Stockton Street Suite 100 | San Francisco, CA 94133
415-277-9500 | fax: 415-277-9505 | www.kpad.com

September 18, 2023

To the Land Use Committee AND
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
RE: BOARD FILE 230446

I am writing to strongly urge the Land-Use Committee to approve this "housing for All" legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisors Engardio and Dorsey, which will advance housing production in the city through streamlining approvals processes and implementing some land-use changes in the Planning Code.

Under the 2022 Housing Element Update, San Francisco's first housing plan that is centered on racial and social equity, San Francisco has a state-mandated goal of constructing 82,000 housing units within the next eight years. Meeting this goal will provide a broader array of housing options for all the people that reside in San Francisco, strengthening our communities and improving diversity and affordability overall.

This **'Housing for All'** ordinance is rooted in several policies from the Housing Element that direct the City to remove obstacles hindering housing construction, particularly when such requirements are based on subjective criteria. Critically, the ordinance proposes process improvements, modification of development standards and expansion of incentives for development and construction of housing throughout the city. Implementation of these changes will provide diverse options for housing for all residents of San Francisco, expanding affordability and opportunity for all.

The State of California is putting intense scrutiny on San Francisco, and HCD and the Attorney General are prepared to make an example out of us to set the tone for the rest of the state. If we do not meet the expectations for constraints removal per the Housing Element to the satisfaction of the State, they are seriously threatening to withhold this funding. This would be *disastrous* to our city and to the most vulnerable members of our community.

OPPOSING THIS LEGISLATION IS EQUIVALENT TO OPPOSING MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND TRANSIT FUNDING FROM THE STATE FOR SAN FRANCISCO.

The 'Housing for All' Ordinance will expand housing options for all San Francisco residents, by expanding the availability of housing units of all types. The law of supply and demand is real, and the evidence is clear that the inadequate supply of housing in San Francisco is a major factor in its high cost. Housing in San Francisco, the State and all over the US is built on the private market, with few if any public subsidies. Streamlining the process and allowing housing developers to increase density will reduce the per-unit costs of construction—a cost that is directly passed in full to the renter or homeowner.

Higher density in our neighborhoods will promote stronger communities by having more eyes on the street. Having more residents in our neighborhood commercial districts will do more to stimulate opportunities for local residents to successfully open and operate small retail businesses than any mandated ground-floor retail space could ever do.

[KP] a + d
Karin Payson | architecture + design
1714 Stockton Street Suite 100 | San Francisco, CA 94133
415-277-9500 | fax: 415-277-9505 | www.kpad.com

Expansion of the inventory of housing options in San Francisco will result in greater neighborhood diversity, provide greater opportunities for vulnerable populations to remain housed, and will promote a healthy city culture where all can thrive.

I urge the Land Use Committee, and the Board of Supervisors, to approve the “Housing for All” ordinance without hesitation.

Respectfully submitted,

Karin Payson, AIA LEED AP
Principal Architect, Karin Payson architecture + design

From: James Hill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for the Housing for All Ordinance
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 11:27:12 AM

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

I strongly agree with the AIA's support of the Housing for All Ordinance representing a dedicated effort to move San Francisco forward in providing state-mandated and needed housing.

Please help us with your support.

James Hill
AIA
james hill architect
836 Haight Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
phone: 415 864 4408

From:	Irving Gonzales
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Constraints Reduction (AKA Housing Production) - Letter of Support
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 11:55:59 AM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png
Importance:	High

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

Re:
Constraints Reduction (AKA Housing Production) Case Number: 2023-003676PCAMAP Board File No. 230446 By Mayor Breed

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 35-year architect currently in practice here in North Beach and an activist in the support of affordable housing and supporting those who may not have a voice in our communities, I am writing to express my strong support for Ordinance 230446 and to encourage you to vote in favor of its passage.

This legislation presents a critical opportunity to remove numerous barriers that have been hindering the construction of new housing in our city where I practice and where I was born and continue to my firm's efforts in making sure that housing is accessible to all. I have also worked with SF DBI and Planning in a workgroup under the Small Firms Committee of AIASF to provide objective recommendations to improve the process by which permits are reviewed and approved to further accelerate housing project approvals in a timely manner. Under this new legislation, projects that were previously held up for 2-5 years, or more, could be streamlined and completed through over the counter review or a specific review track in a matter of months. This is an imperative change if San Francisco is to meet its goal of 82,000 new units in the next 8 years. San Francisco is facing a severe housing crisis, with an acute shortage of affordable and available homes. This crisis has not helped in the reduction and housing of the unhoused, in some cases created displacement, and a has contributed to the diminishing sense of community.

It is essential that we take equally swift and decisive action to address this issue, and Ordinance 230446 finally can begin to move the needle in a meaningful and impactful manner. By streamlining the permitting process and removing unnecessary bureaucracy that we design professionals have endeavored in other forms noted, this ordinance would pave the way for more efficient and timely development of new housing units. I implore you all to carefully consider the positive impacts and potential benefits of Ordinance 230446 and provide your support to its passage. Your vote will not only be a catalyst for positive change but also a testament to your dedication to serving the best interests of our community.

Irving

A community-based architecture firm designing affordable housing that is accessible! Celebrating 35 years in practice and serving our local communities.

G7A
architecture | urban

67A Water Street, San Francisco, California 94133
V: 415.776.8065 Ext 1# | M: 415.254.4717

Irving A. Gonzales–Principal AIA | NOMA
G7A | Gonzales Architects
email: irving@G7Arch.com
web: G7Arch.com

2023 | Board of Directors Chair | Mission Housing Development Corp.
2015 | AIA San Francisco Chapter President

CONFIDENTIALITY: This message may contain privileged and/or confidential information. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipients. Any review, use, disclosure or distribution by other persons or entities is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you!

From:	Eric Brooks
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject:	17 Environmental & Community Orgs Join To Strongly *OPPOSE* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 12:36:03 PM
Attachments:	SF_CEQA_Defenders_Sign-On_September-18-2023.pdf

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

17 Environmental, Environmental Justice & Community Organizations Join To Strongly *OPPOSE* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Constraints Reduction' 'Housing' Ordinance

(Also see attached in PDF format)

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee



SPEAK Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

September 18, 2023

To: City and County of San Francisco Decision Makers - 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **OPPOSE** Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" ("Housing Production") **File #230446**

Dear San Francisco Decision Makers: The undersigned environmental, housing, economic justice, community, and climate crisis response organizations write to voice our strong opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" ordinance. It would enact drastic and sweeping exceptions to San Francisco's environmental and community review of real estate projects and would undermine health, environmental, economic and neighborhood protections. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Sincerely:

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee
California Alliance of Local Electeds Californians for Energy Choice Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Concerned Residents of the Sunset East Mission Improvement Association Extinction Rebellion SF Bay Area Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association Our City SF Our Neighborhood Voices San Franciscans for Urban Nature San Francisco Green Party San Francisco Tomorrow Save Our Neighborhoods SF Sunflower Alliance Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee

SPEAK SUNSET PARKSIDE EDUCATION AND ACTION COMMITTEE

September 18, 2023

To: City and County of San Francisco Decision Makers - 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **OPPOSE** Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" ("Housing Production") **File #230446**

Dear San Francisco Decision Makers:

The undersigned environmental, housing, economic justice, community, and climate crisis response organizations write to voice our ***strong*** opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" ordinance. It would enact drastic and sweeping exceptions to San Francisco's environmental and community review of real estate projects and would undermine health, environmental, economic and neighborhood protections.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is *not* affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% *oversupply* of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing *more* greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Sincerely:

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee
California Alliance of Local Electeds
Californians for Energy Choice
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Concerned Residents of the Sunset
East Mission Improvement Association
Extinction Rebellion SF Bay Area
Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Our City SF
Our Neighborhood Voices
San Franciscans for Urban Nature
San Francisco Green Party
San Francisco Tomorrow
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sunflower Alliance
Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

From:	roisin@sftu.org
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	The Tenants Union formally opposes "Constraint Reduction" legislation
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 6:13:02 PM
Attachments:	Tenants Union Opposes File 230446.pdf

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

Dear Clerk of the Board, Angela Calvillo,

The Tenants Union formally opposes File 230446. The “Constraint Reduction” legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisors Engardio and Dorsey will incentivize the displacement of tenants and demolition of rent-controlled housing, while eliminating recourse for at-risk tenants.

The legislation is being sold as a way to speed up housing production by eliminating planning staff review to make many permits automatic with no public objection allowed. It streamlines demolition of sound rent controlled units as long as the owner declares that either: 1) there have been no records of buyouts or evictions in the last 5 years, and tenants currently do not inhabit the unit; or 2) if tenants currently occupy the unit, displacement will be granted but they have a “right of return” when and if their units are rebuilt. The demolished units must be replaced and increase in number but there is no requirement that the new units are actually rental units – more likely they will become ownership “Tenancy-In-Common” units. This trend is already playing out at the Planning Commission where they still hold hearings and vote on demolition projects for now.

The legislation eliminates hearings where an affected tenant or a neighbor who knows the history of the building could be heard, object, and possibly get a vote of disapproval from the Planning Commission.

Shockingly, the Mayor’s legislation eliminates an existing but pathetically short 1-year ownership requirement in order to qualify for streamlining. Eliminating this requirement opens the floodgates for speculators to buy rent controlled buildings and fast-track their demolition with existing tenants barely able to protest their own displacement. New buyers of buildings, in our experience, are the most ruthless although they hide behind the lore of “mom-and-pop” landlords.

Whether tenants currently occupy the units or the units even exist (in the case of unauthorized units) relies on self-attestation by landlords. Unscrupulous landlords have an incentive to lie on their applications, because if they are truthful the replacement units will come with restrictions.
Many vulnerable tenants, especially in unauthorized units, are asked to pay rent in cash so will not be able to prove their occupancy nor understand where to do so.

San Francisco has many, many in-law units that were built without

permits so exist in a gray market outside of planning maps. These units are still covered by rent control and can use the Rent Board services, but tenants are especially vulnerable because both owners and tenants have an incentive to fly under the radar and hide these illegal spaces so the Planning Department doesn't know they exist and would require replacement.

The legislation incentives pressuring tenants to "voluntarily" move out in order to deliver the unit vacant before applying for permits. There are many ways besides buyouts and evictions to convince tenants to leave when profits are at stake.

In our experience, when a tenant is displaced by fire, flooding, or major rehabilitation work, they almost never return despite their right to. Reconstruction is dragged on and the tenants either move on signing long leases elsewhere and typically give up.

Planning Staff (who support this legislation) could not answer simple questions about which department would track these Right of Return tenants and enforce if an owner simply neglected to inform the former tenants reconstruction was over.

A larger threat is that the speculator can simply rebuild and offer the new units for sale separately - "tenancy-in-commons" - so a tenant wishing to assert their right to return would have no unit available to return to. We believe this is the most likely outcome as older rent controlled buildings are typically cheaper to buy so the profit margin to turn them into condo opportunities will be huge. It will result in the loss of rent controlled units from the market.

Tenants will find it hard to fight their displacement as the demolition of their units has been condoned by the Planning Department and sold as good housing policy by developers who could care less about the effects on tenants.

Thank you very much,

San Francisco Tenants Union

S A N • F R A N C I S C O
T E N A N T S • U N I O N

558 Capp Street • San Francisco CA • 94110 • (415) 282-6543 • www.sftu.org

Dear Clerk of the Board, Angela Calvillo,

The Tenants Union formally opposes File 230446. The "Constraint Reduction" legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisors Engardio and Dorsey will incentivize the displacement of tenants and demolition of rent-controlled housing, while eliminating recourse for at-risk tenants.

The legislation is being sold as a way to speed up housing production by eliminating planning staff review to make many permits automatic with no public objection allowed. It streamlines demolition of sound rent controlled units as long as the owner declares that either: 1) there have been no records of buyouts or evictions in the last 5 years, and tenants currently do not inhabit the unit; or 2) if tenants currently occupy the unit, displacement will be granted but they have a "right of return" when and if their units are rebuilt. The demolished units must be replaced and increase in number but there is no requirement that the new units are actually rental units – more likely they will become ownership "Tenancy-In-Common" units. This trend is already playing out at the Planning Commission where they still hold hearings and vote on demolition projects for now.

The legislation eliminates hearings where an affected tenant or a neighbor who knows the history of the building could be heard, object, and possibly get a vote of disapproval from the Planning Commission.

Shockingly, the Mayor's legislation eliminates an existing but pathetically short 1-year ownership requirement in order to qualify for streamlining. Eliminating this requirement opens the floodgates for speculators to buy rent controlled buildings and fast-track their demolition with existing tenants barely able to protest their own displacement. New buyers of buildings, in our experience, are the most ruthless although they hide behind the lore of "mom-and-pop" landlords.

Whether tenants currently occupy the units or the units even exist (in the case of unauthorized units) relies on self-attestation by landlords. Unscrupulous landlords have an incentive to lie on their applications, because if they are truthful the replacement units will come with restrictions.
Many vulnerable tenants, especially in unauthorized units, are asked to pay rent in cash so will not be able to prove their occupancy nor understand where to do so.

San Francisco has many, many in-law units that were built without permits so exist in a gray market outside of planning maps. These units are still covered by rent control and can use the Rent Board services, but tenants are especially vulnerable because both owners and tenants have an incentive to fly

under the radar and hide these illegal spaces so the Planning Department doesn't know they exist and would require replacement.

The legislation incentives pressuring tenants to "voluntarily" move out in order to deliver the unit vacant before applying for permits. There are many ways besides buyouts and evictions to convince tenants to leave when profits are at stake.

In our experience, when a tenant is displaced by fire, flooding, or major rehabilitation work, they almost never return despite their right to. Reconstruction is dragged on and the tenants either move on signing long leases elsewhere and typically give up.

Planning Staff (who support this legislation) could not answer simple questions about which department would track these Right of Return tenants and enforce if an owner simply neglected to inform the former tenants reconstruction was over.

A larger threat is that the speculator can simply rebuild and offer the new units for sale separately - "tenancy-in-commons" - so a tenant wishing to assert their right to return would have no unit available to return to. We believe this is the most likely outcome as older rent controlled buildings are typically cheaper to buy so the profit margin to turn them into condo opportunities will be huge. It will result in the loss of rent controlled units from the market.

Tenants will find it hard to fight their displacement as the demolition of their units has been condoned by the Planning Department and sold as good housing policy by developers who could care less about the effects on tenants.

Thank you very much,

San Francisco Tenants Union

From:	Dawn Ma
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; MelgarStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject:	Letter of *SUPPORT* for the Housing Legislation Ord. #230446
Date:	Sunday, September 17, 2023 6:35:48 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to **SUPPORT** the Housing for All legislation, specifically the Constraint Reduction, and join the AIASF Housing for All Ordinance Support

It is rare for a national professional organization such as the AIASF to rally their members and practitioners to support a city legislation, unless it is detrimental to the welfare of the community. We are at the frontline of the housing crisis, having to deliver the horrific facts of time and costs it takes to permit their projects. We already lost all credibility as professionals to advise the public to navigate the permit system in San Francisco. The process is getting less transparent, and yet the permit fee is increasing.

Our clients come from all walks of life. Most just want to improve their decades old deferred maintenance in their buildings. It is our American right to improve our living space. We should not be burdened by a system that holds no accountability of their delivery, charges us thousands of dollars of fees, and subjects us to endless debates with random public on whether our code-compliant project meets their interpretation of neighborhood characters.

The inequality of getting a simple building permit directly contributes to substandard and illegal construction, life-threatening living conditions and unsustainable use of resources. So no, the way it is doesn't support the diversity we all claim San Francisco to be, and it is apparent to all of us who choose to continue living here.

As small firm owners, we cannot afford hiring designers within our own city. I have lost good candidates but with no experience to larger firms offering them a $70k salary. We have to resort to outsourcing our staff to other countries, or face constant turnover of inexperienced staff. If you support local businesses, you need to support housing reform.

This past Friday the city experienced a joyous event that galvanized 800k of San Francisco - the Sunset Night Market. It is successful because the event was well-planned, and didn't try to appease everyone (there were many nay-sayers on Nextdoor.com from Supervisor Engerdio's original post). The content of this legislation will not satisfy everyone, but the overall importance of cleaning up the existing process of urban development is an important step. We as architects, engineers and builders will always work w/ the city to get things done. Be brave and trust the professionals to stand side by side with you on this.

Dawn Ma, PE, AAIA
principal
Q-Architecture
Certified Green Business since 2014

p +1 415-695-2700

This email, along with any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Do Not Forward this Email. If the reader and/or recipient of this email is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this email to the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us by phone, fax or return email as listed herein. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

To: Erica Major

BOS-11

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2023 SEP 14 PM 12: 28

September 14, 2023

BY HAND

President Aaron Peskin
Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Supervisor Dean Preston
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
City Hall

Re: Mayor Breed's Constraint Reduction Ordinance **Board File No. 230446**

Dear Chair Melgar, President Peskin and Supervisor Preston:

The Mayor's Ordinance will be heard at the LUT sometime soon. *(September 18th?)*

The Committee *should not* recommend it to the full Board.

This Ordinance is not needed due to the fact of other legislation, both local and from Sacramento. For example:

The Board has passed Chair Melgar's Ordinance to expand housing with the "Family Housing Opportunity SUD".

There is SB 9. And there is the local Four-Plex Program.

The Rezoning under the Housing Element is underway and will be finalized in early 2024.

SB 35 has been extended and expanded via SB 423.

Construction on Treasure Island is underway.

Recent ADU legislation from Sacramento allows them to be sold as condos.

All the other housing bills from the Sacramento....too many to cite!

There are tons of units in the San Francisco pipeline: Stonestown, Park Merced, Schlage Lock, numerous projects around the HUB, etc, etc, etc)

Plenty of existing vacant units. (i.e. One Oak, 603 Tennessee Street, etc, etc, etc)

Let's see what happens with all of this before reducing constraints even more.

Georgia Schuttish

Georgia Schuttish

Copy to Erica Major, Clerk for LUT/ One Copy to each LUT Staff

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	9 Letters regarding File No. 230446
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:53:00 PM
Attachments:	9 Letters regarding File No. 230446.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 9 letters regarding File No. 230446.

> **File No. 230446 -** Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production (Mayor, Engardio, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

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

From:	R L
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 8:04:58 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive, unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high-priced housing that is not “affordable.” It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels! There is nothing “affordable” about this type of ordinance but a subsidized program that only benefits owners, developers, real estate interests or speculators etc. and not those most in need.
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more working class (low/middle income) San Franciscans either out of the City, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction; we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **NO Housing Crisis** – Lets use simple math & logic, since 2022 the population of San Francisco has declined by over 65,000 which certainly has increased for 2023. There are approximately 143,000 units that are vacant, have been built, are currently being built, that are coming soon and are in the pipeline for building, so, why would we need 82,000 more units? Reason - we do NOT have a housing

crisis but a crisis where HCD (RHNA) over-inflated the figures for housing needs & their veiled threats that if cities don't build these numbers, funding will not be given to cities such as San Francisco.

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to build unhealthy housing even more easily on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up"), as well as 2550 Irving and thousands of other sites in the City with similar issues. CEQA and other agencies of this nature were established to protect the Communities & to enforce doing the right thing like doing the proper testing, remediate a site properly, not build on toxic sites or not cut corners for the sake of making money. Removing these protections will harm the Community and <u>all</u> those you profess to care about.
- **Urban Renewal 2.0** – Ordinances of these nature are & will follow the same trajectory as the past like Geneva Towers.* They will be built, not be occupied only to sit vacant (e.g. The Westerly on Sloat), become mismanaged*, not benefit the people's needs and a blight on the Neighborhoods.
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and Community integrity!

Thank you,
<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

Renee Lazear

D4 Resident - 94116

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

Preserve the Nature & Character of Our Neighborhoods

From:	Robert Hall
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 7:27:19 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style

redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Robert Hall
94117

From:	Brian Luenow
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 5:25:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other

building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Brian

94116

From:	A. Colichidas
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Subject: Public Comment: File #230446 Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 3:32:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Do I have to enumerate all the things wrong with the "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance")?

As a lifelong renter, I join San Francisco renters and allies in strongly opposing this legislation.

It is a license to _____ !(you fill in the blank), will gut SF rent protections and worsen the very problems the Board and the Administration are desperate to solve, such as:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

I trust you will do the right thing here and vote NO. You have been sitting in those chairs long enough to know that the human misery on our streets will only be exacerbated and many lives cut short of their potential if this is allowed to proceed.

Sincerely,
*Ann Colichidas, San Francisco
Member: San Francisco Gray Panthers
Member: Our Mission, No Eviction

*The opinions expressed are my own.

From:	Christine Hanson
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 3:18:01 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year! This excludes your teachers, your nurses, and likely many of your own aides!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls • housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels! *If you truly want the City to create more units of affordable housing, please do not vote for anything g that minimizes public input!*

The Homelessness Crisis - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need MORE MARKET OR PROHIBITIVELY EXPENSIVE housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up"). For these reasons, in addition to gross speculation on real estate, the wait time between property purchase and development cannot be less than 10 years.
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building • materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

- This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. *As it exists, the currently proposed legislation will pave the way for this!*

Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank You!
Christine Hanson
Resident of the Excelsior

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

From:	Magick Altman
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS)
Subject:	The iso-called "Family HOusing
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:36:27 PM

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

This will be a travesty for working people, elders, physically challenged, and families with young children. Please stop catering to developers who are not helping with real for the people housing.
This is wrong, and is a giveaway to the developers. UGH!
Yours I truth,
Magick
94107

From:	Kathleen Kelley
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:33:35 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The proposed ordinance by Engardio-Breed is going in the wrong direction.

Taking away public and community input results in toxic sites like 2550 Irving from being cleaned up. The developer, the DTSC, the Mayor, MOHCD all turned their backs on the Sunset community as we raised over two years of legitimate concerns about proven toxin levels, joining in a chorus falsely describing neighbors as NIMBY's, and wasting time and money. And causing heartache.

Why isn't the 2550 Irving site being given the same "apples to apples" testing as requested by the Board of Appeals and the neighbors toxin experts? **Why didn't our Supervisor Engardio follow up on his quote from the Mission Local article https://missionlocal.org/2023/08/affordable-housing-sunset-san-francisco-2550-irving-toxic/**

"Separate and apart from the science here, this is confusing, even for neighborhood residents and city officials staunchly in favor of this project. "You would think that the tests they did on two sites, on two different sides of the street, would be the same, so they'd have a true comparison," said Engardio. Toxic Substances Control "is claiming it did all the testing, and everything is fine. But it does not match up to what the neighborhood asked for, or what a layperson might see as apples to apples."

Engardio stresses that "it's not my role to second-guess a state agency that's in charge of keeping people safe." But, if only to check off a box, "it is baffling to me they would not have done apples to apples tests just to take this argument off the table."

Supervisor Engardio left it at that. It was more convenient for him, the Mayor, MOHCD and

others to sit back, call the neighbors NIMBY's, check the box on state funding and steamroll over the real toxin issue. You said we "were crying wolf". Our leadership has failed the Sunset. You have failed the Sunset by not taking community input seriously, as it was SO much easier to blindly accept the convoluted flawed science of DTSC methodology and check the "housing numbers box" without caring that you do this project right. Clean it up, then build it up. No one in the Sunset said they did not want the housing. It was just convenient for you, our so-called leadership, to take that stance and join the chorus. Look in the mirror. You have failed us.

And 2550 is a real affordable housing site! TNDC and DTSC never involved the community with authentic communication. TNDC and DTSC could have done the testing months ago when requested, saving time and money. The Mar Resolution supposedly "unanimously approved by the BOS" was ignored. Supervisor Engardio, you could have come to your community's aid. But you did not, you were told by the Mayor that we were crying wolf and you bought into that untruth.

Commissioner Trasvina quote from https://missionlocal.org/2023/08/2550-irving-street-affordable-housing-soil-toxins-pce-board-of-appeals/ "I'm ready to grant the appeal, based on an overreliance on, and misplaced deference to, DTSC," said Trasviña, referring to the Department of Toxic Substance Control. He contended that the agency did not meet and communicate enough with residents, and said he was disappointed it did not complete the additional soil vapor tests the Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association requested. "If we really believe in affordable housing, if we really believe in the public health of the people of San Francisco, and future people in San Francisco, then we have to do this right," he said.

Commissioner Lemberg also supported the appeal: "There are several things that smell here, for me," they said, most notably that the Department of Toxic Substances Control did not complete the tests asked for by the appellants.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

This ordinance will also worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance will build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Kathleen Kelley
San Francisco Resident who is Very Discouraged in our Leadership

From: Gregory Stevens
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: We oppose Engardio-Breed-Dorsey Attack on Environment & Affordable Housing
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 2:09:12 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Representing over 50 congregations in San Francisco, we at California Interfaith Power and Light, stand in opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") because it contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

—
Gregory Stevens (they/them)
California Interfaith Power & Light
Northern California Director
(650) 313-3998

Schedule a meeting here.

From:	KyleD
To:	Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Angulo, Sunny (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Smeallie, Kyle (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Groth, Kelly (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Thongsavat, Adam (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Herrera, Ana (BOS); RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Burch, Percy (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Buckley, Jeff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Barnes, Bill (BOS); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Carrillo, Lila (BOS)
Subject:	Please Reject the "Constraints Reduction" "Housing Legislation File #230446
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:03:08 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making $150,000 to $190,000 per year!

My primary concerns are that:
There are insufficient provisions to verify Landlords honor the 'right of return', and insufficient penalties when they fail to do so.
Condo Conversion works around tenant rights and needs to be restricted.
Most of the units that would be effected are below market rate, which are why they are being done, and goes against the premise of the City of San Francisco that more below market rate units are needed.

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making $150,000 to $190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!

- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted

into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Kyle DeWolfe

SF CA 94109

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: More disaster to come on Market Street
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:00:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from ZK regarding street conditions near Market Steet and 6th Street.

Sincerely,

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

From: Zawadi Zawadi <kahawa@juno.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2023 11:19 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: More disaster to come on Market Street

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

HomeRise will "manage" the SRO. If you can brave it, look how the SRO are "managed" on Leavenworth. Stop dumping creating drug addicted, mentally ill ghettos!

On Fri, Sep 15, 2023, 11:14 AM Zawadi Zawadi <kahawa@juno.com> wrote:

> Correction:
>
> The city along with Newsom approved funding for Homesite to have a reconstructed SRO at 6th and Market Street. Also, Breed wants a mental health care and navigation center a few feet away.
>
> Look at all the SRO and city clinics and you know the area will get worse!
>
> ZK

On Fri, Sep 15, 2023, 11:10 AM Zawadi Zawadi <kahawa@juno.com> wrote:

> Mayor Breed does not get it. Adding more mentally ill, marginally housed and drug addicted people to 5, 6, 7 and 8 make the situation worse.
>
> We just found out that the construction at 6th and Market a few feet from Ikea is for an SRO hotel for homeless, drug addicted and mentally ill people.
>
> Isn't the area flooded with this group which drug dealers feed off? Breed also wants to open a mentally ill navigation center a few feet away too.
>
> This does not allow the area to revise and recover. Also, her plans of lip stick on pigs vs. actually addressing the problems on Market or the tenderloin is all she has.
>
> Dorsey, Dean and the President Preston is to blame for the building recklessness. Why are they not allowing the are to recover. Adding more mentally ill, drug addicted and homeless to the area is not progress.
>
> It's bogus and bias. Like dreamforce..Ikea side of the street is suspiciously clear compared to the garbage around them.
>
> People will continue to move away leaving it like the horrid place it is now.
>
> ZK

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Time to change prop 47 in SF
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:04:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from K. Miller regarding California Proposition 47, the Reduced Penalties for Some Crimes Initiative (2014).

Sincerely,

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

-----Original Message-----
From: k miller <kevrmill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2023 11:30 AM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Bolen, Jennifer M.(BOS) <jennifer.m.bolen@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>
Subject: Time to change prop 47 in SF

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

Hi

I write to request the city take action and pass legislation that brings back the policies and laws that prop47 has removed .

Prop 47 removed the policy infrastructure to require mandatory substance abuse treatment.

Beyond being harmful it is plan stupid .

Drug overdoses have skyrocketed.

Shoplifting without consequences is another result of this .

Serial shoplifting is no longer a felony .

The evidence of this failed prop are evident .

The city should act locally and restore these laws as evidence shows those that commit these crimes obviously need consequences to stop their selfish and unacceptable behaviors .

Babysitting and rewarding criminals is not ok ,

Please start to correct prop 47 failures locally .

In good faith ,

K Miller

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Communication
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:06:00 PM
Attachments:	Murawski and Parks.pdf BHC Grievance Portal email.pdf Strategic Plan FY 23-24 draft.pdf print of June 2023 Impl Com mtg page.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Wynship Hillier regarding the Behavioral Health Commission.

Sincerely,

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

From: Wynship Hillier <wynship@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 11:15 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Toni Parks <tonerinsf@me.com>
Subject: Communication

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

Dear Madam, Mx., or Sir:

Please forward this email to the Board of Supervisors and include in the communications packet for the next available meeting of the Board.

Very truly yours,
Wynship Hillier

Wynship W. Hillier, M.S.
3562 20th Street, Apartment 22
San Francisco, California 94110
(415) 505-3856
wynship@hotmail.com

September 17, 2023

Aaron Peskin, Chair
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, California 94102

Sent via email to bos@sfgov.org

RE: LIZA MURAWSKI AND TONI PARKS SHOULD BE DISMISSED FROM THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION FOR OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT.

Honorable Chair Peskin:

Liza Murawski and Toni Parks should be dismissed from the Behavioral Health Commission for official misconduct. Ms. Murawski chaired a meeting of the Site Visit Committee of the Commission and Ms. Parks attended this meeting as well as a meeting of the Implementation Committee on June 13 of this year, at both of which meetings multiple violations of open meetings laws occurred.

> OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT. Official misconduct means any wrongful behavior by a public officer in relation to the duties of his or her office, willful in its character, including any failure, refusal or neglect of an officer to perform any duty enjoined on him or her by law . . . When any City law provides that a violation of the law constitutes or is deemed official misconduct, the conduct is covered by this definition and may subject the person to discipline and/or removal from office.

S.F. Charter § 15.105(e). "Willfully" is defined by *Cal. Penal Code* § 7(1) (second para.) as follows:

> The following words have in this code the signification attached to them in this section, unless otherwise apparent from the context:
> (1) The word "willfully," when applied to the intent with which an act is done or omitted, implies simply a purpose or willingness to commit the act, or

> make the omission referred to. It does not require any intent to violate law, or to injure another, or to acquire any advantage.

Although this definition does not strictly apply to *S.F. Charter*, § 15.105(e) of the latter represents a purely remedial measure, rather than punishment. Consequently, this section of the *Charter* should be construed more liberally than the *Penal Code*, rather than less. I.e., it should include what counts as willful behavior at least according to the *Penal Code*, if not more. Furthermore, the Site Visit Committee was a "legislative body" under the Brown Act because it was a standing committee with the power to act on behalf of the Commission by advising the Director of Behavioral Health Services. It was created by the Commission on May 18, 2022, through passage of its bylaws, and the Commission is a legislative body because it was created by ordinance of the Board of Supervisors, which is a legislative body because it is the governing body of the City and County of San Francisco, which is a local agency. *Cal. Gov't Code* §§ 54951 and 54952(a) and (b), *S.F. Admin. Code* § 15.12(a) (creating the Commission). The Implementation Committee is a "legislative body" because it is a standing advisory committee consisting entirely of less than a majority of the Commission created by the Commission on May 18, 2022, also through the passage of bylaws. Both committees were also "policy bodies" because they were both standing committees of the Commission, which is a policy body because it was created by the Board of Supervisors. *Id.* §§ 15.12(a) (creating the Commission) and 67.3(d)(3) and (d)(5). These factors will become important in the argument below.

When a violation of open meetings laws occurs, every member of the legislative body or policy body present at the meeting shares in the responsibility therefor. This is because the chair has the power to rule items on the agenda out of order for violation of state or local procedural law. RONR (12th ed.) 4:17 and 10:26(1). Upon failure of the chair to do so, other members of the policy body then have the ability to immediately force the issue by raising a point of order, *id.* 23:5, requiring an immediate ruling by the chair, before discussion or consideration of the violative item may begin. This is evident from criminal penalty for violations of the Brown Act, which apply not just to the chair, but to every member of the legislative body present at the meeting where action is taken in violation of the Brown Act who knows or should know the facts that make the violation:

> *Each member of a legislative body who attends a meeting of that legislative body* where action is taken in violation of any provision of this chapter, and where the member intends to deprive the public of information to which the member knows or has reason to know the public is entitled under this chapter, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Cal. Gov't Code § 54959 (in full) (emph. added). This occurred at the meetings of more than one body on June 13.

MEETING OF THE "SITE VISIT COMMITTEE" OF THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION ON JUNE 13

At appx. 2:37 p.m. on June 13, subsequent to a technical delay, Ms. Murawski, also a member of the Committee, chaired a meeting of the "Site Visit Committee" of the Behavioral Health Commission in Room 416 at City Hall which Ms. Parks and one other member also attended. According to the agenda for the meeting, the Site Visit Committee has only three members, so a majority of the members were in attendance. Therefore, a "meeting" of the Site Visit Committee occurred on June 13, 2023, as defined by *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.3(b)(1). However, none of the items on the agenda for the meeting, available here: https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/BHC%20Site%20Visit%20Cmte%20Agenda%206.13.23%20ag_0.pdf, that were within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee were actually discussed or considered during the meeting. Consequently, a "meeting" of the Site Visit Committee as defined by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54952.2(a) did not occur on June 13, 2023.

1. **Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule All of the Items on the Agenda or Off of It Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Conduct of the Meeting when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a).**

Cal. Gov't Code § 54954(a) provided as follows:

> Each legislative body of a local agency, except for advisory committees or standing committees, shall provide, by ordinance, resolution, bylaws, or by whatever other rule is required for the conduct of business by that body, the time and place for holding regular meetings. Meetings of advisory committees or standing committees, for which an agenda is posted at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54954.2, shall be considered for purposes of this chapter to be regular meetings of the legislative body.

The "Site Visit Committee" (actually the Program Evaluation Site Visit Committee) was a standing committee. 2:00 p.m. on June 13 was a regular meeting of the Site Visit Committee because meetings of this Committee were also noticed for 2:00 p.m. on the Tuesday of the week before the third Wednesday in both April and May, i.e. within a quarterly time interval. Consequently, the agenda for the June 13 meeting was posted at least 72 hours in advance pursuant to *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1) (which only applies to regular meetings).

However, *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.6(a) provided as follows: "Each policy body, except for advisory bodies, shall establish by resolution or motion the time and place for holding regular meetings." The Site Visit Committee was a policy body with decision-making power (i.e., not

advisory). Consequently, these two rules directly contradicted one another in this specific instance. Which one applied?

Although the meeting on June 13 was not a "meeting" pursuant to the Brown Act, it was a "meeting" of a policy body under the *Sunshine Ordinance*, and meetings of policy bodies were subject to the Brown Act through the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5 ("All meetings of any policy body shall . . . governed by the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code Section 54950 et seq.) and this Article. . . ."). The two rules directly contradicted one another as to what body was to provide the time and place for regular meetings, and whether such provision was mandatory or discretionary, with respect to standing committees with decision-making power (i.e., not advisory). The second sentence of *id.* gave instruction as to how to resolve such conflicts: "In case of inconsistent requirements under the Brown Act and this Article, the requirement which would result in greater or more expedited public access shall apply." In this case, this gave little guidance, because there was a question as to which rule provided greater public access.

Neither Rule Clearly Provided Greater Public Access.

The Brown Act rule requiring that a decision have been made at the level of the creating body as to whether a committee thereof should meet regularly, and, if so, where and when, could have resulted in more public access because it would have resulted in a more stable judgment. It would have required that a larger body vote on the matter, and to revise such a vote under the most popular system of parliamentary rules would require a 2/3 majority. RONR (12th ed.) pp. xlix-l and para. 6:25(c). A 2/3 vote in a large body might have been difficult to muster, especially given local laws in some cities such as San Francisco, i.e., *S.F. Charter* § 4.104(b), requiring that such a vote of the Commission obtain the assent of 2/3 of its members, rather than the members present. A 2/3 majority vote at the level of the committee might have been much easier to obtain, especially if the aforementioned rule did not generally apply to committees, as was the case in San Francisco. (This situation was exacerbated by the Commission's bylaws, which, following the *Good Government Guide*, used "members" to mean the number of seats on the Commission, such that a 2/3 vote of the Commission would be 12 "yes" votes, currently impossible to obtain because the Commission had no more than 10 members currently appointed to it.) More stability meant more predictability, which translated into more openness. If meeting dates were more difficult to change, they would have changed less often. If they had changed less often, members of the public would have been better able to arrange their lives to attend the meetings.

The Brown Act rule might also have resulted more directly in greater public access. If the decision had been made by the larger body, then members of the larger body who were not members of the committee would have been able to contribute to it. This would have resulted in greater public access because it would have been more likely that a time and place would have been chosen for regular meetings of the committee that members of the larger body who were not members of the committee (who would have been members of the public with respect to the

committee) would have been able to attend. Furthermore, meetings of the larger body would have been more likely to be attended by members the public (with respect to the Commission). Thus, more members of the public with respect to the Commission would also have been able to contribute to the decision and be able to attend the meetings of the committee.

However, it could be argued that some members of the public would have been more interested in the proceedings of the committee than that of the larger body, and more likely to attend the former than the latter. This might especially have been the case with committees with decision-making power, such as this one, because such a committee would have needed no approval from the larger body to take action on its behalf. With advisory committees, which cannot take action on behalf of the creating body, any interest in their proceedings would have extended to interest in the creating body, which alone would have had the power to act on behalf of the advice of the committee. Thus, the decision as to the time and place for regular meetings being made at the committee level for a committee with decision-making power might have been conducive to public access, because it might have attracted more members of the public, who would have had more interest in the activities of the committee alone. The second sentence of sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5 did not give unequivocal guidance therefor.

A Functionalist Argument Supported the Brown Act Rule.

Because of the nature of these provisions, the previous dispute did not need to be resolved. Unlike nearly all other provisions in either law, these provisions had effects which extended over more than a single meeting. Thus, although the meeting on June 13 was not a "meeting" under the Brown Act, if it had been so, the Brown Act might have preempted the *Sunshine Ordinance* wherever the two were in conflict, regardless of the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5, which only applied when the Brown Act was applicable solely through the first sentence. It seems reasonable to presume that, at some point, the Site Visit Committee would have held a regular meeting at which it would have transacted or discussed a matter within its subject-matter jurisdiction, wither on the agenda for that meeting or not. If and when it did, the Brown Act would apply *per se* and possibly with preemptive force. Such a meeting would be illegal unless the Commission had passed a resolution providing a time and place for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee, and the Committee was in fact meeting at that place and time provided, if it was a regular meeting. The Brown Act rule alone must be assumed to apply, then, and to preempt the conflicting *Sunshine Ordinance* rule, in order that a single rule would apply in all regular meetings, whether matters within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the committee were discussed or not. The Brown Act rule must have applied even when the Brown Act itself only applied through the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5, as it did on June 13.

It could not have been any other way. If the *Sunshine Ordinance* rule applied to meetings that were not meetings under the Brown Act *per se* and the Brown Act applied (with preemptive force) to the other ones, then there would have to be two provisions: One by the Commission providing a time and place for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee, to which the Brown Act applied *per se* and with preemptive force (implicitly allowing them), and another by the Site

Visit Committee for its own regular meetings, to which the Brown Act applied only through the *Sunshine Ordinance*, assuming that the Sunshine Ordinance rule provided greater public access. There would have been no way to require that the two provisions provide the same time and place for regular meetings of the committee, nor that the Commission provide either a regular time or place. If the two bodies made different provisions, then it would be impossible to notice a regular meeting, because which provision were to apply to it would depend entirely upon whether any business would transacted or discussed within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Site Visit Committee at the meeting. This would not be known until the meeting actually took place, regardless of what was on the agenda, because of the provisions for discussing matters without notice on the agenda, the Commission's practice of filling their agendas with many "dead" items under which no discussion or consideration actually occurred at the meeting, items not reached for lack of time, and the possibility that the chair might rule an item on the agenda out of order before discussion or consideration of it could begin.

The Functionalist Argument Required That the Brown Act Rule Preempt the Sunshine Ordinance Rule When the Two per se *Were in Conflict, and It Did in Fact.*

As mentioned, the above argument assumed that the Brown Act preempted the Sunshine Ordinance whenever the two *per se* were in conflict. This was not necessarily so on the facts recounted so far. San Francisco had adopted a home-rule provision, *S.F. Charter* § 1.101, which allowed an ordinance of the Board of Supervisors to prevail over state law, if it could be shown that the two were in conflict and that the state law was overbroad, such that a conflicting provision was not reasonably related to a statewide concern, and thus unduly constrained local legislatures having home-rule power. *See*, *Cal. Const.* Art. XI, § 5 (limiting home rule power to "municipal affairs").

Such an argument could not be sustained regarding *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a). Even though it was equivocal which rule would have provided *greater* public access, the Brown Act rule was reasonably related to public access insofar as it extended to standing committees with power. This allowed it to preempt the Sunshine Ordinance, even given the home rule provision in the *Charter*.

The Brown Act rule was reasonably related to public access, even with respect to standing committees with decision-making power such as the "Site Visit Committee." We have just related how the fact of decision-making power held by the Site Visit Committee suggested that the Sunshine Ordinance rule might have been conducive to greater public access. Against this argument, a standing committee might have had decision-making power limited to a very small area, as was the case with the Site Visit Committee. Most of its work might well be advisory. Such a committee would be considered to have decision-making power because of the small area in which it did. To have required it to make its own decisions about regular meetings (per the Sunshine Ordinance rule) because of the narrow area would have been conducive to less public access, because the factors that applied to advisory committees would have predominated. It would also have led boards and commissions to create standing committees with "token"

decision-making power, solely in order that the committees could have decided on times and places for their own regular meetings with less public access. This was probably why the Brown Act rule gave only ad hoc committees with decision-making power the ability to decide on times and places for their own regular meetings (and required them to have regular meetings). Ad hoc committees were created to do only one thing. If that one thing was action taken on behalf of the creating body, then these committees would have had no advisory capacity whatsoever, and so nothing would have been lost by requiring them to hold regular meetings and to determine for themselves the times and places for them.

With respect to the distinction between the creating body determining *whether* a standing committee with decision-making power would meet regularly at all, as required by the Brown Act, and simply requiring that it do so, per the Sunshine Ordinance, the following ought to be considered. Whatever advantages with respect to openness would be achieved by requiring standing committees with decision-making power to meet regularly (per the Sunshine Ordinance) would be mitigated in part by the advantages of having the decision made by the creating body (per the Brown Act) for the reasons stated above. Recall that, with respect to the committee, many of the members of the creating body are likely to be members of the public. If the public had an interest in the committee meeting regularly, this would be reflected in a provision by the creating body to this effect. Furthermore, it is an adage that power tends to be used. If the creating body has the power to provide the time and place for regular meetings, it will tend to provide that the committee meet regularly at them. Furthermore, openness is not aided by requiring that a committee also meet regularly if the nature of its business requires that it do all its work at special meetings. On the whole, the advantages with respect to openness of the creating body providing the place and time for regular meetings, if any, of its standing committee with decision-making power will outweigh the disadvantage of the creating body sometimes not providing that the committee meet regularly. This would be all that would be required for state law to prevail, i.e., a reasonable relationship between the provision in question and the goal of openness.

This argument assumed that the Brown Act regulated a matter of predominantly statewide concern. After an early opinion of the State Attorney General took this view, 27 *Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen.* 123, 130-31 (3-2-56), binding precedent made it into law: *San Diego Union v. City Council*, 146 Cal. App. 3d 947, *958 (1983) (Justice Work) (unanimous). It had also been said that, generally, whether statewide concerns or municipal affairs predominated in an area of conflicting state and local provisions depended upon historical circumstance. *California Fed. Savings & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles*, 54 Cal. 3d 1, *18 (1991) (Justice Arabian) (unanimous in the judgment). If historical circumstance had relevantly changed since 1983, the correct course would not have been, as occurred here, to ignore *San Diego Union* and apply the Sunshine Ordinance rule. Society would cease to function if everyone took the law into their own hands whenever they conceived of an argument of why the law might be wrong. Stability instead required that one had proven one's argument by having brought a lawsuit that had overturned *San Diego Union*. Until this had been accomplished, *San Diego Union* was ruling

case law and was required to have been followed. (If, on the other hand, Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks had merely wished to commit civil disobedience without calling the law otherwise into question, they must necessarily have consented to the punishment—or, in this case, the purely remedial measure—that could be predicted to follow therefrom.)

The Brown Act rule for regular meetings of committees was reasonably related to the objective of public access such that San Francisco's home rule provision, supporting its *Sunshine Ordinance* in cases in which the two were in conflict, was held in abeyance, and the Brown Act rule applied. The mere prospect of discussion or consideration of a matter within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the committee at a meeting required the use of a single rule for all meetings of the committee. The case for application of the Brown Act rule to the meeting of the "Site Visit Committee" on June 13 was thus complete.

Therefore, Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct at the Meeting of the "Site Visit Committee" on June 13.

For these reasons, the Brown Act rule unequivocally applied to the June 13 meeting. Neither the Commission nor its Executive Committee ever provided Room 416 at City Hall for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee. Neither provided 2:00 p.m. on the Tuesday of the week before the third Wednesday, either. The Commission had provided a time for regular meetings of this Committee on Dec. 17, 2022, but the time provided was 3:00 p.m. on the Tuesday of the week before the third Wednesday of the month for April, May, and June of 2023, i.e., an hour later than the time for which this meeting was noticed. See p. 10 of the agenda here: https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/BHC%20Retreat%20Agenda%2012.17.22%20.pdf. (These times for regular meetings were approved during Item No. 5.0 a. on the agenda.)

Consequently, the meeting of this Committee was regular with the Commission having provided neither the time nor the place for it. *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a) imposed this duty upon the Commission which the Commission failed, refused, or neglected to perform. Knowing (or should having known) that the Commission had omitted to perform this duty enjoined upon it by law, Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks then enrolled themselves in and completed the Commission's failure, refusal, or neglect through their own failure, refusal, or neglect to bring what was a regular meeting of this standing committee of the Commission to an halt before entering into discussion or consideration of the first item on the agenda, by either Ms. Murawski ruling all of the items on the agenda out of order and adjourning the meeting for lack of further business before discussion or consideration began on the first item on the agenda or off of it, or, immediately upon Ms. Murawski's failure to do so, Ms. Parks raising a point of order against the conduct of any business at the meeting because of the aforementioned omission, and the third member present also failing to do as was required of Ms. Parks. Thus, discussion or consideration proceeded on the first item on the agenda for the regular meeting, the violation of *id.* was completed, and committee members Murawski and Parks should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct.

2. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule "AGENDA CHANGES" on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).

"**AGENDA CHANGES**" on the agenda for the meeting of the Site Visit Committee on June 13 was as follows: "BHC should open the meeting with a motion to disclose the physical place, time, and location of the meeting under Item 1.1". Item no. 1.1 stated as follows:

> **1.1** The Co-Chairs will call for a motion to disclose the physical place, time, and location of the meetings going forward and BHC Staff call attention to California Government Code Section 54953(e) also known as AB 361 for the hybrid participants which empowers local policy bodies to convene by teleconferencing technology for those physically unable to attend – **[action item]**

This confused message describes two items: The "motion to disclose the physical place", etc., and the "BHC Staff call attention to . . ." The second of these was out of date; it only applied during Governor Newsom's Emergency Order, which he rescinded effective Mar. 1.

The first notice did not provide enough detail to advise someone whose interests would be affected by the item of whether to attend the meeting, which is the standard for compliance with *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1). *Olson v. Hornbrook Community Services Dist.*, 33 Cal. App. 5th 502, *520 (2019) (Justice Robie) (unanimous):

> Those interested in the payment had notice that it was going to be discussed and acted upon at the District's August meeting and could attend the meeting and participate in the Board's action . . . plaintiffs' allegations lead us to conclude the essential nature of the Board's action was communicated and did not prevent public participation that would have otherwise occurred . . .

Id. at *521 ("[T]hose interested in the District's expenses would know from the agenda description that they needed to attend the meeting to participate in that discussion and action . . .") ("Those interested in payments not listed would not know to attend the September 2016 meeting so they could comment on the subject."). The notice above informed the public that a decision of whether to disclose information to the public about times and places for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee that had been provided elsewhere and was otherwise privy to the Site Visit Committee. It did not entail the actual disclosure, only a decision of whether any disclosure would be made at a time and in a manner perhaps also to be decided at the meeting. This was not at all what was transacted under "**AGENDA CHANGES**". What was transacted under "**AGENDA CHANGES**" was what time and place to provide for regular

meetings of the Committee, not whether to disclose a time and place that had already been provided elsewhere and how and when to do so. Consequently, someone whose interests would have been affected by the time and place to be provided for regular meetings of the Committee but was unconcerned by the decision of whether to disclose them or when and how to do so would not have known to attend the meeting on June 13.

Provision by the agenda of a brief, general description of the item to be transacted thereunder was a duty enjoined by law upon the Committee. Knowing that the description of this item was inadequate for what had been moved under it, Ms. Murawski should have ruled the motion out of order when it was introduced. Upon her failure to do so, Ms. Parks should have immediately raised a point of order against the consideration of the motion on the same basis before discussion, debate, or voting began on the item. By both of them failing to do so and the third member also failing to do what Ms. Parks should have done, all three members enrolled themselves in and completed the failure, refusal, or neglect to perform an act enjoined upon them by law, and thus committed official misconduct, and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

3. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule Item "AGENDA CHANGES" on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

The requirement of the previous number is substantially repeated by the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a), which requires "an agenda containing a meaningful description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting. . . ." "[A] meaningful description" is defined by *id.* § 67.7(b), expressly stating a standard similar to that for *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1), as follows: "A description is meaningful if it is sufficiently clear and specific to alert a person of average intelligence and education whose interests are affected by the item that he or she may have reason to attend the meeting or seek more information about the item. . . ." Consequently, Ms. Murawski should have ruled this item out of order for violation of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) as well as *Cal. Gov't Code* §§ 54954(a) and 54954.2(a)(1), and, failing this, Ms. Parks or the other member present should have raised a point of order against the discussion or consideration of "**AGENDA CHANGES**" before discussion or consideration of it began at the meeting. By all three failing, refusing, or neglecting to perform these duties, all three enrolled themselves in this failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, and Ms. Parks and Ms. Murawski should be dismissed from the Behavioral Health Commission for official misconduct.

4. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule Item "AGENDA CHANGES" on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

The second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) reads as follows: "Agendas shall specify for each item of business the proposed action or a statement that the item is for discussion only." When this item was called up, a motion was made and carried "That the Site Visit Committee be held on Tuesday according to the schedule attached to the Behavioral Health Commission meeting in Room 416 at 2:00 p.m." The agenda, to the contrary, read as specified under item no. 2, above, which contained none of this information. It contained neither the proposed action that was taken at the meeting nor a statement that the item was for discussion only. Consequently, this item violated the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a). Ms. Murawski should have ruled it out of order when calling it up. When she failed, refused, or neglected to do so, Ms. Parks or the other member present should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item. When neither of them did so, all three enrolled themselves in the failure, refusal, or neglect to perform the duty enjoined by the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a). Ms. Parks and Ms. Murawski should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct therefor.

5. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule Item "AGENDA CHANGES" on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.3(a).

Cal. Gov't Code § 54955.3(a) requires that the agenda provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the committee on each item of interest to the public before or during the discussion or consideration of the item. The agenda provided no opportunity to address the committee regarding "**AGENDA CHANGES**" at all. Although "**AGENDA CHANGES**" referenced item no. 1.1 on the agenda, the agenda neither provided an opportunity for the public to address the committee regarding item no. 1.1 before or during the consideration of the item. The fact that Ms. Murawski asked for public comment on this item at the meeting did not cure the defect in the agenda. Consequently, she should have ruled "**AGENDA CHANGES**" out of order as soon as she called it up. Failing this, Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order before consideration of this item began, and Ms. Murawski should have ruled the point of order to be well taken. When none of the members did so, all of them committed official misconduct by willfully enrolling themselves in the failure,

refusal, or neglect to include the required information on the agenda. Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

6. **Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Amending the Action in Item No. 1.3 on the Agenda beyond Its Original Scope, by Assigning Commissioners Jackson-Lane, Mason, Wynn, and Parks to Visit Jordan Arms and McAllister Apartments, and by Amending the Action in Item No. 1.3 on the Agenda beyond Its Original Scope by Ordering Staff to Send Correspondence to These Sites Within 24 Hours Requiring That The Sites Respond Within 15 Days as to When They Would Host the Site Visit at Least 30 Days Thereafter, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against These Amendments when Ms. Murawski Made Them, Which Forbearances and Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) reads as follows: "Agendas shall specify for each item of business the proposed action or a statement that the item is for discussion only." Item No. 1.3 on the agenda for the meeting of the Site Visit Committee on June 13, 2023, read as follows:

> **1.3** Discuss strategic planning around future presentations by programs that have been recently evaluated. It was suggested that the BHC do site visits on the Jordan Apartments and the McAllister Apartments. **[action item]**

Taking the second sentence to be the proposed action, it did not include many of the things that Ms. Murawski added. While the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) allows amendments at the meeting that reduce the scope of the proposed action below that which was proposed on the agenda, it does not allow amendments at the meeting that increase the scope beyond what was proposed on the agenda. The agenda not including these aspects of the action was failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on the Site Visit Committee by law and thus official misconduct. Ms. Murawski endorsed this official misconduct by proposing these amendments and Ms. Parks by not objecting thereto. Although no vote was taken, this was a "collective decision" and thus "action taken" as defined by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54952.6.

7. **Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Corral Discussion on Item No. 2.5 to within the Confines of a List of Assignments of Commissioners to Sites, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against These Excesses when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).**

This legal requirement is discussed under Item No. 2 of this complaint.

Item No. 2.5 on the agenda for the meeting read as follows:

> **2.5** Update on scheduling of new Site Visits; to engage the commissioners in the site visit process, it was determined that Chair Murawski would begin a list to present to the Commissioners; vote to accept. **[action item]**

Under this item, Chair Murawski moved "that the committee get clarification on mental health services provided by Behavioral Health Services under their contract with Homelessness and Supportive Housing." Someone whose interests would be affected by this would not know from the notice on the agenda whether they should attend the meeting. Consequently, the notice was inadequate and there was a failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on someone by law, namely the provision of adequate notice on the agenda. Mr. Murawski endorsed this failure, refusal, or neglect, by making this motion, and Ms. Parks enrolled herself therein by not raising a point of order against this motion before consideration of it began.

8. **Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Corral Discussion on Item No. 2.5 to within the Confines of a List of Assignments of Commissioners to Sites, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against These Excesses when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The legal requirement of this sentence is discussed under Item No. 3 of this complaint. The factual situation is discussed under Item No. 7 of this complaint. The inability of a person whose interests would be affected by what was moved under this item to know whether to attend the meeting from the notice that appeared on the agenda was also a violation of this sentence.

9. **Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Making a Main Motion That Did Not Appear on the Agenda under Item No. 2.5, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against Its Consideration when Ms. Murawski So Acted, Which Forbearance and Duty Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The legal requirement of this sentence is discussed under Item Nos. 4 and 6 of this complaint. The factual situation is described under Item No. 7 of this complaint. The proposed action that appeared on the agenda did not encompass in any way the motion that was made at the meeting.

MEETING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE OF THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION ON JUNE 13

At appx. 3:00 p.m. on June 13, a meeting of the Implementation Committee of the Behavioral Health Commission was held in Room 416 at City Hall which Ms. Parks and two other members also attended, agenda available here: https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/BHC%20Implementation%20Cmte%20Agenda%206.13.23%20ag.pdf . According to the agenda for the meeting, the Implementation Committee had only four members,

so a majority of the members were in attendance. Therefore, a "meeting" of the Implementation Committee occurred on June 13, 2023, as defined by *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.3(b)(1). Thus, the meeting was subject to the Brown Act through the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5. Furthermore, a matter within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Implementation Committee was discussed during this meeting. Therefore, it was also a "meeting" as defined by the Brown Act, *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54952.2(a), and the Brown Act also applied to it *per se*.

1. **Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Conduct of the Entire Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 1 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The Implementation Committee being an advisory committee, however, the section of the *Sunshine Ordinance* that conflicts with the Brown Act is different, and it conflicts differently. The section that conflicts is *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.6(f). It begins as follows: "Special meetings of any policy body, *including advisory bodies that choose to establish regular meeting times* . . ." (emph. added). This clause conflicts only on the issue of which body decides whether the committee is to meet regularly (the committee or its parent) and the place and time of the regular meetings. It does not conflict as to whether regular meetings are mandatory or discretionary.

This meeting was regular because an agenda had been posted for the same Committee at the same time, 3:00 p.m., on the Tuesday of the week prior to the third Wednesday of the month two months earlier, in April.

The Commission had never provided for the Implementation Committee to meet regularly at this time and place. In fact, it had provided for it to meet regularly one hour later, at 4:00 p.m., on this date, the provision having been made on Dec. 17, 2022. It had never provided for this Committee to meet in Room 416 of City Hall. Therefore, this meeting violated *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a) two different ways. The chair should have ruled the entire meeting out of order before discussion or consideration could begin on the first item on the agenda. That they did not enrolled every member present, including Ms. Parks, in the violation, because neither Ms. Parks nor the other member present raised a point of order against the conduct of the meeting before discussion or consideration began of the first item on the agenda. If they had done so, the point of order should have been well taken, the meeting should have been adjourned for lack of further business, and the committee would not have failed, refused, or neglected to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law.

2. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 2 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for the Implementation Committee and the Site Visit Committee. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. As with the Site Visit Committee, a motion was made and passed to determine the time and place for regular meetings of the Implementation Committee, rather than what was described on the agenda for this item. This violated the section in question. The committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor. Given this state of affairs, Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question, which point of order should have been well taken. By failing, refusing, or neglecting to raise a point of order, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform the task enjoined upon them by law, and should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct.

3. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Again, please see the discussion of the law and the facts under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for both committees. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. As with the Site Visit Committee, a motion was made and passed to determine the time and place for regular meetings of the Implementation Committee, rather than what was described on the agenda for this item. This violated the section in question. The committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor. Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question, and the point of order should have been well-taken. By her failure, refusal, or neglect, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined upon them by law and should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct.

4. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see the discussion of the law and the facts under Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for both committees. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. As with the meeting of the Site Visit Committee, a motion was made and passed "to meet on the Second Tuesday at 3 p.m. in hearing room 416 in City Hall at 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place", which action did not appear on the agenda for the meeting. This violated the section in question. When the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor, Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question, and the point of order should have been well taken. By failing even to raise it, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, and should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct.

5. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of "AGENDA CHANGES" when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.3(a).

Please see the discussion of the law and the facts under Item No. 5 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for both committees. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. This violated the section in question. When calling up the item the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor. Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question as soon as it was stated by the committee chair, and the point of order should have been well taken. Consequently, consideration was allowed to begin on the question. Ms. Parks thus endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined on them by law, which was to provide an opportunity for member of the public to address the committee on the agenda before or during the consideration of the item. Ms. Parks should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct therefor.

6. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see the discussion of the law under Item Nos. 4 and 6 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Item No. 2.1 on the agenda stated as follows:

> **2.1 <u>Follow up on Grievance Procedures:</u>** update on BHC strategy to improve Grievance Procedures; vote to adopt Commissioner Wynn's portal to be installed on the BHC website. Commissioners need to create and submit sample items for the portal. **[action item]**

What was actually approved under this item on June 13 was a motion "that BHS have online complaint process active by 12/31/23." While the notice on the agenda might have been enough to inform someone whose interests were affected of whether they should attend the meeting, the motion that was passed was not strictly within the scope of the motion that appeared on the agenda. The motion was changed from an instruction to staff to put a complaint portal on the BHC website which was to be further specified into an advice to BHS that they must put an online complaint portal on their website by a certain date. Consequently, the motion that was passed violated the second sentence of *S.F. Admin.. Code* § 67.7(a). The committee chair failing to rule the motion out of order, Ms. Parks or the remaining other member should have raised a point of order against the motion as soon as the committee chair stated it. By both remaining members neglecting, refusing, or failing to raise a point of order, Ms. Parks endorsed the neglect, refusal, or failure of the committee to perform a duty enjoined by law, which was to put the proposed action on the agenda for the meeting, required by *id*. Thus, she committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

7. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.3(a).

Please see Item No. 5 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above, for a discussion of this law. The agenda did not provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the Implementation Committee on Item No. 2.1 on the agenda for the meeting before or during the consideration of the item. That public comment was actually called during the consideration of this item, and that there was no public comment, did not cure this defect. The chair should have ruled this item out of order before discussion or consideration of it began. When the chair failed to do so, Ms. Parks or the remaining other member should have raised a point of order against any consideration of this item on this basis, and the point of order should have been well taken. By neither of them doing so, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform an act enjoined upon them by law, which was for them to provide the required opportunity *on the agenda* for the meeting. This was official misconduct, for which Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission.

8. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Reference Clause of the Third Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b).

The third sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b) states as follows:

> [The meaningful description of each item of business on the agenda for the meeting] shall refer to any explanatory documents that have been provided to the policy body in connection with the item, such as correspondence or reports, and such documents shall be posted adjacent to the agenda, or, if such documents are of more than one page in length, made available for public inspection and copying at a location indicated on the agenda during normal office hours.

(square brackets added.) Please see the description of the agenda item in Item No. 6 regarding the meeting of the Implementation Committee in this document. This description clearly references no documents. However, a multiple-page email I sent to the Commission on April 20, 2023, a copy of which I am attaching, was provided to the Commission in reference to this item. This was "correspondence" and should have been referenced in the item description. The agenda item failed to reference it. This email having been sent to all members of the Commission, when calling up this item, the committee chair should have ruled it out of order therefor. When he failed, refused or neglected to do so, Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item on the basis of the violation of a procedural rule prescribed by applicable local law, and the point of order should have been well taken. Because neither of them did so, all three members of the committee present endorsed and enrolled themselves in the failure of the committee to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law, which was to print the reference to the explanatory documents on the agenda. Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct therefor.

9. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.9(a).

Please see the description of the agenda item in Item No. 6 of this complaint. As mentioned in Item No. 8, above, the description referenced no documents, and yet Ms. Parks and the other members of the Implementation Committee were aware that an email document existed that was associated to this item. Therefore, they should have inferred from this lack of reference on the agenda and exclusion from their agenda packet that this document had neither been posted on the Commission's website. As the attached printout shows, the email regarding the proposed web portal was never posted on the Commission's internet site for the meeting.

> Agendas of meetings and any other documents on file with the clerk of a policy body, when intended for distribution to all, or a majority of all, of the members of a policy body in connection with a matter anticipated for discussion or consideration at a public meeting shall be made available to the public. To the extent possible, such documents shall also be made available through the policy body's Internet site. However, this disclosure need not include any material exempt from disclosure under this ordinance.

S.F. Admin. Code § 67.9(a) (in full). Therefore, the committee chair should have ruled Item No. 2.1 on the agenda out of order as soon as he called it up. Failing to do so, either Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item, and the point of order should have been well taken. That Ms. Parks did not do so when her colleague also failed to do so endorsed and enrolled her in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, namely, to publish documents associated with items on the agenda for a meeting on their website. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

10. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Reference Clause of the Third Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b).

Please see Item No. 8 for a description of the law. Agenda item no. 2.2 read as follows:

> **2.2 <u>Strategic Plan: Continue revision process begun in BHC Retreat of 12/17/22:</u>** This is an ongoing item on the Implementation Committee agenda and will allow the committee/BHC to have an ongoing sense of our progress on meeting goals (discuss outcomes that came out of the retreat and who will take the lead post Commissioner Bohrer's resignation) **[action item]**

(sq. brackets, emphases in orig.). This description clearly references no document. However, a strategic plan document, more than one page in length, existed in the possession of BHC and is attached to this correspondence. It had been attached to the agendas of other meetings of the committee, and so all members of the committee knew of its existence. Agenda Item 2.2 failed to reference it. When item no. 2.2 was called up therefor, the committee chair should have ruled it out of order. When he failed, refused, or neglected to do so, one of the other members of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item before its consideration began, and the point of order should have been well taken. By failing, refusing, or neglecting to do so under these circumstances when no other member did, all of the members of the committee endorsed and enrolled themselves in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined upon them by the section cited, which was to reference the

explanatory document in the item on the agenda. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

11. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Reference Clause of the Third Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b).

Please see Item No. 5 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above, for a discussion of this law. The agenda did not provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the Implementation Committee on Item No. 2.2 on the agenda for the meeting before or during the consideration of the item. That public comment was actually called during the consideration of this item, and that there was no public comment, did not cure this defect. The chair should have ruled this item out of order before discussion or consideration of it began. When the chair failed to do so, Ms. Parks or the remaining other member should have raised a point of order against any consideration of this item on this basis, and the point of order should have been well taken. By neither of them doing so, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform an act enjoined upon them by law, which was for them to provide the required opportunity *on the agenda* for the meeting. This was official misconduct, for which Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission.

12. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above, for a discussion of this law and Item No. 10 for a description of this item on the agenda for the meeting.

No motion was made during this item, nor was any collective decision reached without the introduction of a motion. The committee chair only made a short announcement that he would do something related to this item. Therefore, this item was for discussion only, and the agenda was required to include a statement to this effect. Because there was neither a proposed action on the agenda for this item, nor a statement that it was or discussion only, the committee chair should have ruled it out of order, rather than making his announcement. Upon his failure to do so, Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the discussion or consideration of the item before the chair made his announcement. Her and her colleague's failure, refusal, or neglect to do so enrolled each member of the committee in the failure of the committee to perform an act enjoined upon it by law, which was to provide either a proposed action or a statement that the item was for discussion only for every item thereon. Consequently, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

13. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule Them out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.9(a).

Please see Item No. 9 for a description of this law, and Item No. 10 for a description of item no. 2.2 on the agenda for the meeting, as well as the document associated therewith. As the associated printout of the web page for the meeting shows, the strategic plan document was not included with the documents for the meeting, and the members of the committee should have inferred from this that it had not been posted on the website. The committee chair should have ruled this item out of order therefor. The committee chair failing to do so, it fell to the members of the committee to raise a point of order against the consideration of the item. When neither Ms. Parks nor her colleague did so, Ms. Parks enrolled herself in and subscribed to the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined on them by law, which was to post the plan document associated with this item on their web page. This was official misconduct, and Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

14. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item Nos. 2.1 and 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule Them out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Location Clause of the Third Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b).

Please see Item No. 8 for a description of the law, Item Nos. 6 and 10 for descriptions of Item Nos. 1.2 and 2.2 on the agenda for the meeting, and Item Nos. 8 and 10 for a description of the explanatory documents related to these items.

The agenda failed to indicate a physical location where the documents associated with these items would be made available for inspection and copying during normal office hours. The address on the letterhead, "1380 Howard St., 2nd Floor" was not specific enough. The second floor of 1380 Howard St. is a big maze of cubicles and hallways with no reception desk. A member of the public would not be able to find anyone on the basis of this information. Furthermore, nothing on the agenda said that this or any other location were where documents referenced on the agenda may be inspected and copied during normal business hours.

Because of the lack of a provision of a physical location for the examination and photocopying of related documents, the committee chair should have ruled the items on the agenda that had associated documents, Item Nos. 2.1 and 2.2, out of order for violation of this procedural rule prescribed by local law. When they failed to do so, it became beholden upon the other members of the committee to raise points of order against the consideration of these items on this basis, and the points of order should have been well taken. The members' failure, refusal, or neglect to do so endorsed and enrolled them in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform

an act enjoined upon it by law, which was to provide such a physical location on the agenda for the meeting. Ms. Parks, by her participation therein, incurred official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

15. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.3 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 2 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Agenda item no. 2.3 on the agenda for the meeting read as follows: "**2.3 Annual Public Hearing:** Discussion continued regarding public hearings **[discussion only]**". This item did not specify by whom the annual public hearing was to be held, nor whether the hearing was proposed or past. Consistent with the subject-matter jurisdiction of this committee, the referenced hearing might have been held by Behavioral Health Services as part of their engagement of the community in the planning process. Or it might have been held by DPH, or the Health Commission, or the Board of Supervisors, or Homelessness and Supportive Housing, or the Commission, or by a local or state nonprofit, or by the state legislature or administrative organ, *et al*. References to past discussions mean nothing to a member of the public who might be considering attending a meeting for the first time. Therefore, this item did not contain enough detail for someone whose interests would be affected by the item to know whether to attend the meeting. It did not meet the minimum notice requirement of the section cited, and the committee chair should have ruled it out of order as soon as he called it up. Once he failed to do so, one of the other members of the committee should have raised a point of order against any discussion of the item before the discussion began, and this point of order should have been well taken. By allowing the discussion to continue when the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule and her colleague failed, refused, or neglected to raise a point of order against the discussion of the item, Ms. Parks endorsed and enrolled herself in the discussion of the item, and thus cooperated in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to provide a brief, general, description of the item on the agenda, a duty enjoined upon them by law, which has been specified as to its requirement by the California Court of Appeal. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

16. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.3 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 15 for a description of the agenda item. The legal

standard of this section is the same as that for Item No. 15 with respect to the facts at issue, and the argument is consequently exactly the same.

17. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.4 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 2 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Agenda item no. 2.4 on the agenda for the meeting read as follows, in full: "**2.4 How to Address Housing & Behavioral Health:** Discussion on process". This description might have been adequate if it had been as general as it sounded and also accurate. However, the discussion that took place under it had nothing to do with process in general, and spanned far less than the entirety of the problem of housing and behavioral health. In fact, the discussion did not even touch upon this topic. As was revealed when the item was called up, what the proponent of the item actually wanted to propose under its broad and global rubric was that someone from the committee attend meetings of the newly-formed Homelessness and Supportive Housing Commission, a very concrete and specific proposal, far from a wide-ranging and freewheeling discussion of all of the ins and outs of housing and behavioral health. They should have put the actual topic on the agenda, and not hide under vague, elusive, and cosmic-sounding generalities such as "How to Address Housing & Behavioral Health," when something much more specific was in mind. Given that they had failed in this, the committee chair (who was the proponent of the item) should have ruled it out of order when he called it up, as the description on the agenda was far too vague to alert someone whose interests would be affected by what would be discussed under the actual item to know whether they should attend the meeting. Given that the committee chair failed to rule the item out of order, the other members of the committee should have raised a point of order as soon as the committee chair revealed that the description of this item on the agenda was merely a subterfuge hiding a specific proposal, without waiting to obtain the floor, on the basis that a vague generality had been placed on the agenda to disguise a specific proposal, in violation of the cited section. The committee chair should have found the point of order to be well-taken. When Ms. Parks did not do this, given that her colleague also failed, refused, or neglected to do so, she then endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined upon them by law, namely putting a description of the item on the agenda with enough specificity as to alert someone whose interests may be affected by the item of whether they should attend the meeting. Thus, she committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission.

18. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.4 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 17 for a description of the agenda item. The legal standard of this section is the same as that for Item No. 17 with respect to the facts at issue, and the argument is consequently exactly the same.

19. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.4 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 17 of this complaint for a description of the agenda item. Item No. 2.4 on the agenda included neither a proposed action nor a statement that the item was for discussion only, as required by the cited sentence, and violated the cited section on its face. The committee chair should have ruled it out of order therefor. When they failed, refused, or neglected to do so, a member of the committee should have raised a point of order against any discussion of the item, and the point of order should have been well taken. When neither Ms. Parks nor her colleague did so, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law, which was to publish a proposed action or a statement that the item was for discussion only for each item of business on the agenda. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

20. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 3.0 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The description of Item No. 3.0 on the agenda was as follows, in full: "**COMMITTEE MEMBERS [*sic*] REPORTS –** For discussion and possible action." (sq. brackets added, emph. in orig.). Under this item was discussed the Mayor's proposal to cut mental health services in the City and County. In fact, Ms. Parks herself made this announcement. The committee chair should have ruled this item out of order as soon as he called it up, for the description is obviously so general as to contain almost anything, and

provides no help whatsoever to a member of the public who would be trying to make an intelligent decision about whether to attend the meeting on the basis of what would actually be transacted or discussed there, rather than just showing up and seeing what would happen. It is to be noted that, while "a brief announcement" is exempt from the notice requirement of the Brown Act, *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(3), the Board of Supervisors filled in this exemption with the similar requirement of the *Sunshine Ordinance*, cited above, which contains no analogous exemption. Brief announcements without special notice on the agenda thus violate local law. When the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule this item out of order for this reason, either Ms. Parks or her colleague should have raised a point of order against any discussion or action under this item, and their point of order should have been well taken. Ms. Parks's failure, refusal, or neglect to do so, in this context, was an endorsement of the committee's failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law, which was to provide a meaningful description of each item on the agenda, with a few very, very narrow exceptions not containing what was done here. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission.

21. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 3.0 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 20 of this complaint for a description of the item on the agenda. The description of this item on the agenda was required to contain either a proposed action or a statement that it was for discussion only. The committee chair, therefore, should have ruled this item out of order as soon as he called it up. When he failed, refused, or neglect to do so, either of the other two members of the committee should have raised a point of order against the discussion or consideration of the item, which point of order should have been well taken. They were able to do this right away, because it was apparent from the description of this item that, no matter what transpired under it, the notice was inadequate. By Ms. Parks failing, refusing, or neglecting to raise a point of order when her colleague did the same was official misconduct. By doing so, Ms. Parks enrolled herself in the committee's failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, which was to provide either a proposed action or a statement that the item was for discussion only for each item on the agenda. Consequently, she should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct.

Very Truly Yours,

/s/
Wynship Hillier

cc: Toni Parks

Proposed BHC grievance portal

wynship@hotmail.com

Thu 4/20/2023 4:15 PM

To:DPH-San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission <sfbhc@sfdph.org>

Cc:wynship@hotmail.com <wynship@hotmail.com>

Bcc:LIZA murawski <[redacted]>;Stephen Banuelos <[redacted]>;Toni Parks <[redacted]>;Lisa Wynn <[redacted]>

(sent via bcc to Commissioners Murawski, Parks, Banuelos, and Wynn)

Please forward to all Commissioners and reference in all further agenda items regarding this matter, *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b), and post on the Commission's website, *id.* § 67.9(a), if this matter is ever agendized again.

Parts of the *San Francisco Mental Health Plan* ("*Plan*"), which I previously sent to you on Nov. 22, 2022, are directly relevant to this issue. See, in particular, Attachment 12 to Exhibit A, "BENEFICIARY PROBLEM RESOLUTION", pp. 71-93 of the PDF.

This section cites the Federal Code of Regulations, which it tracks very closely. Furthermore, upon following the citations (this is essential to understanding the Plan, and never be afraid of reading the CFR, which is uniformly clearly written), I find that what Mr. Banuelos said in committees last week is not true, and precisely the *opposite* of what he said is true; "grievance", as the term is used in the Plan and applicable federal regulations, does not apply to adverse benefit determinations (which are subject to appeals, not grievances) and is not otherwise significantly limited. It is defined as follows in 42 CFR § 438.400(b), which applies to all of Subpart F of Part 438:

> *Grievance* means an expression of dissatisfaction about any matter other than an adverse benefit determination. Grievances may include, but are not limited to, the quality of care or services provided, and aspects of interpersonal relationships such as rudeness of a provider or employee, or failure to respect an enrollee's rights regardless of whether remedial action is requested. Grievance includes an enrollee's right to dispute an extension of time proposed by the MCI, PIHP, or PAHP to make an authorization decision.

There are some carve-outs from subpart F as a whole in 42 CFR § 438.402(a), but they are so narrow that it would seem better to call them "slice-outs". This being the case, any protected health information or other confidential information, such as information that would or could be used to identify the patient, including contact information, would have to be redacted from every grievance before BHC could look at it. *Plan* para. 1.B.10, citing 9 CCR § 1850.205(c)(6). I find that *Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code* § 5328 would also be applicable to any Personally Identifying Information in a grievance to a provider of specialty mental health services, because it would disclose the fact that the complainant was receiving treatment for a mental disorder covered by this section. BHS would have to do the redaction. The information entered into the portal would have to go straight to BHS therefore. Thus, there would be no point on housing the portal on the BHC website unless patients are more likely to look for it there. No evidence whatsoever has been offered that patients are more likely to look for it on the BHC web page, and it seems that the real purpose of this proposal might be to drive more traffic to the BHC web page. Furthermore, to the extent that BHC has an interest in any of this information under its first power and duty, to "Review and evaluate the City and County's mental health needs, services, facilities, and special problems," *S.F. Admin. Code* § 15.14(a)(1), an individual

Commissioner could obtain this information through public records requests. A motion to *Rescind* the motion passed in February to put such a portal on the BHC website, requiring a vote of 2/3 of the members present to pass, will not only be in order at the May meeting (assuming that this meeting is legally held and draws a quorum), but BHC's integrity requires it.

As for BHC subcontractor noncompliance with the *Plan* and associated state and federal regulations, i.e., requirements applicable to grievances, it is without BHC's powers and duties to refer matters to federal, state, or local offices with enforcement power over the *Plan*, subcontractor agreements, or associated state and federal regulations. Commissioners or Consumers may approach these authorities as individuals. However, the *Plan*, Exhibit A -- Attachment 13 ("PROGRAM INTEGRITY") § 3, ¶ B(1)-(3), as well as 42 CFR § 438.608(a)(1)(i)-(iii) both require the following:

> **Administrative and management arrangements or procedures to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse.** The State, through its contract with the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP, must require that the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP, or subcontractor to the extent that the subcontractor is delegated responsibility under the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP for coverage of services and payment of claims under the contract between the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP, implement and maintain procedures that are designed to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse. The arrangements or procedures must include the following:
>
> (1) A compliance program that includes, at a minimum, all of the following elements:
>
> (i) written policies, procedures, and standards of conduct that articulate the organization's commitment to comply with all applicable requirements and standards under the contract, and all applicable federal and state requirements.
>
> (ii) The designation of a compliance officer who is responsible for developing and implementing policies, procedures and practices designed to ensure compliance with the contract and who reports directly to the Chief Executive Officer and the board of directors.
>
> (iii) The establishment of a Regulatory Compliance Committee on the Board of Directors and at the senior management level charged with overseeing the organization's compliance program and its compliance with the requirements under the contract.
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . .

42 CFR § 438.608(a)(1) (ellipses added). There is no question in my mind but that the Behavioral Health Commission is this Board of Directors, and that it is required to establish this Regulatory Compliance Committee. This should be placed on the agenda for the May meeting, along with the motion to *Rescind* the February resolution establishing the web portal:

> *Resolved*, That the Behavioral Health Commission create a Regulatory Compliance Committee with jurisdiction over the compliance program of Behavioral Health Services and Behavioral Health Service's compliance with the San Francisco Mental Health Plan, to consist of four members to be appointed by the Co-Chair Committee, including, as an *ex officio* nonvoting member, the Compliance Officer of Behavioral Health Services, to meet at 3:00 p.m. at City Hall in Room 408 on the first Friday of every month.

This is essential to addressing the issues raised by the BHC recently, as well as required by the *Plan*. The "requirements under the contract" includes the following:

> [BHS] and/or [DHCS] shall verify through an on-site review that:

> . . . .
> . . . .
> 3) The physical plant of any site owned, leased, or operated by the provider and used for services or staff is clean, sanitary, and in good repair.
> 4) The organizational provider establishes and implements maintenance policies for any site owned, leased, or operated by the provider and used for services or staff to ensure the safety and well-being of beneficiaries and staff.

Plan, Exhibit A, Attachment 8 ("PROVIDER NETWORK"), § 8, ¶ G.3-4.

With respect to grievances, it requires that reasonable assistance be provided to the consumer in filing a grievance. *Plan*, Exhibit A -- Attachment 12 ("BENEFICIARY PROBLEM RESOLUTION") § 1, ¶ B(1)(d). Consumers are to receive a written acknowledgement of grievances within five days of their filing them. *Id.* § 3, ¶ B. Each grievance is due to be resolved within 90 days after filing. *Id.* ¶ C. The consumer is due a written notice of the resolution. *Id.* ¶ E. All of this information was to be included in the beneficiary handbook and posted on the provider's physical site, as well as forms and self-addressed envelopes be made available without the consumer having to make a request to anyone. *Id.* § 1, ¶ B(1)(a)-(c). *See, also*, 42 CFR §§ 438.406(a) and (b)(1) and 438.408(b)(1).

All of these provisions apply to BHS subcontractors, as well. *Plan*, Exhibit A, Attachment 8 ("PROVIDER NETWORK"), § 10, ¶ A, requires that BHS notify subcontractors of the grievance program requirements, and *id.*, Exhibit D(F) ("**Special Terms and Conditions**"), § 5 ("**Subcontractor Requirements**"), ¶ f ("The Contractor is responsible for all performance requirements under this Agreement, even though performance may be carried out through a subcontract.").

Consequently, an appropriate response to the problems raised in recent years is to establish the required Regulatory Compliance Committee, not put up a web form. If BHC wants compliance with provisions of the Plan applicable to the problems of which it is aware, it must itself comply with the Plan and take on its share of the burden of regulatory compliance. BHC cannot insist on BHS's compliance and also shirk such compliance itself. If it does not create the required committee and include the Compliance Officer as a nonvoting member, it cannot insist on BHS's adherence to the terms of the *Plan* that apply to BHS and, through BHS, its contractors.

Very truly yours,
Wynship Hillier

Part of Behavioral Health Commission

BHC Implementation Committee - June

Tuesday, June 13, 2023

Agenda

1 ## BHC Implementation Agenda

BHC Implementation Agenda - June

2 ## BHC Implementation Minutes

BHC Implementation Minutes - June

Date & Time

Tuesday, June 13, 2023
3:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Behavioral Health Commission Meetings

BHC Committee Meetings
San Francisco City Hall
1 Carlton B Goodlett Place
Room 416
San Francisco, CA 94102



Get directions

Online

BHC Implementation Committee

Join Zoom Meeting

Last updated June 9, 2023

Was this page helpful?

Yes **No** Report something wrong with this page

STRATEGIC PLAN: FY 2023-24 BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION OF SAN FRANCISCO

GOAL 1. Review and evaluate the behavioral health needs, services, facilities, and special problems.	**RESPONSIBLE PARTIES**	**OUTCOME MEASURES**	**COMPLETION DATE**
a. Review monthly reports submitted by the Behavioral Health Director. Request presentation of specific data pertaining to priority issues.	Behavioral Health Director and Commissioners	Reports reviewed at each meeting and included with minutes. Questions and comments made.	Monthly meeting
b. Evaluate services via conducting a minimum of xx Program Review Site Visits annually and via MHSA and other provider presentations at Commission meetings. Each Commissioner will be requested to conduct a minimum of xx Program Evaluation site visits.	Establish Program Review Site Visit Committee; Invite presenters; Commissioners with staff assistance.	Number of completed visits; written reports prepared by Commissioners submitted to Behavioral Health Svs. Director. Attend Provider presentations; offer comments/recommendations.	A minimum of xx site visits conducted monthly. Monthly meetings
c. Hold one (1) public hearing annually. Consider holding monthly Commission meetings at different Community sites.	(Ad hoc Public Hearing Committee ??) Staff and Commissioners	Public Hearing held. Follow up actions, if any, completed.	Public Hearing ? DATE
d. Participate in selection of the Behavioral Health Director.	Commissioner(s)	Full participation in selection process.	When necessary.
e. Advise Board of Supervisors and Mayor and Behavioral Health Director as to any aspect of the local mental health program.	Commissioners	Testify at BOS meetings, Annual Report completed; resolutions presented; and letters/memos as needed.	Annual Report – Testify, Resolutions/Letters – as needed.
f. Complete Data Notebook distributed by the California Mental Health Planning Council.	Commissioners (Ad Hoc Committee)	Timely submission to request from Planning Council.	Due date?

DRAFT

g. Review and comment on MHSA multi-year plan. Hold Public Hearing on Plan. Divide report into sections; assign Commissioners to review and report back prior to Public Hearing	Commissioners Ad hoc MHSA Review Committee; staff schedule Hearing date	Comments provided within time frame. Time allocated for Public Hearing.	DATE- July ?
GOAL 2. Review any agreements entered into by the Behavioral Health Services. Review realignment.	**RESPONSIBLE PARTIES**	**OUTCOME MEASURES**	**COMPLETION DATE**
Request information from the Director of Behavioral Health Services. Review contract(s) and reports.	**Executive Committee and Staff**	**Contracts reviewed; comments submitted to Board and BHS Director**	**Monthly**
GOAL 3. Establish committees to address special needs, projects, and issues, e.g., Executive Committee, Legislation, Bylaws, Program, Site Visits, Public Hearing and Awards.	**RESPONSIBLE PARTIES**	**OUTCOME MEASURES**	**COMPLETION DATE**
a. Update Commission By-laws; review every five years. b. Convene Annual Board retreat in December to set priorities for the next year. c. Set Annual priorities via Strategic Plan.	Ad hoc Subcommittee, Executive Comm. & staff Commissioners & staff Ad hoc retreat planning committee Commissioners; Committee Chairs/ staff	Bylaws completed. Retreat planned and held. Priorities set at December retreat. Strategic Plan reviewed bi-monthly to note progress. Status reported at monthly BHC meetings. Recorded in meeting minutes	Draft: December 2022 Final: ? 2023 Review 2028. December 2023 & 2024 FY 23-24 Plan – Bi-monthly review – November/January/March/May July/September

d. Establish Committees to address priorities (e.g., special needs, projects, and issues). FY 23: 1. Executive Committee 2. Site Visit Committee 3. Implementation Committee 4. Ad hoc Committees/Tasks A) MHSA Review/Public Hearing B) Bylaw Revisions C) Annual Report D) Nominating E) State Planning Data Report F) Monitor MH/SF G) Outreach - members	Commissioners & staff 1. 2. 3. 4. 4.A 4.B 4.C 4.D 4.E 4.F 4.G	Committees established. Each Committee reports its progress and status monthly. Over a two-year period, Identify, analyze, and publicize gaps pertaining to each issue; produce written reports; testify at BOS hearings and meetings; share information with California Association of Local Behavioral Health Boards/Commissions, SF Health Commission, SFDPH BHS & MHSF Director. Outreach to recommend new people for Commissioner appointments.	Committee meetings held; develop objectives and work plan for the year. List DATE Issue interim reports at DATE meeting. Complete tasks by DATE. 4.C Due June 4D. November every even year. 4E. Usually due in February 4F. Monthly meetings held 4G. all year
e. Priority Issues For 2023-2024: [INCLUDE SHORT AND LONG-TERM PROJECT GOALS] 1.Improve communication with BOS 2.Develop Position Papers/Interim reports 3.Housing Issues 4.?	Commissioners	1.BOS Contacts reported and increased contact over time; 2. Issue papers completed and presented to BOS and Mayor; 3. Implementation Comm. 4	? DATE ? DATE ? DATE

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	23 Letters regarding File No. 230078
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:09:00 PM
Attachments:	23 Letters regarding File No. 230078.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 23 letters regarding File No. 230078, which is Item No. 10 on today's agenda.

> **File No. 230078 -** Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative Updates - September 19, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Daniel B. Landry
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	The SF African American Reparations Final Plan - PETITION ATTACHED!
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 8:49:45 PM
Attachments:	petition_signatures_jobs_37146925_20230916031929 (1) - petition_signatures_jobs_37146925_20230916031929 (1).pdf

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

Hi, Angela Calvillo:

Attached below is the official petition in support of the SF African American Reparations Final Plan from
change.org. Please distribute to all Board of Supervisors prior to our scheduled hearing next Tuesday,
September 19, 2023.

If you have please feel free to contact me at 1.415.902.1009.

Thank you.

DANIEL B. LANDRY, AARAC
Policy Subcommittee

Name	City	State	Postal Code	Country	Signed On
Daniel Landry	San Francisco	CA		US	2023-08-14
Gloria Berry	San Jose	CA	95112	US	2023-08-14
Yolanda Harris	San Francisco	CA	94124	US	2023-08-14
MaKaylah Sampl	Canton		44709	US	2023-08-14
Lori Ruffin	Fayetteville		28304	US	2023-08-14
Eric Brown	Oakland	CA	94606	US	2023-08-14
Andersa Brumair	Orlando		32818	US	2023-08-15
elizabeth Machad	Port Orange		32129	US	2023-08-15
Jullian Mero	Kissimmee		34759	US	2023-08-15
Andre Parks	Redford		48240	US	2023-08-15
Sonic Son	Oroville		95966	US	2023-08-15
Savannah Price	Port Orange		32127	US	2023-08-15
makayla michaud	DeLand		32763	US	2023-08-15
Sophia Pulgar	Davenport		33837	US	2023-08-15
Eheh Bbsbb	Orlando		32822	US	2023-08-15
Isabel Quinones	Sanford		32773	US	2023-08-15
Gedamene Edoa	Tamarac		33321	US	2023-08-15
Elsa Hailemarian	Springfield		22153	US	2023-08-15
Brayden Surprise	Highland		12528	US	2023-08-15
Amanda Jackson	Birmingham	AL	35205	US	2023-08-15
Journey Avery	Dallas		75270	US	2023-08-15
Joanna Caballero	San Francisco		94142	US	2023-08-15
ariella bowen	Miami		33132	US	2023-08-15
Isabella Rodrigue	Naples		34102	US	2023-08-15
Edward Szewczy	Peru		61354	US	2023-08-15
rachael Glogovsk	Lake Geneva		53147	US	2023-08-15
Nina Pierre	Orlando		32811	US	2023-08-15
Phoenix Griffin	West Valley City		84119	US	2023-08-15
Jaslynn Melecio	Prairieville		70769	US	2023-08-15
M Peter	Sebring		33870	US	2023-08-15
Brittany Madley				US	2023-08-15

Jayla Lopes	Middleburg		32068	US	2023-08-15
leilany luna	Van Nuys		91406	US	2023-08-15
jade santos	Merchantville		8109	US	2023-08-15
Adam wells Wells	Bettendorf		52722	US	2023-08-15
Omorede Hamilto	San Francisco	CA	94124	US	2023-08-15
Shonda jones	San Jose	CA	95110	US	2023-08-15
Sade Saheli	San Francisco	CA	94114	US	2023-08-15
Meka Jones	Oakland	CA	94621	US	2023-08-15
Bivett Brackett	San Francisco	CA	94134	US	2023-08-15
Preston Updegra	Hartford		6123	US	2023-08-15
ixamara kalary	riverside		90262	US	2023-08-15
Ashkan Alavi nez	New York		10013	US	2023-08-15
j p	Port Orchard		98367	US	2023-08-15
Mariah Rodrigue	Austin		78741	US	2023-08-15
Reese Wilkins	Fort Wayne		46765	US	2023-08-15
Jason Martinez	Tacoma	WA	98408	US	2023-08-15
Mia Jackson	San Francisco	CA	94105	US	2023-08-15
Robert A Smith	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-15
David Ligon	Salinas		93907	US	2023-08-15
Leona Walker	San Francisco	CA	94124-2932	US	2023-08-15
Dontae Hill	Roseville	CA	95628	US	2023-08-15
Brenda Weaver	Sacramento	CA	95823	US	2023-08-15
Latrice Washingt	San Francisco	CA	94109	US	2023-08-15
JanNise Booker	San Francisco	CA	94116	US	2023-08-15
Mark Cappetta	Rancho Mirage		92270-5622	US	2023-08-15
Linda Ross	San Francisco	CA	94102	US	2023-08-15
Isabelle Benaon	Racine		53402	US	2023-08-15
Emily Hosseini	Bristow		20136	US	2023-08-15
Lauryn F	Baldwinsville		13027	US	2023-08-15
Olivia Reinke	Ashton		51232	US	2023-08-15
mohammed pate	Kissimmee		34741	US	2023-08-15

Rob Kaminski	berkeley		8741	US	2023-08-15
Katherine Hutchi	Phoenix		85050	US	2023-08-15
Jamie Dufault	Los Angeles		90006	US	2023-08-15
Keira Que	Las Vegas		89111	US	2023-08-15
Hana Saloum	Egg Harbor Township		8234	US	2023-08-15
Logan Hogeland	Portland		97204	US	2023-08-15
Hunter Hendricks	Mt carmel		37645	US	2023-08-15
Christopher Bean				US	2023-08-15
Ray Washington	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-15
Linda Jordan	San Francisco	CA	94124	US	2023-08-15
A decent lady	Unknown		Unknown	US	2023-08-15
Mary Apanowicz	Carroll		3575	US	2023-08-15
Jayme Spencer	Milwaukee		53208	US	2023-08-15
Aaron Blair	Corydon		47112	US	2023-08-15
Bill McDonnell	Providence		2908	US	2023-08-15
Silvio Carron	Miami		33136	US	2023-08-15
Traicia Constant	Pompano Beach		33064	US	2023-08-15
zaharra lawrence	Cape Coral		33990	US	2023-08-15
Walker Whiten	Pace		32571	US	2023-08-15
Sammie Broadna	San Francisco	CA	94115	US	2023-08-15
Adam Kaluba	Burleson	TX	76028	US	2023-08-15
Linda Parker Per	San Francisco	CA	94127	US	2023-08-15
Steven Gaines	San	TX	76111	US	2023-08-15
Marquis Muhamr	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-15
Ander A	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-16
Johnathan Willis	Dallas	TX	75241	US	2023-08-16
Brian Mitchell	San Jose	CA	95111	US	2023-08-16
Gwendolyn Hubb	San Francisco	CA	94116	US	2023-08-16
elliot helman	San Francisco	CA	94103	US	2023-08-16
Emily Morris	San Mateo	CA	94402	US	2023-08-16
Dee Seligman	San Francisco	CA	94117	US	2023-08-16

Jennifer Raviv	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-08-16
Maya Pollak	San Francisco	CA	94114	US	2023-08-17
Aya Harel	Berkeley	CA	94704	US	2023-08-17
Marcus Landry	San Francisco	CA	94115	US	2023-08-17
Nekia Wright				Zimbabwe	2023-08-17
Shaka Jackson	San Francisco	CA	94102	US	2023-08-17
martina roland	San Francisco	CA	94115	US	2023-08-17
Tyrone Anderson	Oakland	CA	94606	US	2023-08-17
Elly Simmons. Sp	San Francisco	CA	94133	US	2023-08-18
Gwendolyn White	Sacramento		95841	US	2023-08-18
Jennifer Kellar	Caliente		89008	US	2023-08-18
Axel Santos Ram	Elizabeth		7202	US	2023-08-18
Mikel Norman	Chicago		60637	US	2023-08-18
Micaiah Adames	Tucson		85713	US	2023-08-18
Nela Anni	Puyallup		98374	US	2023-08-18
Ny D	Ladera Ranch		92694	US	2023-08-18
Karl Myers	Seatle		98168	US	2023-08-18
Jada Wales				US	2023-08-19
Charli Kearse	Denver		80204	US	2023-08-19
Majeid Crawford	San Francisco	CA	94115	US	2023-08-19
Cum InMyAss	Canton		69420	US	2023-08-22
Theresa corrales	Lake Elsinore		92530	US	2023-08-22
Sasha Medina				US	2023-08-22
Patricia Pineda	Plainfield		7060	US	2023-08-22
Hansol Hwang	Hamden		90017	US	2023-08-22
Gordon Poston	Kingstree		29556	US	2023-08-22
Gavin Stephens	Louisiana		71115	US	2023-08-22
Eileen Gallagher	Jersey City		7302	US	2023-08-22
Kyla Gannon	Tyler		75701	US	2023-08-22
hoang lukas cock	nope		nope	US	2023-08-22
Ediverto Galvez	Panorama City		91402	US	2023-08-22

Jason Akers	Tacoma		98446	US	2023-08-22
Joshua Curphey	Peterborough		PE7	US	2023-08-22
Nova Van Ness	Flagstaff		86004	US	2023-08-23
aliyah Simet	Howell		48843	US	2023-08-23
Jo Lubin	Watchung		7069	US	2023-08-23
Anja Bircher	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-08-23
Matthew visconti	New Rochelle		10801	US	2023-08-23
Natassia Lample	Atlanta		30340	US	2023-08-23
Eileen Dawson	Philadelphia	PA	19147	US	2023-08-23
Izzy Cunningham	Austin		78745	US	2023-08-23
Brianna Crawford	Portland8		97070	US	2023-08-23
Makenzie Lafond	Kankakee		60901	US	2023-08-23
ishwar vijayakum	Frisco		75035	US	2023-08-23
Michael Hughes	Pekin		61554	US	2023-08-24
Selam Habte	Alexandria		22314	US	2023-08-24
Thea Baker	Monson		1057	US	2023-08-24
Chris Bethel				US	2023-08-24
Heather Shoup	Butler		16001	US	2023-08-24
Mikaela Bodek	Fort Lee		7024	US	2023-08-24
Kathylene Steven	Louisville		40210	US	2023-08-24
Mildred Johnson	Lancaster		29721	US	2023-08-24
Jameel Patterson	Sanfrancisco	CA	94124	US	2023-08-24
Deandra Bryant	Secaucus	NJ	7094	US	2023-08-24
richale Babbs	Merced	CA	95348	US	2023-08-24
Dawn Gray	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-08-24
Carl Norde	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-24
Ashir Rayikanti	San Francisco	CA	94109	US	2023-08-24
Aisha Gilmore	San Francisco	CA	94103	US	2023-08-24
RYAN JACKSON	San Leandro	CA	94577	US	2023-08-24
Dante Dimario	Los Angeles		90026-4227	US	2023-08-24
Rahman McCrea	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-08-24

Vanessa Jackson	San Francisco	CA	94132	US	2023-08-25
Alise Vincent	San Francisco	CA	94124	US	2023-08-25
tami Bryant	San Francisco	CA	94115	US	2023-08-25
Larry Martin	San Francisco	CA	94109	US	2023-08-26
Marcia Peterzell	San Francisco	CA	94115	US	2023-08-26
james GLOVER	San Francisco	CA	94123	US	2023-08-26
Franzo King	San Francisco	CA	94124	US	2023-08-27
Aleena White	Bemidji		56601	US	2023-08-27
Emily Flores	Artesia		88210	US	2023-08-27
Tiffany Whitaker	DeSoto		75115	US	2023-08-27
Melany Arbolaez	Hialeah		33012	US	2023-08-27
Reyna Sanchez	Albuquerque		87112	US	2023-08-27
Sabrina Uribe	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-27
Shamari Wooten	Tracy	CA	95376	US	2023-08-29
Kevin Epps	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-29
Katrina Nelson	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-08-30
Cassandra Ester	San Francisco	CA	94142	US	2023-08-30
Joshua Spector	Cortland		13045	US	2023-09-04
joe ward	San francisco	CA	94115	US	2023-09-04
Wendy Williams	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-09-06
Nicolle Foland	San Francisco	CA	94122	US	2023-09-06
Kylan Southern	Claremore		74019	US	2023-09-06
Eva Freedman	Deerfield Beach		33441	US	2023-09-06
Erin Stuart	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-09-06
Christopher Willia	Sanford		27330	US	2023-09-06
Donovan Casper	Pensacola		32503	US	2023-09-06
Téa McCoy	Winnsboro		75494	US	2023-09-06
M.S. Wise LCSW	San Jose	CA	95122	US	2023-09-06
Brandee Marckm	San Francisco	IA	94118	US	2023-09-06
Jonathan Weinst	San Francisco	CA	94117	US	2023-09-07
lea mcgeever	San Francisco	CA	94121	US	2023-09-07

Julie Pitta	San Francisco	CA	94121	US	2023-09-08
Rose Brennan	Valley Stream		11580	US	2023-09-08
G. Diane Matthev	Carson		90746	US	2023-09-08
Tyler Walker	San Antonio		78254	US	2023-09-08
Emma Thomas	Ithaca		14850	US	2023-09-08
Joseph De Feo	Yonkers		10704	US	2023-09-08
Dev Alwine	Chicago		60014	US	2023-09-08
Walid Shokoori	Baldwin Park		91706	US	2023-09-08
Emily Cook	Fresno		93737	US	2023-09-08
Graham Isom	San Francisco	CA	94112	US	2023-09-09
Aaron Baggs	Richmond	CA	94801	US	2023-09-11
Schaeffer Nelsor	San Francisco	CA	94112	US	2023-09-11
Rosemary Hanno	Berkeley	CA	94708	US	2023-09-11
Emily Barrett	San Francisco	CA	94110	US	2023-09-12

From:	Bruce Neuburger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 9:52:14 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Both my parents had to flee the country of their birth and suffered great losses to their families as a result of racial prejudice. It took 10 years from the end of World War II for them to begin to receive reparations for the damage inflicted. Only a small part of the stolen wealth was compensated for (of course there could be no compensation for the stolen lives), but at least there was an effort. It has now been hundreds of years since the damage inflicted by racism against the African American community began and yet it continues. There is much to be done to end this. Monetary reparations to the African American is a very small step in the right direction, but a necessary one.

Bruce Neuburger
bruceneu@gmail.com
25 Ellington Avenue
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Christina Gomez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date: Friday, September 15, 2023 6:15:30 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. As an ally to San Francisco's Black community, with urgency, I ask that you now continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Reparations for Black San Franciscans, the most disenfranchised group of SF residents, is the first step in the direction of shrinking our terrible wealth gap. Based on other opportunities for residents in other cities who've had access to additional resources (that look similar to reparations) including cash payments, parents paid bills, were able to access basic supplies that made day to day living easier and were able to invest in their kids well-being through tutoring and after school activities, essentially increasing the livelihood of their family.

Reparations can be all these things for Black San Franciscans. We know reparations means the opportunity to increase family and individual well-being, break generational cycles of poverty and build generational wealth. Which will increase the likelihood of Black San Franciscans STAYING in San Francisco and contributing to their communities in the most positive ways. It means having the ability to participate in the economic rebuilding of San Francisco and to revitalize parts of Black San Francisco that have needed attention and care for some time.

Again, I urge you to make reparations for Black San Franciscans a reality. Don't let their contributions, past and present, to our City go without an acknowledgment that those contributions are major to this City's cultural and historic landscape.

In Community,

Christina "Krea" Gomez

Christina Gomez
kreagomez@gmail.com
607 Peralta Ave

San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Chaney, Bilal (DPH)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	Support for Reparations for Black San Franciscans
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:44:52 AM

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you and the Board of Supervisors to vote in favor of the reparations plan. Reparations are a vital step towards healing the wounds of the past and building a more equitable and inclusive future for all residents of San Francisco.

Furthermore, I hope and pray that no one on the BOS believes in their own perception that they are race neutral and have nothing to do personally with the legacy of slavery. We as the descendants of enslaved people must implore you to do the right thing. This has gone on far too long

Regards,

Bilal

Bilal Chaney, BS
Program Coordinator
Radiology, Internships & Volunteers
DEI Lead
Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging
ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL
HOSPITAL AND TRAUMA CENTER
1001 Potrero Avenue Room 1x26

San Francisco, CA 94110
Phone: (628) 206 - 3805
Fax: (628) 206 - 8946
ZuckerbergSanFranciscoGeneral.org
Follow us on Facebook

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Info. HRC (HRC); HRC-Reparations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Souza, Sarah (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Fwd: Julien, Reparations Hearing TODAY. Call in!
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:31:08 AM

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

NO TO THIS RACIST, ILLEGAL, UNCONSTITUTIONAL REPARATIONS PLAN!

WE ALL HAD ENOUGH OF YOUR BULLSHIT RADICAL-LEFT AGENDA.

STOP WASTING OUR HARD-EARNED TAXPAYERS DOLLARS.

STOP THIS NON-SENSE AND DISSOLVE THE REPARATIONS COMMITTEE IMMEDIATELY.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Richie Greenberg Press Office** <comments@richiegreenberg.org>
Subject: Julien, Reparations Hearing TODAY. Call in!



REPARATIONS ON AGENDA

SF Board will hold hearing 3:00pm today, CALL IN to the meeting, voice your concerns.

TUESDAY, Sept 19, 2023

Message from Richie Greenberg:

LAST MINUTE URGENT ALERT. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors will hold a hearing at 3:00pm today, Tuesday, to discuss the Reparations Plan.

The Reparations Plan has already been shown by analysts and commentators to be unconstitutional, yet the SF Supervisors are discussing the plan regardless.

> **CALL THE BOARD DURING THE MEETING:**
> Call 415.655.0001 Meeting ID 2664 385 6418 ##
> Press *3 to enter the Speaker's line

There are several federal and state constitutional violations, civil rights act violations and court decisions making the SF Reparations Plan unlawful, You may mention any or all of these when you call, but you are limited to 2 minutes to speak:

California Prop 209 - also known as the California Civil Rights Initiative or CCRI approved November 1996, amended the state constitution to prohibit state governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity or national origin specifically in the areas of public employment, public contracting, and public education, preventing the government from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment. Proposition 209 banned the use of affirmative action involving race-based or sex-based preferences in California.

California Article 1 Section 7 - California state constitution provides a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied equal protection of the laws.

California Article XI, Section 10(a) CA state Constitution provides a local

government body ... may not pay a claim under an agreement made without authority of law.

California Article 34 - California state constitution requires voter approval before developing, constructing, or acquiring in any manner public housing (low-rent housing project) in a community.

Federal Title VI of Civil Rights Act - Was enacted as part of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance such as grants and student loans as well as racial segregation in schools and public accommodations, and employment discrimination.

Federal Title VII of Civil Rights Act – Also from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a federal employment law that prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

Federal 14th Amendment to US Constitution – Guarantees all citizens equal protection under law; a state shall not violate a citizen's privileges; shall not deprive any person of property without due process of law; Regarding Segregation: In 1954 (Brown v. Board of Education) the Supreme Court unanimously held that separate schools for blacks and whites violated the Equal Protection Clause.

You may also email your opinion to the Board Clerk, which adds your comments to public record: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

You may wish to email the Human Rights Commission, they are the city agency administering the SF Reparations Plan: hrc.info@sfgov.org

The African American Reparations Advisory Committee can be contacted as well: reparations@sfgov.org

If you choose to make your opinion on the Reparations Plan known to these agencies, please be cordial and respectful. Consider informing them of the RejectThePlan.com website which outlines all the violations of law which their plan runs afoul of. Remind them the Mayor, the City Attorney, The Reparations Committee itself were all served with Cease

& Desist demands to stop their work, stop the waste of taxpayers' money on unlawful legislation.

Richie

Try email marketing for free today!

From:	Eleana Binder
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support Reparations by Implementing the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee"s Recommendations
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:16:51 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan. The San Francisco Reparations Plan offers a framework for defining the scope of the policy-based harms that have contributed to inequitable outcomes in Black communities over time, and outlines comprehensive, systemic remedies to address them, through policy and programmatic action. By supporting the recommendations, you will be supporting community-centered solutions to address the injustices of the past and present and try to move us towards a more just future.

Eleana Binder
ebinder@glide.org
330 Ellis St
San Francisco, California 94102-2710

From:	beaubarlotte
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Info, HRC (HRC); HRC-Reparations
Subject:	NO to the Reparations Plan
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:09:15 AM

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

Dear All,

The Reparations Plan is unconstitutional and an egregious attempt to deplete vast amounts of money out of San Francisco's public coffers. Those who wrote this plan claim victimhood for an entire group, many of whom do not agree with their perspective. Also, a vast majority of San Francisco's taxpayers had nothing to do with historic wrongs against black Americans. It is unfair and unconstitutional to use our taxed money to create entitlements for a specified racial group. Taxpayer money is intended for the benefit of the entire community.

This plan is arrogant, divisive, fraught with unfairness and emotionally extortive. Indubitably anyone who opposes the plan will be metaphorically slapped with the epithet of "RACIST!" We San Franciscans are no longer willing to condone this manipulative bullying.

You can never 'right' a wrong with another wrong. This plan is wrong. Cancel it.

Cordially,

C. W.

Truth and freedom matter more

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.

From: Delia Fitzpatrick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Subject: Support for Reparations for Black San Franciscans
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:03:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors Clerk

I am writing to express my support for the SF Reparations Plan. It's crucial that we acknowledge and address the historical injustices and systemic discrimination that have disproportionately affected African Americans in our city, and this plan does exactly that.

The recent report detailing the harm inflicted by public policies paints a disturbing picture of the hardships faced by many Black San Franciscans. The disparities around the access for child care, resources support for specialists to support the educational, emotional and overall health of our children are undeniable. It is our moral obligation to take concrete steps towards rectifying these injustices.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to vote in favor of the reparations plan. Reparations are a vital step towards healing the wounds of the past and building a more equitable and inclusive future for all residents of San Francisco.

Furthermore, I would like to request that the Board of Supervisors ensures transparency and accountability in the allocation and distribution of reparations funds. This will help build trust and confidence within the community and ensure that the intended goals are met.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. Please consider my support for reparations as you make your decision, and I hope that you will choose to stand on the right side of history by supporting this important initiative.

Sincerely,

Delia Fitzpatrick

--
Delia Fitzpatrick

From:	John E.Jones
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	HRC-Reparations; Info, HRC (HRC); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Comment for Public Record: REPARATIONS NO
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:26:20 AM

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

May I state my firm opposition to the Reparations Plan to be considered by the Board today.

I have considered the State and local reparations plans, and the arguments presented in support, but remain convinced that the parlous state of the black community is mostly self-inflicted.

One lasting effect of this reparations debate will be to embitter race relations for generations.

/s/ John E. Jones
(Sine / Cosine)

From:	Greenberg Nation
To:	Meyer, Catherine (HRC)
Cc:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); myr_alldepartmentheads; waynem
Subject:	Reparations Unconstitutional - Cease & Desist in force
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:57:36 AM

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

Good Day,

Over the past months, once the SF Reparations Plan came to light, a deep analysis and expose on the plan's unconstitutionality and unlawfulness became the impetus for RejectThePlan.com . The site provides great detail of which state and federal laws, civil rights act(s) and court rulings the SF Reparations plan could run afoul of. In a nutshell, SF Reparations is unlawful, and pursuing the plan regardless of this fact is a clear and purposeful wasting of the city's taxpayers' money, which has legal precedent to sue under, under CA Constitution.

Three separate Cease & Desist demands were served: On Mayor London Breed, on the Board of Supervisors, and on chairman of the African-American Reparations Advisory Committee. Copies had been provided to City Attorney Chiu.

These C&D demands have not been rescinded.

Kindly,

Richie Greenberg,
San Francisco
richie@greenbergnation.com

From: Chaney, Bilal (DPH)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: San Francisco Reparations
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:55:36 AM

Dear BOS-Supervisors,

I implore you to adopt and formalize the African American Reparations Plan. My hope and prayer is that the esteemed BOS-Supervisors are willing, able, and capable to hear and accept feedback from people who share my heritage and who share a history of Black Lives not mattering.

Throughout this country and the world, people will be watching, whether or not, the fundamental humanity that was brutally taken from an entire race of people, will finally take responsibility and pay reparations for the harm that was done to them.

Regards,

Bilal

Bilal Chaney, BS
Program Coordinator
Radiology, Internships & Volunteers
DEI Lead
Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging
ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL
HOSPITAL AND TRAUMA CENTER
1001 Potrero Avenue Room 1x26

San Francisco, CA 94110
Phone: (628) 206 - 3805
Fax: (628) 206 - 8946
ZuckerbergSanFranciscoGeneral.org
Follow us on Facebook

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

From: Arnold Cohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Stop Reparations
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:10:43 AM

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

California Prop 209 - also known as the California Civil Rights Initiative or CCRI approved November 1996, amended the state constitution to prohibit state governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity or national origin specifically in the areas of public employment, public contracting, and public education, preventing the government from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment. Proposition 209 banned the use of affirmative action involving race-based or sex-based preferences in California.

California Article 1 Section 7 - California state constitution provides a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied equal protection of the laws.

California Article XI, Section 10(a) CA state Constitution provides a local government body ... may not pay a claim under an agreement made without authority of law.

California Article 34 - California state constitution requires voter approval before developing, constructing, or acquiring in any manner public housing (low-rent housing project) in a community.

Federal Title VI of Civil Rights Act - Was enacted as part of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance such as grants and student loans as well as racial segregation in schools and public accommodations, and employment discrimination.

Federal Title VII of Civil Rights Act – Also from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a federal employment law that prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

Federal 14th Amendment to US Constitution – Guarantees all citizens equal protection under law; a state shall not violate a citizen's privileges; shall not deprive any person of property without due process of law; Regarding Segregation: In 1954 (Brown v. Board of Education) the Supreme Court unanimously held that separate schools for blacks and whites violated the Equal Protection Clause.

Arnold Cohn

From: phnxextant2.0@yahoo.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: REPARATIONS PLAN
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:34:58 AM

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

Objections to what is likely to be a huge waste of taxpayers money:

(1)Pre and post Civil War, California was not a slave owner state.
(2) If reparations money is to be paid, it should come from those states which pre-civil war had slave owner ship in their history.

Please consider the objections raised by the website: Reject the Plan.Com

Thank you.
Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From: Marc Rabideau
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reparations Benefits
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:33:43 AM

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

I want to go on the record as opposing the planned Reparations Act.
I have read the materials and the "Reject The Plan" outline. I agree that these actions would be unconstitutional and unfair in their face. Thanks for allowing me to express my opposition to Reparations benefits for one class of citizens.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc Joseph Rabideau, PT
Physical Therapy of San Francisco
2410-18th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
415.681.9287 clinic phone
415.681.6329 clinic fax

From:	Emily Morris
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementing all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 7:42:28 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. I am writing to urge you to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Thank you for your time,
Emily

Emily Morris
emilys.morris21@gmail.com
128 N Humboldt St,
San Mateo, California 94401

From:	john nelson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 6:45:45 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

john nelson
johnnelson540@gmail.com
445 O'farrell ST
San Francisco, California 94102

From:	Nicholas Endres
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 6:33:55 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Nicholas Endres
nickendres@gmail.com
1225 Channing Way
Berkeley, California 94702

From:	Frederick Martin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 12:05:18 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Frederick Martin
heirwitjes@gmail.com
1510 Eddy St, 1201
San Francisco, California 94115

From:	Cyrone Byrd
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); MYR-ALL Department Heads; alidafisher@sfusd.edu; kevineboggess@sfusd.edu; jennylam@sfusd.edu; lisaweissman-ward@sfusd.edu; MattAlexander@sfusd.edu; lainiemotamedi@sfusd.edu; MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; waynem@sfusd.edu
Subject:	San Francisco Office of Reparations
Date:	Sunday, September 17, 2023 11:32:29 PM

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

>
> Hello, my name is Cyrone Byrd. I believe it's absolutely essential to create an office of reparations for African American. Reparations a long over due for African Americans, & Here are a few reasons that it's important:
> 1. Historical context: African Americans have faced centuries of systematic oppression, including slavery, segregation, discriminatory policies, and economic disadvantages. Reparations acknowledge this historical context and aim to address the long-lasting effects of these injustices.
> 2. Economic Inequality: African Americans in the United States and particularly in San Francisco, have consistently experienced lower levels of wealth, income, and educational opportunities compared to our white counterparts. Reparations can help bridge the economic gap by providing financial resources, educational support, and business opportunities.
> 3. Redress for Past Injustices: Reparations seek to provide redress for the injustices suffered by African Americans, such as forced labor and exploitation endured during slavery and subsequent racial discrimination. Establishing an Office of Reparations signifies a commitment to rectifying these past wrongs.
> 4. Generational Wealth Transfer: Due to historical disadvantages and discriminatory practices, African American ms have been unable to accumulate wealth at the same rate as white Americans. Reparations can help address this wealth gap by providing resources and opportunities that enable the transfer of generational wealth.
> 5. Symbolic and Moral Responsibility: Creating an Office of Reparations demonstrates a recognition of the systemic racism and injustices faced by African Americans. It sends a powerful message that society acknowledges the need to address these inequalities and works towards racial justice and equality.
> 6. Truth and Reconciliation: Reparations can contribute to the healing process by fostering a sense of truth and reconciliation. By acknowledging past wrongs and providing reparative measures, it opens the door for dialogue, understanding, and healing between the communities.
> 7. Leading by Example: By establishing an Office of Reparations, San Francisco can serve as a model for other cities and jurisdictions, inspiring them to undertake similar initiatives. It can be a catalyst for broader discussion and actions surrounding reparations at the national level.
> Lastly I would like to mention that African Americans have received some of the worst racism, and endured it for the longest amount of time. Yet we the only ethnicity that hasn't received any reparations or compensation after being promised 40 acres and a mule. Also there are many African Americans who have passed away before receiving their proper reparations. Please Let us begin the process of long overdue reparations for our African American community.
>
> Cyrone Byrd

From:	Gowan Mclin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Saturday, September 16, 2023 11:07:27 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Gowan Mclin
gowanmclin@gmail.com
20 Towerside Ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From:	Eneshal Miller
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Saturday, September 16, 2023 5:38:19 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Eneshal Miller
eneshalmiller371@gmail.com
8560 Second Ave
Silver Spring , Maryland 20910

From:	Cassandra Pierce
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 10:20:28 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Cassandra Pierce
cece4me2@yahoo.com
639 Lakeview
San Francisco , California 94112

From:	Angela
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; RonenStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	Support for Reparations for Black San Franciscans
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:05:56 PM

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

Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support for the SF Reparations Plan. It's crucial that we acknowledge and address the historical injustices and systemic discrimination that have disproportionately affected African Americans in our city, and this plan does exactly that.

The recent report detailing the harm inflicted by public policies paints a disturbing picture of the hardships faced by many Black San Franciscans. The disparities [_____ (**fill in with specific harm: ie: *in housing, exposure to environmental racism, educational opportunities, etc.*)]** are undeniable. It is our moral obligation to take concrete steps towards rectifying these injustices.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to vote in favor of the reparations plan. Reparations are a vital step towards healing the wounds of the past and building a more equitable and inclusive future for all residents of San Francisco.

Furthermore, I would like to request that the Board of Supervisors ensures transparency and accountability in the allocation and distribution of reparations funds. This will help build trust and confidence within the community and ensure that the intended goals are met.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. Please consider my support for reparations as you make your decision, and I hope that you will choose to stand on the right side of history by supporting this important initiative.

Sincerely,

Angela R. Y. Jenkins

.

Bos 11

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2023 SEP 19 AM 10: 08
BY

September 16, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Carlton B Goodlett Plaza, Suite 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Attn: Aaron Peskin and members of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco City and County

I am a supporter of the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, and attend their monthly meetings in City Hall. I'm writing to you today to express support for legislation of findings of the AARAC, and to ask that you make clear that threats to undermine these actions will not be tolerated.

I would also like to take a moment to describe my reasons for supporting diverse, quality legal representation that reflects the history and needs of the African American, Black community and all BIPOC communities in the San Francisco Bay Area.

At the age of 35, I became the subject of a U.S. Executive ordered torture, psy-op and enhanced interrogation *without a formal charge* by a former U.S. Executive. Prior to this event I had no knowledge that I had come into contact with intelligence, or how federal intelligence functioned. In January of 2017, I began a legal search for lawyers qualified to represent an individual where classified legal content was relevant to representation. I began this search while having no knowledge of who might help me, and while being the subject of severe harassment by the torture-counterintelligence employed by the former Executive.

Within a period of six years -between January of 2017 and January of 2023- I contacted at least thirty legal forums that included faculty of Ivy Legue Law Schools and Law Firms, the Attorney General's office, the Office of U.S. Attorney in San Francisco, and three offices of the Department of Justice. I spent six years, without a car visiting the federal buildings, requesting any information related to who could help me with submitting information of classified torture assault and where to obtain proper legal representation. I did this while the Executive's torture-counterintelligence were permitted to enter my home, threaten my family and disrupt emails and phone calls. In September of 2018, I travelled to the UNHCR in Geneva, Switzerland to request a diplomatic intervention based on horrific classified torture, obstructions to representation, and identified involuntary displacement. When I returned home, I was sent a notice that I had not exhausted all domestic resources and that my submissions were not in the proper legal format. I was never able to reach a UNHCR Special Rapporteur for assistance from the U.S., and found that noone within the U.S. could direct me to an individual who was familiar with the UNHCR treaty or assisting individuals with completing their complaints for submission.

Between January of 2017 and January of 2023, **not one** federal agency that I contacted was able to direct me to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, or to the U.S. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance court as the correct locations for submitting classified interrogation evidence. Noone referred to these courts, or knew where to request representation and a protective order for classified torture. I received referrals to community legal clinics that could not assist me, or to law firms that were only familiar with torture related to immigration.

Non-classified information from my enhanced review demonstrated that I had been the subject of torture based solely on the use of censored physical eugenics practices, permitted by the former Executive. Supportive intelligence discovered that I have an immunity to malaria and naturally inherited African American gene expression that promoted healthy teeth, skin, hair growth, and high integrity nervous tissue repair; considered lighter and more desirable by the Executive's torture. Unfortunately, the Executive's torture were permitted to censor this information by attempting to thin the sides of my hair, and experiment with skin lightening, hair removal across the rest of my body, and tooth filing as an adult. I would not have this information if supportive intelligence from the U.K., Europe, the former Soviet Union, Africa, and China had not been present to investigate these activities when I was a small child. Sadly, this has had no impact on my ability to acquire legal information at a County or Federal level while being the subject of violent torture. I have yet to meet a lawyer who is familiar with representing an individual who has been the subject of classified eugenics, or who is knowledgeable about the Black intelligence experience. I've only found that modern eugenics have been unlawfully forced into classified censorship in this county, following World War II. Comparatively, I have met individuals who have shared being the subject of domestic torture, and they have never received help or an acknowledgement for their suffering. They are all persons of color.

I am writing to advocate for quality legal support for the African American community and for persons of color who have lived through decades of decline in legal care, where the pool of knowledgeable legal representation has become invisible. I would like to see support for County Police Force and District Attorney education, and the establishment of responsive Victim Witness programs that will support and not turn away individuals who have similar experiences to my own. I also welcome an Incident Drop Box, where citizens can file a complaint on carbon paper in designated precinct offices, without the need for an officer present, that can then be reviewed at a later time with an officer and social worker.

The meetings that the AARAC have provided for the public have been instrumental in offering a place of safety for individuals like myself whose voices have been silenced. I greatly appreciate your review of my letter and please Legislate the Financial Action.

Most Respectfully,

Rebecca L. Bradshaw

Rebecca L. Bradshaw

22 South Park, Unit 220
San Francisco, California 94107
Email: rbbradshaw@yahoo.com

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	27 Letters regarding File No. 230078
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:46:00 PM
Attachments:	27 Letters regarding File No. 230078.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 27 letters regarding File No. 230078.

> **File No. 230078 -** Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative Updates - September 19, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Angela A
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Angela A
Subject:	To add to 9/19/23 REPARATIONS Minutes
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:56:49 PM
Attachments:	Angela Alexandrea Reparations Comment to BOS_091923.pdf

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

If you prefer a WORD DOC kindly TEXT ME and I'll send you one:
415-570-3690

To add to the Minutes of the September 19, 2023 Board of Supervisors Meeting

Dear Board of Supervisors,
I called in and made a curtailed public comment, simply because allotting one minute for each public comment is insufficient for some, (though understandable), which was the case for me. I was however told that I can send in my recommendation comment as well as the ideas I gave to Aaron Peskin back in March. And these would be added to today's meeting minutes.

My "1-minute comment was to be fully this:
"My name is Angela Alexandrea
Back in March, members of The Board, appeared to express a desire for Reparations, which leaves the QUESTION OF HOW? As a constituent of Supervisor Peskin, back in March, I gave Aaron several suggestions that could be considered towards FUNDING REPARATIONS—POTENTIALLY ***WITHOUT BURDENING SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS,*** *which means, holding accountable entities who profited from actions directed toward African-Americans, WHO CONTINUE PROSPERING EVEN TODAY; WEALTH BUILT OFF OF blacks!! And, one of my suggestions included The City BRINGING LAWSUITS ON BEHALF OF THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO aimed at institutions/entities, funding that can be used for restitution. I also want to point out ANOTHER MAJOR IMPACT from the reduction in population of the black community over these decades is the impact to OUR POLITICAL POWER; as someone mentioned earlier during public comment, OUR POWER LIES IN OUR POWER TO NEGOTIATE yet how do we do that without sufficient political power and/or without our allies? Lastly, I want to also express that* ***PRIORITY MUST BE GIVEN TO SENIORS PERSONS STARTING AT AGE 62/65 AND OLDER and DONE SO QUICKLY BEFORE WE DIE****!. Dr. Davis during her presentation, mentioned seniors, indicating age 70 or 80 – NO!!* ***It has to be earlier than that!!!*** *Lastly, there has already been acknowledgement of SFARRC committee members, well-deserved, AND acknowledgement needs to be given to the members of the public who have been involved FOR MONTH, many, many months of subcommittee meetings, group discussions, suggestions culled and there were those such as myself, behind the scenes, conducting research projects, without stipend, to aid towards development of the report. Thank you to EVERYONE WHO HELPED!!"*

Here is what I had given to Aaron Peskin back in March:

" I have heard so many be concerned about the cost. In consideration of that and surely the slew of pushback that will arise related to costs, an idea came to my mind where I wondered **if the City of San Francisco could recoup the funds paid out for the Reparations??**

Any black residents who meet the residency requirement and who also is a descendant of Chattel Slavery should be made a plaintiff against those who profited. We cannot expect the Federal Government to bring redress for harms the done to the black community but, the City of San Francisco can.

Recoup how? By suing, on behalf of the black residents of San Francisco, specific businesses, organizations, **(including entities outside of the US),** as well as countries—YES COUNTRIES – (even African countries), involved in **the slave trade or involved in any activity** that brought

harm or who profited from blacks. This approach is not only fair and justified but could make it a win-win all around—black residents benefit, and the city doesn't lose! **However, I hope we don't have to wait until any case is settled in order to receive such compensation!**
PAY US REPARATIONS FIRST AND THEN WORK ON RE-COUPING THE FUNDS.

Here is a law firm I had found named **Hagens Berman;** seems highly competent; their main page is this: https://www.hbsslaw.com *(btw, Looks like their most recent case is the train derailment in East Palestine.)* **Hagens Berman's** cases have involved not only individuals, but companies, (foreign and domestic), cities, states and countries!! I came across a mention of Hagens Beman in a report titled: **European Class Action Report 2021**
The report mentions Hagens Berman as having opened an office in the UK, which might be handy given that a significant portion of the slave trade was from the British and Portugal!!)
https://cms.law/en/media/international/files/publications/publications/cms-european-class-actions-report-2021?v=2

This is the link of many cases they have been involved with; you'll see some very high caliber clients, and get an idea of the quality and breadth of their cases; cases of immense importance such magnitude: https://www.hbsslaw.com/cases

You can also filter by area. Here are cases involving governmental representation:
https://www.hbsslaw.com/practices/governmental-representation

They have/are apparently doing/are doing work for the City of San Francisco.
I saw this one in which the defendants are: Chevron Corp., Exxon Mobil Corp., Royal Dutch Shell PLC and ConocoPhillips
here: https://www.hbsslaw.com/cases/climate-change-san-francisco-oakland

And there is this case: https://www.hbsslaw.com/press/mckesson-corp/hbss-co-counsels-with-san-francisco-city-attorney-in-case-against-mckesson

Btw…I'm not a lawyer, but didn't Citizens United declare that corporations are. People? Don't let them use a corporation status to try to get out of paying!)

Can a country be sued? Well, I recently saw this example of a US citizen suing a country:
Washington Post journalist Jason Rezaian sues Iran over 'torture'
"The lawsuit says Mr Rezaian suffered "irreparable harm" due to "torture and other cruel treatment".
https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-37552607

Isn't "irreparable harm" due to "torture and other cruel treatment" familiar to what was done to black folks here in this country?

There is also this article—again I am not a lawyer and wondered if this can be employed:
"… since the enactment of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act(FSIA) in 1976, foreign sovereigns have become subject to a number of statutory exceptions to immunity in U.S. courts. **The most significant exception is for when the foreign nation conducts "commercial activity" with a U.S. nexus**…"
https://www.justsecurity.org/71263/suing-foreign-states-in-us-courts/

Wasn't slavery a commercial activity??!!

We must move toward healing…
I believe reparations is not ONLY ABOUT MONETARY COMPENSATION. There has to be acknowledgments and apologies made; **forgiveness asked for and forgiveness given.** There needs to be redress and healing. A comprehensive Reparations plan that considers several factors that may contribute to one's healing. Personally FREE **genealogy research/resources** with just as importantly FREE **DNA MATCHING** should be added to the plan. Our ancestors were taken from tribes, slave owners raped our women, (and men and children too!) within my blood runs the DNA of who? Growing up in foster care, not knowing my own direct roots, plays into a large void of not knowing my identity. Many Americans can celebrate with family reunions or know their European roots. Knowing where you come from is not only powerful but brings a sense of belonging and connection, helps in the healing process. That is why genealogy and DNA MATCHING matters.

I would request that you keep in mind my story and my requests when you are conferring with other members of the Board. I must also stress this is my story. I do not know the hardships and/or tragedies others may have endured; surely some worse than mine but the common denominator I feel is the suffering we've experienced due to a system that has not valued, nurtured nor supported black people since the inception of this country. And to make it even more difficult is when there is a need to have these discussions, yet some folks would find it easier to talk about sex than face truths and talk about race.

Schedule of payouts:
I notice so much attention and discussion is given on youth support and development yet much less attention is given on the two population groups of greatest needs: **seniors and persons with disabilities.**

Priority of payments should **first go to seniors, age 65 and up**!!!! Afterall it is the OLDER GENERATION WHO HAS BEEN MOST IMPACTED BY RACISM; particularly those born **before or during the Civil Rights era** (1954-1968).

Then priority (or at the same time that seniors are paid), to **persons with disabilities who are <u>NOT</u> working**!!!

Also…
DO NOT pay out seniors in installments. I am 66 years old. I want a lump sum—TAX FREE or at a greatly discounted tax rate. **I hope I live long enough to see an actual payment** providing a means for me to live my remaining years with some level of enjoyment, which I have not really had in most of my life and I am sure there are plenty others such as myself.

Do however make installment payouts, if proposed, to the younger folks, between a determined age bracket. In fact, I feel younger folks should get less compensation relative to older folks as today's generation has a slew of support services available <u>and</u> they have experienced FAR LESS racism given their shorter existence and given the strides our country has made in race relations, despite continued challenges. This is not the case for older folks nor was it EVER the case when I was growing up. I wish some of the resources, services and free benefits, available to young people today were available when I was growing up --my life would have unfolded differently.

From: Toni Hines
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reparations for African Americans
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:10:29 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors
Please accept the recommendations of the Reparations Committee. African Americans are harmed by many San Francisco Departments. Please protect this group of your constituents.
Thanks you

Sent from Mail for Windows

From:	justin williams
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:42:02 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

justin williams
jgouda32@gmail.com
4227 lincoln way
sf , California 94122

From:	veronica pittman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:40:05 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

veronica pittman
veronicapittman11@yahoo.com
4227 lincoln way
san francisco , California 94122

From: Maya Pollak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: SF Reparations
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:38:22 PM

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

Hi there,

I’m a Noe Valley resident and am emailing to voice my strong support for SF Reparations. I hope you’ll take action on the critical recommendations outlined in the SF Reparations Plan.

Thank you for your consideration,
Maya Pollak

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mcwilliams Joseph
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Reparations
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 5:36:43 PM

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

I Joseph Williams 30 resident of SF and
City Employee
I'm present at the last city hall meeting 9/18/23

The Crime that was inflicted upon my people
has caused the outburst of Crime in the Community and around the world

The key to this message is Safety
Ones you Pay reparations this will clearly reduce crime nearly 50/% (Safety first)

Pay up
Thank you

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From:	Austin Stack
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:51:29 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Austin Stack
sfrocker@comcast.net
155 Bronte Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Joyce Nakamura
To:	BOS-Supervisors; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); aynem@sfusd.edu
Subject:	Support for Final African American Reparations Plan
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:38:15 PM

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

I am a 3rd generation Japanese American who has lived most of my life in San Francisco since 1972. I now reside in District 3.

I agree with the Final African American Reparations Plan that focuses on the City of San Francisco harms of redevelopment. I witnessed the last legs of the redevelpment destruction of the Black community in the Fillmore District in the 1970's. Formally known as the "Harlem of the West," redevelopment destroyed not only the residential community, but the Black middle class, further harnessing any hope of generating generational wealth, along with the City's policies and pracetice of over cimininalization of the Black community, educational restrictions and workplace discrimination.

Reparations is long overdue to address the harms inflicted on the Black community in San Francisco. I urge the adoption of the Final African American Reparations Plan to begin the process of rectifying these harms for currenmt and future generations sof Black San Franciscans.

Joyce Nakamura
resdient of District 3

From:	Jennifer Kozicki
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:27:50 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Jennifer Kozicki
jkozicki@glide.org
330 Ellis
San Francisco , California 94102

From:	Mrs. Nikcole Cunningham
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); MYR-ALL Department Heads; alidafisher@sfusd.edu; kevineboggess@sfusd.edu; jennylam@sfusd.edu; lisaweissman-ward@sfusd.edu; MattAlexander@sfusd.edu; lainiemotamedi@sfusd.edu; MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; waynem@sfusd.edu
Cc:	Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); asha.safai@sfgov.org; Chan, Connie (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Public comment for 9/19/2023
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:23:22 PM

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

Hello Mayor Breed, Superintendent, Board of Supervisors and staff,

I apologize that I cannot be physically present in today's meeting with you due to being ill. I'd like to take this time to thank you all for showing up as your best selves to hear our plea to your humanity about our humanity as Black people in San Francisco.

I have the following asks of you:
1) Please do not bring any Reparations recommendations to the San Francisco residents to vote on, they do not want Black people to have reparations.

2) Please sign our recommendations into LAW directly in a way that they must be enforced where consequences and repercussions will be bestowed on if not enforced. We (Black people) are human beings and deserve to be treated as such.

3) Please personally review all of our over 140 recommendations and personally commit to overseeing 8-10 recommendations each. With your personal commitment, we can reach nearly all recommendations. These recommendations are simple humanity needs, not gifts, not something "special," it's an attempt to make Black people whole again in a way no one else has ever attempted to do so.

4) Please vote for the Office of Reparations and fully fund this office in a manner that it will thrive for the next 400 years.

5) Please hire someone outside of the City and County of San Francisco to lead and head the Office of Reparations. We need someone who is not tied to the City and County of San Francisco in any capacity. You've seen the systemic corruption exposed in the past few years within several City departments; we cannot allow this very important office to become corrupt or neglected by anyone already involved with harming Black people in San Francisco. Anti-blackness and racism runs rapidly throughout all offices in the City and County of San Francisco.

6) Please allow the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee, Mayor Breed, Supervisor Walton, and Dr. Sheryl Davis to be part of the interviewing process for the leadership of the Office of Reparations. We cannot afford to others to hire someone who will continue the harm, we all should be directly involved with hiring the best person to head this department.
Side note: All Black folk are not kin folk meaning...just because someone is Black, it does not mean they will do right by Black people.

In conclusion, until Black people can walk in any state in this country and feel SAFE and PROTECTED like any white woman can, we are not equal! Do what you can to put YOUR vote towards real enforceable policies to attempt to protect Black people at all costs!

Thank you for your time and support to make restitution to Black people harmed by the policies and racist acts in San Francisco.

Nikcole Cunningham
Member of the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee (seat 6)

Racist status: Not-Racist, You?
Preferred Pronouns: She/Her I support LGBTQA+

"You have to find the blessings within the hell you're in!" Nikcole

From: Mrs. Nikcole Cunningham
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); MYR-ALL Department Heads; alidafisher@sfusd.edu; kevineboggess@sfusd.edu; jennylam@sfusd.edu; lisaweissman-ward@sfusd.edu; MattAlexander@sfusd.edu; lainiemotamedi@sfusd.edu; MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu; waynem@sfusd.edu
Cc: Walton, Shamann (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); asha.safai@sfgov.org; Chan, Connie (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS)
Subject: Public comment for 9/19/2023
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:23:19 PM

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

Hello Mayor Breed, Superintendent, Board of Supervisors and staff,

I apologize that I cannot be physically present in today's meeting with you due to being ill. I'd like to take this time to thank you all for showing up as your best selves to hear our plea to your humanity about our humanity as Black people in San Francisco.

I have the following asks of you:
1) Please do not bring any Reparations recommendations to the San Francisco residents to vote on, they do not want Black people to have reparations.

2) Please sign our recommendations into LAW directly in a way that they must be enforced where consequences and repercussions will be bestowed on if not enforced. We (Black people) are human beings and deserve to be treated as such.

3) Please personally review all of our over 140 recommendations and personally commit to overseeing 8-10 recommendations each. With your personal commitment, we can reach nearly all recommendations. These recommendations are simple humanity needs, not gifts, not something "special," it's an attempt to make Black people whole again in a way no one else has ever attempted to do so.

4) Please vote for the Office of Reparations and fully fund this office in a manner that it will thrive for the next 400 years.

5) Please hire someone outside of the City and County of San Francisco to lead and head the Office of Reparations. We need someone who is not tied to the City and County of San Francisco in any capacity. You've seen the systemic corruption exposed in the past few years within several City departments; we cannot allow this very important office to become corrupt or neglected by anyone already involved with harming Black people in San Francisco. Anti-blackness and racism runs rapidly throughout all offices in the City and County of San Francisco.

6) Please allow the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee, Mayor Breed, Supervisor Walton, and Dr. Sheryl Davis to be part of the interviewing process for the leadership of the Office of Reparations. We cannot afford to others to hire someone who will continue the harm, we all should be directly involved with hiring the best person to head this department.
Side note: All Black folk are not kin folk meaning...just because someone is Black, it does not

mean they will do right by Black people.

In conclusion, until Black people can walk in any state in this country and feel SAFE and PROTECTED like any white woman can, we are not equal! Do what you can to put YOUR vote towards real enforceable policies to attempt to protect Black people at all costs!

Thank you for your time and support to make restitution to Black people harmed by the policies and racist acts in San Francisco.

Nikcole Cunningham
Member of the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee (seat 6)

Racist status: Not-Racist, You?
Preferred Pronouns: She/Her I support LGBTQA+

"You have to find the blessings within the hell you're in!" Nikcole

From: Jennifer Waggoner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support implementation of SF African American Reparations Committee recommendations
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:17:25 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan. Delays or no action is unacceptable.

Jennifer Waggoner
jenny-AN@consume.org
912 Cole St, Suite 326
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117

From: Jackie Wright, W.E. Power&UNITY Spotlight
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Happening Now, San Francisco Reparations Rally Followed by 2 p.m. Board of Supervisors Meeting, The City's Office of Economic and Workforce Development Transitions, BWDPA's Mental Health Symposium
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 1:20:48 PM

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

Wright Enterprises-Community Spotlight

(Greatest Message of All time) **September 19, 2023**

HAVE YOU SIGNED UP FOR W.E. ENEWS YET?

Videos and Information from the Office of Phyllis Bowie- Click Here for more details

Supervisor Shamann Walton

ERIC MCDONNELL, CHAIRMAN
SAN FRANCISCO REPARATIONS COMMITTEE

IT'S NOT REPARATIONS IN ONE PLACE. IT'S REPARATIONS IN EVERY PLACE. THANK YOU FROM THE BOTTOM OF MY HEART...IT DOESN'T STOP HERE...IT'S JUST THE BEGINNING...

Anietie Ekanem
Member SF Reparations Committee

All Free to Call in the City or Outside.

Remote Participation: Watch SF Cable Channel 26, 28, 78, or 99 (depending on your provider) Watch www.sfgovtv.org
Public Comment Phone Number 1 (415) 655-0001
Meeting ID: 2664 385 6418 # # (Press *3 to enter the speaker line)

MORE SAN FRANCISCO CITY NEWS...



September 19, 2023

Dear Esteemed Community Partners and Colleagues,

It has been an honor and a privilege to work closely with you all as San Francisco's Director of Workforce Development these past 5+ years. It has been a joy to help support your programs and to develop so many new initiatives with you on behalf of the communities we serve. Together we have established new policies, practices, and frameworks that I have been excited to share, often side by side with so many of you, with other workforce development boards around the state and country.

At last week's workforce board meeting, I shared that I'm transitioning out of my role as Director of Workforce Development at the end of the month and I invite you all to join us at the "**Working Together 2023**" event on**Wednesday September 27 from 5-7 PM** (7 PM or beyond!) at Bissap Baobab, located at 2243 Mission Street, for what I hope will become a new annual tradition at the workforce shop after I'm gone.

"Working Together" celebrates National Workforce Development Month, our community and labor partners, and outgoing workforce leaders. This year's inaugural event highlights the work that we collectively do in workforce development to recruit, train and support job seekers and workers on behalf of the community and society. We will also recognize those who have transitioned onto their next chapters as part of the continuum of leadership development in this work, including longtime workforce folks like Jeff Mori, David Taylor and myself.

I am grateful to Mayor London Breed for her faith in appointing me to this role in the summer of 2018, and it's been a pleasure and inspiration to spend 5+ years working alongside our amazing OEWD team and all of our community, labor Union, business, education, and government partners.

I hope to see you all on the 27th, and please RSVP if you can to Armina Brown at ladiirobinson@gmail.com.

Lastly, please let us all never forget to, as Human Rights Commission Director Dr. Sheryl Davis says, "Celebrate Community" each and every day.

Thank you all,

Josh

Joshua Arce, **Director of Workforce Development**
Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), Workforce Division
City and County of San Francisco

1 South Van Ness, 5th Fl., San Francisco, CA 94103
415.701.4861 (DIRECT) 415.701.4848 (MAIN) 415.701.4894 (FAX)
Joshua.Arce@sfgov.org
OEWD/Workforce | Job Centers | Training Orientations
#LocalHire #WorkforceSF



OTHER NEWS...



Kelly Armstrong, host of podcast "Straight Talking with Kelly" lauds KTVU's Claudine Wong's Interview of The Oakland International Film Festival Co-founder and Executive Director, David Roach.
Click Image to see the Interview.



Related Article

The Oakland International Film Festival by Zaire Saunders
https://sfbayview.com/2023/09/the-oakland-international-film-festival-starts-sept-14/

"SURVIVAL"
COMING SOON ON STREAMING PLATFORMS 9/25/23
READ ABOUT IT--CLICK THE IMAGE
READ ABOUT DAMON JAMAL, CO-WRITER & DIRECTOR, AN ALUM OF SAN FRANCISCO BLACK FILM FESTIVAL

KRON TV'S OLIVIA HORTON SPEAKS DAMON JAMAL





WATCH THE "SURVIVAL" TRAILER.

LISTEN OUT FOR THE UPCOMING INTERVIEW
STREAMING WITH DAMON JAMAL ON
ABC7'S MORNINGS @ 7

IN OTHER NEWS...



CLICK IMAGE FOR DETAILS







WRIGHT ENTERPRISES COMMUNITY SPOTLIGHT COMMUNITY NEWS

SIGN UP FOR W.E. COMMUNITY SPOTLIGHT NEWSLETTER!

Wright Enterprises Community Spotlight Recent Editions:

"Rediscover Oakland & The World Through Film" 21st Oakland International Film Festival, Barbara Lee & Elihu Harris Lecture, BWOPA Mental Health Symposium & More
https://conta.cc/469CWEz

Remembering 9-11, Lest We Forget...W.E. Salute
https://conta.cc/4684IRA

Hope Your Labor Day Weekend Was Great---Thanks to Labor Keeping the Country and World Going...Artistically and Financially The Arts Contribute to Local, National, and Economies Worldwide
https://conta.cc/45TeiI7

Remember August 28, 1963...Remember Jacksonville...Remember "Love Thy Neighbor" Honorary Mayor Beyoncé in The Bay in Dos Dias
https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://conta.cc/3spkTLQ___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlmN2FjNTA1NDJiMzVkYzY0ZDc3ZDo2OjI2NjM6NzIjOWUwZDdhN2IzYzQ0ZWY5ODU1MGE1MjhmOTYxZDdkOTM3ZjE4MzAyNzNjMzM2NDlmNzlhZGZkOTRjNGE2ZTp0OlQ

DFW-LL COOL "The F.O.R.C.E. Tour 50 Years of Hip Hop" Hits the Heart of One Half A Century Admirer in Dallas Metroplex
Plus Questlove and the Roots, Rakim, M.C. Lyte, Ceelo Green and Goodie Mob, Raekwon from the Wu-Tang Clan, Juvenile, Bone Thugs and Harmony and Big Boi Making Some Noise
https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://conta.cc/3KX33qe___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlmN2FjNTA1NDJiMzVkYzY0ZDc3ZDo2OmU3NWE6NDA1MWM4Y2MwZjhmNTI0NjQ5MDNmN2QzMTViOWY1ZjRlOWU3NDhiYzcxYmIxNGY4ODZmNjdmOWZkYzNkZDVlMzp0OlQ

SAN FRANCISCO-NOW-6 P.M. FREE ! HOWARD HEWITT; DIGITAL UNDERGROUND; CASE, PLUS MORGAN FREEMAN'S DOC ON WWII 761st BATTALION & More
https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://conta.cc/3KPZKAV___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlmN2FjNTA1NDJiMzVkYzY0ZDc3ZDo2OjQ3ZTQ6NWJjZWM0YjBmNjU0YjFiOTRmZjBlZTQ

4NmZkZDcxZTMyYmRiZDI5YzExMjcwNzk0YzlhNDk0OTgyYTQ5MzOzOTp0OlQ

Oakland, CA - Join Black Women Organized for Political Action/Training Institute for Leadership Enrichment (BWOPA/TILE) for its final presentation for Cohort 7 of the Dezie Woods Jones Policy Fellowship Program, Wednesday, August 16th, via ZOOM, 6:00-8:30 p.m.
https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://conta.cc/47sjq7t___YXAzONmZHOyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlmN2FjNTA1NDJiMzVkYzY0ZDc3ZDo2OjhmYjU6Njk1NTI2YTFiMTEwYzE5OTRhYmUxMWNlZTYyN2RiZjcwMzkwMGZlZjU3OTg5MWFmMGYwMTg5ZWJmNDY5MDNiZjp0OlQ

Jackie Wright,
President of Wright Enterprises
Contact: jackiewright@wrightnow.biz
415 525 0410

BE INSPIRED WITH
30 MINUTES TO SUCCESS
INSPIRATIONAL TUESDAY TALKS
ON TUESDAY TALKS INSPIRE YOUTUBE CHANNEL

Share This Email | Share This Email | Share This Email

Wright Enterprises-Community Spotlight | P.O. Box 591077, San Francisco, CA 94159
https://url.avanan.click/v2/___www.wrightnow.biz___YXAzOnNmZHOyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlmN2FjNTA1NDJiMzVkYzY0ZDc3ZDo2OjgyNWY6MDRjOWM0Y2EwZjA4NWVkMjY2OTE3ZmYyNmYwNjMwODk0MDRlNTljZGQxMDU5ZDhhNWRhNWNhOTUzYmUzNDU5ZjpOOlQ

Unsubscribe board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Update Profile | Constant Contact Data Notice
Sent by jackiewright@wrightnow.biz powered by

Try email marketing for free today!

From: Stacia Fink
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:36:45 PM

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

An outrage

From:	Dean Schaffer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS)
Subject:	SF Reparations Plan and Hearing
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:34:51 PM

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

Hi,

I'm writing to show my support for the San Francisco Reparations Plan, which I know is being considered in today's hearing. San Francisco must redress the discriminatory actions taken to violently displace, limit the political participation of, invisibilize, restrict the physical and financial mobility of, and otherwise harm Black people across San Francisco. It's critical that we be accountable for actions that subjugated Black people in San Francisco, the vestiges of which uphold the intent and legacy of chattel slavery and continue to have impacts today.

I'm a San Francisco resident in District 7 (Kirkham @ 8th Ave).

Thanks,

Dean Schaffer

From: Karen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:11:46 PM

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

Very slippery slope here, " we" have also taken land from American Indigenous peoples, incarcerated the Japanese, and perpetrated many other harmful acts, against many ethnic groups.

I urge you to stop this " reparations " discrimination (it is explicitly discriminatory) before San Francisco has to defend itself in another lawsuit.

Thanks in advance,
K. R. Schwartz
D8 resident and voter

From:	Marvin Fulton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:08:27 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Marvin Fulton
marvin69692004@yahoo.com
351 Turk st #612
San Francisco, 94102

From: Lucey Bowen
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Reparations
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:10:11 AM

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

I am a property tax payer in San Francisco. Please procede with long overdue reparations for those who were robbed by SF's destructive demolitions.--
Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: Maryanne Razzo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: SF Reparations Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:51:22 PM

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

Dear Honorable San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing with concern about the approval of the SF Reparations Plan and feel the disposition of those monies could endanger the solvency of San Francisco.

Additionally, there are several federal and state constitutional violations, civil rights act violations and court decisions making the SF Reparations Plan unlawful,

California Prop 209 - also known as the California Civil Rights Initiative or CCRI approved November 1996, amended the state constitution to prohibit state governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity or national origin specifically in the areas of public employment, public contracting, and public education, preventing the government from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment. Proposition 209 banned the use of affirmative action involving race-based or sex-based preferences in California.

California Article 1 Section 7 - California state constitution provides a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied equal protection of the laws.

California Article XI, Section 10(a) CA state Constitution provides a local government body ... may not pay a claim under an agreement made without authority of law.

California Article 34 - California state constitution requires voter approval before developing, constructing, or acquiring in any manner public housing (low-rent housing project) in a community.

Federal Title VI of Civil Rights Act - Was enacted as part of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance such as grants and student loans as well as racial segregation in schools and public accommodations, and employment discrimination.

Federal Title VII of Civil Rights Act – Also from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a federal employment law that prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

Federal 14th Amendment to US Constitution – Guarantees all citizens equal protection under law; a state shall not violate a citizen’s privileges; shall not deprive any person of property without due process of law; Regarding Segregation: In 1954 (Brown v. Board of Education) the Supreme Court unanimously held that separate schools for blacks and whites violated the Equal Protection Clause.

With great respect,

Maryanne Razzo
1118 Brussels Street
San Francisco, CA 94134

From:	Julien DeFrance
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Info. HRC (HRC); HRC-Reparations; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Souza, Sarah (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; RonenStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Re: NO TO THE REPARATIONS PLAN!
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:02:18 PM

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

You are all LUNATICS.

“SAN FRANCISCO — Payments of $5 million to every eligible Black adult, the elimination of personal debt and tax burdens, guaranteed annual incomes of at least $97,000 for 250 years and homes in San Francisco for just $1 a family.”

What is gonna be the cost of this non-sense for everyone else?

STUPIDITY and ARROGANCE have no limits with you all CORRUPT DEMOC’RATS!

San Francisco board open to reparations with $5M payouts
nbcnews.com

> On Sep 20, 2023, at 09:38, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> NONE OF THIS IS ECONOMICALLY VIABLE, EITHER.
>
> ALL OF YOU'RE GOING TO DO IS TO BANKRUPT THIS CITY.
>
> SHAME ON YOU.
> THIS IS NOT DEMOCRACY.
>
> On Tue, Sep 19, 2023 at 4:32 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com>

wrote:

> **NO ONE IS ENTITLED ANY SUCH THING AS REPARATIONS**
>
> **NO ONE LIVING IS SAN FRANCISCO TODAY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT HAPPENED OVER US HISTORY OR IN ANCIENT ROME OR WHENEVER**
>
> **WE ALL HAD ENOUGH OF YOUR BULLSHIT RADICAL-LEFT AGENDA, LISTENING TO ALL OF THOSE SOCIALIST LUNATICS**
>
> **STOP WASTING OUR HARD-EARNED TAXPAYERS DOLLARS.**
>
> **STOP THIS NON-SENSE AND DISSOLVE THE REPARATIONS COMMITTEE IMMEDIATELY.**
>
> **SAN FRANCISCO ISN'T A STOLEN LAND EITHER. IT MIGHT BE TIME YOU TAKE THIS LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT BULLSHIT OUT OF THE ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE OF THIS MEETING AND INSTEAD FOCUS ON THE ACTUAL GOAL OF THIS MEETING**

From:	Virginia Marshall
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:41:04 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Virginia Marshall
vmarshall999@yahoo.com
7A Gonzalez Dr
San Francisco, California 94132

From:	ALICE XAVER
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS)
Subject:	Oppose reparations
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:43:02 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

We are opposed to reparations to the black community, as suggested by the non elected Human Rights Commission and discussed by the Board of Supervisors.

The Chinese had no involvement in slavery or redlining. In fact, the Chinese were redlined and discriminated against. The Chinese Exclusion Act is a prime example of the US government allowing such discrimination.

The Chinese are still singled out and beaten, often by members of the Black community, yet no one dares to speak openly about this. Why? When the civil rights of the Chinese are violated, no one really cares. We are even asked to accept being pushed off a bus platform as an accident. Case closed!

Cheryl Davis, Director of the non elected Human Rights Commission, was once asked to address the beatings of the Chinese community at a Zoom meeting I attended She said “to forgive”. Well, we do not accept that response!

The Chinese people were offered an apology by the City and no reparations. The Black community should be given the same apology. Cash payments should not be part of the discussion unless it’s reparations for all who were discriminated against.

Thank you for your time. I realize this is a very difficult discussion.

Alice & Chris Xavier
D7

From:	Marc Brenman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Info, HRC (HRC); HRC-Reparations; Ronen, Hillary; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Krista.Pfefferkorn@sen.ca.gov; Jeff.Sparks@sen.ca.gov; assemblymember.haney@assembly.ca.gov; Staffabigail.rivamontemesa@asm.ca.gov
Cc:	richie@greenbergnation.com
Subject:	Comments on Reparations Proposals
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 7:46:34 AM

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

Dear Colleagues;
I understand the position of advocates on reparations for African-Americans, but there are many other disadvantaged populations in the City and State with a history of discrimination, including Asian-Americans, Hispanics, indigenous people, and people with disabilities.
Any set of benefits provided to African-Americans should be subject to means testing, so that wealthy and well-educated Blacks do not receive undue benefits.
In addition, benefits already received, such as subsidized housing, fair housing laws, passage and enforcement of civil rights nondiscrimination laws, investigation and resolution of civil rights complaints and grievances, the dollar amount of court ordered settlements, law enforcement efforts against hate crimes, disadvantaged business enterprise programs, preferences, quotas, affirmative action, aid to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Black studies programs, school lunch programs, Earned Income Tax Credit, LIHEAP, Section 8 vouchers, TANF, WIC, War on Poverty, etc. should be deducted from the reparations amounts granted.
Finally, anyone receiving the reparations benefits should be required to sign a binding legal document that they waive and forgo any past, present, and future claims to discrimination.
The City and State will also need to prepare for inevitable legal challenges based on Constitutional equal protection claims due to provision of benefits to a single racial group. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled against much affirmative action. Provision of benefits based on race will be subject to a strict scrutiny analysis under the U.S. Constitution and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
It will be very difficult to determine who is eligible. Certain myths need to be disposed of, such as the assertion that California was once a slave state. There is no American legal concept that the sins of the father are visited unto the son unto the seventh generation. Will benefits be distributed based on the percent of ancestors who lived in slavery? Would this be a perpetuation of the one-drop rule?
Where will the money come from? Will this money deprive other worthy programs of funding? How will individuals who receive the money spend it? Will there be any controls on how it is spent by individuals? Will the benefits be taxable?
All other reparations programs internationally have included the necessity to show direct connection within a single generation to the harm. This includes the Japanese-American reparations, which only went to those who were actually incarcerated, and the German Holocaust reparations, which required the direct connection within a single generation.
All in all, unless your approach takes these matters into serious consideration, you're

making a mistake. There are so many present problems and failures in the City and the State that need to be dealt with; this issue detracts from solving them, to the detriment of all other San Franciscans and Californians. It's time to think more broadly, of the City and State as a whole, and not concentrate so much on one relatively small population with only a tenuous or no connection to slavery.
Sincerely,
Marc Brenman
2636 Bryant St.
SF, CA 94110
Mbrenman001@comcast.net

From:	Lisa King
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Comment about African American Reparations in San Francisco
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:12:09 PM

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

Dear Office of the Clerk of the Board, and Board of Supervisors,

From some of my earliest memories in grade school, the issue of racial injustice has plagued my heart, mind, and consciousness, though I never experienced racial discrimination myself. I'm writing you today to say: May today's session actually move to its historic promise.

As a white woman who has been active in the struggle for Black Liberation since Trump was elected in 2017 and has lived in San Francisco for over 30 years. It took me far too long to see the depth of racial injustice and become active in the pursuit for change. I only became more aware by volunteering with Wealth & Disparities in the Black Community of the stats of inequities and injustices in San Francisco, which are shameful in all categories including how surprised nearly all the Supervisors we met with were about the stats of the disparities.

The trappings of greed are the American way, and so has racism been the dark foundation of this nation. I understand that most of what is being asked for is repair for harm done, and I couldn't be more pleased that we could be on the precipice of making this a reality. We must repair the harm and build a foundation forward for equality for all Black San Franciscans.

Supervisors will be encouraged to negotiate, limit, and may even be tempted to back-pedal on your gracious statements today. I urge you not to, and advance BOLD policy with speed. There is no more time to waste. This city, country and world desperately needs a racial reparations reckoning.

Yours,
Lisa King

PS. For a topic this important, 1 minute is NOT long enough for public comment. 2 minutes must become the minimum amount of time for any topic.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Motor homes on Winston and SFSU
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:33:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Remi Tan regarding proposed locations for RVs.

Sincerely,

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

From: Remi Tan <remitan@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:32 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: Motor homes on Winston and SFSU

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

Dear BOS and Mayor Breed. Heard about the city trying to move the motorhomes around SFSU and Winston. The City should consider pier 32 as that area is usually vacant and is near services

Thank you and Best Regards,

Remi Tan, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Architecture, Green/Sustainability Consulting, and Real Estate Investment

650-291-3097

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Dean Preston"s comment on empty shelter beds and the unhoused
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:39:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Remi Tan regarding vacant shelter spaces.

Sincerely,

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

From: Remi Tan <remitan@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:28 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: Dean Preston's comment on empty shelter beds and the unhoused

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

Dear Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed -

Heard on the news that Dean Preston is urging filling the 10% of available shelter spaces that is vacant. This is a great idea - the city should not have any vacant shelter spaces with the high amount of unhoused on our streets - and the board and mayor should put aside all political differences to make this happen. vacant beds is a waste of city resources that were spent to create and maintain them.

However, 10% vacancies out of the 1200 total shelter beds is only a drop in the bucket with only 120 available beds to house the purportedly 5000 homeless persons on the street out of total of 8000 homeless persons.

There has been anecdotal evidence that many of the unhoused are from out of area/state. The city should expand the homeward bound program to help return out of area/state unhoused to their original homes - many are missing persons that desperate families are trying to find. Only if the unhoused person was abused by family/spouse/partner, should the city consider placing the person in foster care(for youth) or shelter for battered persons. All others should be sent home. This should help reduce a large part of the unhoused population who are not from the city.

The majority of the unhoused are addicted to drugs. The city needs to be seeking money from the opioid settlements with Perdue, Sacklers and other pharma, pharmacy companies to help with the drug rehab programs and building more rehab beds which is the only real solution to the crisis.

Thank you and Best Regards,

Remi Tan, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Architecture, Green/Sustainability Consulting, and Real Estate Investment

650-291-3097

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: De Jure Recognition of Artsakh
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:43:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Richard Youatt regarding File No. 230979.

> **File No. 230979 -** Resolution declaring September 21, 2023, as Armenian Independence Day in the City and County of San Francisco and commemorating the 32nd Anniversary of Armenian Independence Day on September 21, 2023. (Melgar, Peskin, Safai, Mandelman, Stefani, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

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

From: Richard Youatt <richardyouatt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 1:44 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: De Jure Recognition of Artsakh

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

I urge you to work with all levels of Government, especially the Federal level, to establish de jure recognition of the Republic of Artsakh, its right to self-determination and freedom from wars of aggression by the government of Azerbaijan.

At the local level, I urge full public disclosure of the outcome of the investigation into the acts of arson committed against the offices of the St. Gregory's Armenian church on Commonwealth Avenue.

Sent from Mail for Windows

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject:	4 Letters Regarding File No. 230951
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:45:00 PM
Attachments:	4 Letters Regarding File No. 230951.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 4 letters regarding File No. 230951.

> **File No. 230951 -** Urging the Recreation and Park Department to Publicly Share Information Regarding Pilot Activation of UN Plaza and Take Steps to Mitigate Any Impact on the Farmers' Market. (Preston, Peskin)

Sincerely,

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

From:	Friedland
To:	Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Cc:	PrestonStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment re Civic Center Farmers Market/Skate Park plan.
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:06:40 PM

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

Dear Government Audit and Oversight Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the shift of the Farmers' Market from UN Plaza to Fulton Street for the sake of installing a skate park and other recreational equipment.

I'm not a resident of the Tenderloin, but I'm an employee of the City and County of San Francisco, and I work in the Tenderloin.

Rec & Park's plan for UN Plaza is mean-spirited and unproductive:

1) The farmers worked very hard throughout the pandemic to bring food to the heart of the city, especially to marginalized and poor folk who depend on this market for their produce needs.

This is how the City rewards them? By making farmers' jobs more difficult? Why take away their ease of parking? Why not prioritize their needs? **The shift has already impacted their livelihood. According to one farmer, due to the parking squeeze and the reduction of tent space with the relocation, each farmer is losing between $1,000 and $2,000 per week during their peak produce season.**

It's already very tough to be a small-scale farmer in the U.S. Let's give them the respect and ease-of-operation that they deserve.

2) **A skate park will not succeed in UN Plaza, and it doesn't meet the real needs of the Tenderloin community.**

Is this installation actually for the purpose of making the UN Plaza safer and more citizen friendly? Or, is it for burnishing Mayor's Breed's terrible image nationwide with respect to drug-dealing in that area? The skaters and drug dealers will co-exist just as Urban Alchemy staff and drug dealers are co-existing. The installation of ping pong tables will not cause the dealing to stop. **The dealing would only, temporarily, shift to Market Street and further into the streets of the Tenderloin.**

Parents will still not want to bring their kids to the UN Plaza to play if they have any other option.

If the Mayor and the City would like to make the Tenderloin District more "family friendly," they should instead come up with initiatives to improve the lives of the families that actually *live* in the Tenderloin, first, by close listening to the businesses and families of the neighborhood to learn what their unmet needs are.

Minimally, some honest assessment of the success of this skatepark in serving the Tenderloin community should be made after its first six months of operation if Rec & Park decides to move forward on this ill-conceived plan.

Thanks for considering my opinion as a worker who frequents UN Plaza many days a week and as a City of San Francisco employee and resident.

L Friedland
friedlandstaying@yahoo.com

From: Susan Keyte
To: Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject: I'm Against Replacing Heart of the City Farmer's Market With a Skate Park!!!
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 8:34:08 AM

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

I've just read the following SF Chronicle article and am horrified at this development.

'It's going to be a nightmare': SF displaces farmers market to make room for skate area

I own a condo in Opera Plaza & am surrounded by drug users, drug dealers & homeless enablers. Your idea of opening a skate area, etc. a few blocks away will be a huge magnet for more of what we're already experiencing.

In addition , you'll be ruining any chance for the new IKEA store to survive. It appears you have no idea of the disastrous consequences of this insane idea to Market Street, the tenderloin AND our beautiful Farmer's Market. You're going to bring more of the same lowlife teenagers & 20 somethings we're already dealing w/ 24/7.

Quote from SF Chronicle article:
"A message sent to the Recreation and Park Department was not returned before publication. However, Phil Ginsburg, general manager of San Francisco Recreation and Park, told the farmers market's Board of Directors that the recreation area is an experiment and that the vendors will be allowed to return if the project does not improve the public health issues in U.N. Plaza"

STOP. LEAVE US ALONE. DON'T DO THIS!!!!!!!! DECENT PEOPLE LIVE HERE, WE DON'T NEED OR WANT THIS KIND OF EXPERIMENT!!!!!!!! YOU BOTH KNOW DISTRICT 2 & I WONDER WHERE YOU LIVE THAT YOU WOULD COME UP W/ THIS HAIRBRAINED IDEA AS A REMEDY.

PLEASE RECONSIDER. Thank you.

Susan Keyte

Opera Plaza Condo Owner
601 Van Ness Ave., #741
San Francisco, CA. 94102
415-605-6903

From:	Tara Cahn
To:	Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject:	United Nations Plaza Heart of the City Farmer"s Market Heritage Site
Date:	Sunday, September 17, 2023 3:18:07 PM
Attachments:	United Nations Plaza Heart of the City Farmer"s Market Heritage Site.One of the hidden Jewels of SF.Final.docx

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

Clerk Stephanie Cabrera:
Re: Government Audit & Oversight Committee Meeting this week. Public comment submission.

Please see attached letter.

Thank you,
T.Cahn

Tara Cahn Architecture
Former Fulbright Scholar

From: Jan Michaels
To: Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject: Farmer"s Market Location Change
Date: Sunday, September 17, 2023 1:15:50 PM

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

Please put me down in the record as a SF resident who opposed the location change of the Farmer's Market at Civic Center Plaza. The market needs the extra space to thrive. A skateboard park at UN Plaza is not a good idea. It will not improve anything. Thank you, Jan Michaels

1580 Jackson St #11
San Francisco CA 94109

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Public comment for September 20, 2023 BOS Government Audit & Oversight Committee
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:38:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Adele Framer regarding File No. 230951, which is Item No. 2 on today's Government Audit and Oversight Committee agenda.

> **File No. 230951 -** Urging the Recreation and Park Department to Publicly Share Information Regarding Pilot Activation of UN Plaza and Take Steps to Mitigate Any Impact on the Farmers' Market (Preston, Peskin)

Sincerely,

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

From: Adele Framer <adeleframer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:39 PM
To: Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS) <stephanie.cabrera@sfgov.org>
Cc: MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public comment for September 20, 2023 BOS Government Audit & Oversight Committee

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

Comment on 2. 230951 [Urging the Recreation and Park Department to Publicly Share Information Regarding Pilot Activation of UN Plaza and Take Steps to Mitigate Any Impact on the Farmers' Market]

My name is Adele Framer. I live in current District 8. I've enjoyed shopping at the farmers' market on UN Plaza for more than 20 years, like thousands of other San Francisco voters.

I urge all supervisors to support this resolution.

I am very concerned about the health of the farmers' market. There are signs that the relocation to Fulton Plaza has been very rough for them. The new location is out of the way, too small, and logistically difficult. The farmers cannot afford much in the way of financial losses.

Everyone agrees that the farmers' market has been a shining asset to the city for 41 years. The crowds attracted by the farmers's market transformed UN Plaza every market day. It was established with a state grant to remedy a food desert. Without the market, the area is still a food desert.

The farmers' market is a small business and its members are mostly people of color who have worked hard to feed a poor neighborhood as well as thousands of other San Franciscans. If the farmers' market fails, I urge the committee to consider how this will affect food equity in the heart of San Francisco. How will this make our city look?

Overall, the UN Plaza project is poorly planned. Other than a paragraph describing skate ramp construction for Rec & Park's Planning application, I can find no formal plans, studies, or projected demographics or usage patterns for the skate park project. It never went before the Rec and Park board. The Planning department was told it was a temporary installation. Exactly how temporary is this slipshod pilot project?

This is not an obscure corner of the city. UN Plaza is a historic landmark and the gateway to our Civic Center. The Civic Center of the city of San Francisco belongs to all San Franciscans.

Why a skate park? Will that bring in the same kind of foot traffic as the farmers' market? I want to know why the Recreation and Park board did not explore other alternatives that would keep the farmers' market in place on UN Plaza. The night market organized by Supervisor Joel Engardio was a raging success. People come out for food. Why not have food in UN Plaza 7 days a week?

Sincerely,

Adele Framer

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Acquisition of the Dana King sculpture titled Monumental Reckoning currently on display
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:54:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Regina Sneed regarding the artwork *Monumental Reckoning* by artists Dana King.

Sincerely,

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

From: regina sneed <reginasneed@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:58 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Acquisition of the Dana King sculpture titled Monumental Reckoning currently on display

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

"It Makes One Speechless": 350 Sculptures Invoke First Enslaved Africans
hyperallergic.com

Dear Board Members:

To mark today in San Francisco history at the Board of Supervisors, the permanent display in Golden Gate Park and purchase of this great work of art would let the world know that San Francisco has recognized its history and plans to address its past and present in reparation and healing.

Please request the Arts Commission to purchase this work.

Thank you for considering my request.

Regina Sneed
District Two resident

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject:	1 Letter Regarding File No. 230826
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:57:00 PM
Attachments:	1 Letter Regarding File No. 203826.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for communication from Denny Garbuio regarding File No. 230826.

File No. 230826 - Hearing - City's Efforts to Address Car Break-Ins (Preston)

Sincerely,

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

From: John Fluevog Haight St San Francisco
To: Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject: Thursday 10am/ Hearing on Car Break ins--Urgent Action Needed: Addressing the Alarming Rise in Car Break-Ins
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:59:31 AM

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

Dear Government Heads of San Francisco,

I write to you today as a concerned business manager on Haight Street, a street celebrated for its vibrant culture and welcoming atmosphere, but that has now become synonymous with the rampant car break-ins that plague our beloved city. I must admit that it is increasingly difficult to find anything positive in a city that is suffering from a seemingly unending epidemic of car break-ins and increased crime.

It deeply saddens me to report that San Francisco has reached a point where tourists, who should be captivated by the beauty and charm of our city, are instead leaving with harrowing tales of their vehicles being broken into, leaving them not just inconvenienced, but emotionally scarred by the loss of their belongings and personal security.

Recently, I had two friends visit San Francisco, both of whom had their vehicles broken into. It is not an exaggeration to say that the impression this left on them was nothing short of terrible. They, like many others, took to social media to share their unfortunate experiences, and I fear the damage this does to our reputation as a tourist destination.

The situation is dire, and it is utterly perplexing that we find ourselves here despite the extensive surveillance infrastructure throughout the city. We can see where these criminals live, we can track them, and we can follow their actions. Yet, car break-ins continue to plague Alamo Square, Twin Peaks lookout, Haight Street, Fisherman's Wharf, and countless other areas. It is disheartening to witness the decline of this once-great city into a hotbed of criminal activity.

The devastating sight of shattered glass in our neighborhoods is now an all too familiar one. We are tired, and yes, we are angry. We have been voicing our concerns for years, yet the problem persists. Why are these criminals not being held accountable for their actions? It is time to put an end to this cycle of leniency and slap-on-the-wrist justice.

As residents and business owners in a city with one of the highest costs of living, we deserve more than empty promises. It is time for action. We implore you to take decisive steps to incarcerate these criminals, protect our streets, and restore San Francisco's reputation as a safe and welcoming destination.

We understand that addressing this issue is complex, but the longer we delay, the more damage is done to our city's reputation and, consequently, our economy. We urge you to work tirelessly to find a solution that ensures the safety of our residents and visitors alike.

Let us not allow San Francisco's legacy to be defined by crime and open air drug abuse. We have the potential to turn the tide, but it will require a collective effort and unwavering determination. We stand ready to support any measures that will bring back the San Francisco we once knew and loved.

Sincerely,

Denny Garbuio
John Fluevog Shoes
1697 Haight St
San Francisco, CA
94117

--

JOHN FLUEVOG SHOES, HAIGHT STREET

P: 415-436-9784 E: sanfrancisco@fluevog.com
W: www.fluevog.com
1697 Haight St. San Francisco CA. 94117 USA
Mon-Sat 11-7 Sun 12-6

UNIQUE SOLES FOR UNIQUE SOULS: SINCE 1970

T: www.fluevog.com/twitter FB: www.facebook.com/fluevog

VancouverSeattleBostonTorontoNewYorkSanFranciscoChicagoLosAngelesMontrealPortlandCalgaryDenverOttawaNewOrleansEdmontonVictoriaAmsterdamMelbourneDallas

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations; Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Addressing Car Break-Ins
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:50:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Ted Getten regarding File No. 230826, which is Item No. 1 on today's Government Audit and Oversight Committee agenda.

File No. 230826 - Hearing - City's Efforts to Address Car Break-Ins (Preston)

Sincerely,

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

From: Ted Getten <ted.getten@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:48 AM
To: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS) <stephanie.cabrera@sfgov.org>
Subject: Addressing Car Break-Ins

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

Supervisors,

On today's Government Audit and Oversight Committee agenda, Supervisor Preston is leading an item on car break-ins. I read the Supervisor's letter about the approach he believes the city should take to car break-ins, and I am left wholly disappointed. Where else is the strategy, "departments should talk more, and people shouldn't leave stuff in their cars"? How is this a practical approach to solving a significant issue that impacts the quality of life for all residents and visitors, especially those who are poor?

Where is the focus on actual deterrence? Where is the focus on solving the problem itself? Where is

the focus on the consequences for those who are smashing windows and those who are buying the stolen goods?

Our city streets are littered with car window glass. Is this the best our Board of Supervisors has to solve an issue plaguing us and worsening? I hope today's hearing contains far more nuance than Supervisor Preston's proposal, which reads more like a last-minute brainstorm and less like a well-thought-out policy presentation that can turn the tide on break-ins.

Let's come together and truly solve these issues!

Thank you,
Ted

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Lake Merced Quick Build
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:32:00 AM
Attachments:	LMB OB.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Mike Regan regarding the Lake Merced Quick-Build Project.

Sincerely,

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

From: Mike Regan <myoldgoat@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:33 PM
To: MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; mtaboard@sfmta.com; senator@boxer.senate.gov; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; northcoast@coastal.ca.gov; Leng, Thalia (MTA) <Thalia.Leng@sfmta.com>; metro@sfchronicle.com; elindqwister@sfstandard.com; Editor@RichmondSunsetNews.com; Govenor <governor@governor.ca.gov>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>
Subject: Lake Merced Quick Build

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

Hello, the attached pdf answers the questions Supervisor Melgar asked me.

It is too long to put into an email, but then most of you won't read it anyway.

Thanks

Mike Regan
D7

I think that your party's belief is that you can effect a modal change in transportation by forcing residents out of their cars. I would like to address some of the things in your email.

Just a couple of items to look at:

1. **Let's look at these intersections crosswalks and see what is going on**.

- Brotherhood way and Winston don't intersect (I know some of the maps show LMB as Brotherhood way) but we both know that's wrong.)
- There is a controlled intersection ***with*** crosswalks at Lake Merced Blvd and Brotherhood way.
- There is a controlled intersection ***with*** crosswalks at Higuera and LMB
- There is a controlled intersection ***with*** crosswalks at Font and LMB
- There is a controlled intersection without a crosswalk at State and LMB (could use one)
- There is a controlled intersection ***with*** a crosswalk at Winston and LMB
- There is a controlled intersection ***with*** a crosswalk at Middlefield and MLB
- There is an uncontrolled turn out without a crosswalk at Clearfield and MLB.
- There is no crosswalk where LMB turns into Sunset Blvd.
- Even the controlled intersection of LMB and John Muir has a crosswalk

So out of 10 *intersections* all but two have crosswalks and are controlled intersections but those two aren't really intersections. All the major intersections that pedestrians use have cross walks and are controlled. Could some of these existing crosswalks be improved? Certainly and they should be but that isn't really what is going on here.

2. Let's look at these accidents by intersection: (The information is from the TransBase at SFGOV.ORG from 2017 to 2022 (there is some 2023 data here 7 years of data)

- John Muir and LMB 8 accidents zero fatalities, one cyclist involved accident.
- Lake Merced Hill and LMB 1 accident zero fatalities controlled intersection with crosswalk.
- Brotherhood way and LMB 16 accidents zero fatalities, one pedestrians injury and that person was crossing outside of the crosswalk. (the problem here is the right turn from Brotherhood to LMB has no yield sign, there should be a right turn light at this intersection and the slip lane could be eliminated)
- Higuera and LMB 3 accidents one fatality in 2021 by a drunk driver. (Sorry don't think any of the precautions or changes that are being implemented will stop this from happening). In fact one of the injury accidents here was a cyclist who ran over a pedestrian and was cited for unsafe speed for prevailing conditions
- Font and LMB 2 accidents no pedestrians and this is an intersection that is very well controlled.
- Middlefield and LMB 3 accidents no peds
- Clearfield and LMB 5 accidents no pedestrians.
- Sunset and LMB 5 accidents no pedestrians

The two fatalities that occurred during your tenure only one was on the stretch of road that this quick build addresses. The other was on John Muir drive at Lakewood

apartments. Tragically, a 14 year old lost her life here. Strangely enough she was in an SFMTA recommended raised crosswalk and was struck by a 91 year old woman in daylight.

From 2017 to 2021 there were 1.4 fatalities; from 2018 to 2023 there were also 1.4 fatalities. While I agree any fatalities need to be investigated and if remedial actions are necessary they should be done, but this quick build is spitting into the wind if they think that any of their solutions are going to be effective. 1.4 in 5 years and 1.4 in 6 years seems to me that there are far more dangerous places that need to addressed. Like maybe 19th Ave. or even some of those really dangerous intersections downtown that SFMTA created. One section of Market St. had over 3,500 incidents in that time frame **3,500** and we are going to spend how much this quick build?

3. **Lets talk about the bike route from Lowell/LakeShore**. Google maps show Eculid to 20th to Stonestown as the best/safest bike route. Euclid has highly visible crosswalks and is a fairly quiet street. Could also use Ocean since we have already put in bike lanes there or maybe Sloat where a traffic lane was eliminated to make room for a bike lane. If a cycling route is wanted or needed there are better and less complicated ways and places to do this. There is a lot of space on LMB and everything that this "quick build" wants to do can be done without "repurposing parking" or taking out lanes or reducing lane size. You just have to be willing to look at other alternatives that don't eliminate motor vehicles or make driving more difficult.

4. **Let's talk about parking.** This quick build is slated to "repurpose" 350 parking spots. What this really means is they want to eliminate 350 places where people need to and have been parking. You say there is plenty of space in Park Merced but that is only because of remote learning and let's not forget that there are additional large towers that will be built there. I remember Holloway at State and you couldn't find a space at all. You mention all the new residents that will be "living" at Stonestown. Well that project is going to take out parking as well.

   I hope you realize that the reason we have permit parking in our area is because of the students who drive going to State so please let's not pretend that parking isn't an issue especially with all the new buildings not requiring adequate parking for residents.

5. **Let's talk about the Great Highway:** While this road isn't in your area many of your constituents use the highway to get across the park and other people outside of SF need that road as well. Over 20,000 people per day used that road but that doesn't matter since a few cyclists want to take it over for their pleasure rides. (Do we really think anyone is using the Great Highway to commute to work on a bike?)

   - **Southern Extension:** All of these "environmentalists" and cyclists want to shut down this road because they claim climate change and sea level rise will allow the sea to reclaim this area. Well the sea has been trying to take this area back since I was a kid and we as a "people" worked to maintain it. NOAA data shows that this whole area is in no danger from rising seas. However downtown, Marina, SOMA and other areas in the bay may have a problem. They always show the worst scenario, so this is with a

12’ sea level rise and a 100 year storm surge. Funny, if you’re talking managed retreat I think the Bay is where the problem is, not the Great Highway.

FIGURE 4-24
TEMPORARY COASTAL FLOODING IN SEA LEVEL RISE VULNERABILITY ZONE



- When you read the plan it’s strange that we really aren’t managed retreating from this area at all, in fact I would say we are doing just the opposite. We are building a giant ***SEAWALL*** to protect the sewer plant and the tunnel. In addition the sand replenishment is going to continue with sand from the shipping channel dredging and from the area north (Kelly’s Cove) near the Cliff House. I was told keeping the road would cost 11 million dollars and people baulked at that number, but this project is

going to cost well over 200 million and close the road.

They want to put in a new bathroom, the new pumping station is being built, updates to the old pumping station are being completed, and we are putting in a water recycling plant there so, how in anyone's world does this even resemble managed retreat? The misinformation that is coming out of city hall and its agencies these days is breaking records. **Hence NO TRUST!** Forcing people to drive more/longer is doing more damage to the climate. Bunch of hypocrites!

All of you talk about safety; well the two roads that you want to close are safer than the majority of roads in the city. I count **TWO** accidents on the GH extension (or the Southern Extension) from 4/1/2018 to 3/31/2023. You want to close this safe road and push that traffic onto a road that has had more incidents? Does that make sense to anyone?



The majority of us don't have a problem "improving" the area. In fact it would be great to have a new restroom built and a walking trail, but you **DON'T NEED TO SHUT THE ROAD DOWN TO CARS TO ACCOMPLISH THAT**.

- **Central Extension**: The pilot program to shut this road down for 3 years (a leftover from our friend G. Mar) is just a ploy to attempt to get public acceptance of this closing and to encourage more usage to pump the numbers. The bicycle lobby is pushing this along with other "nonprofits" to finish their bay-to-beach unobstructed route at the expense of thousands of motorist.

  Closing this road at noon on Friday was and is a slap in the face to all of those

people who need the road to do their normal daily activities. Closing the road on weekends creates more problems than it solves and pits communities against each other.

The data that the city (Park & Rec) collected is tainted and full of misrepresentations, omitted data, manipulated data and flat out lies.

When the city allowed the cycling activists (safe street rebels) to slow ride this section, it was a slap in the face to all motorists and law abiding citizens. The PD was told hands off and even provided a buffer for them. (Now they have moved to shutting down the bridges because they want a bike lane).

The chaos and money that closing this road cost us was ridiculous. The over $500,000 that was spent to mitigate the diverted traffic was a waste. I attribute the accidents that occurred on 45th Ave to the closing. Putting in bollards to stop people from making a left at 47th (a much safer place to turn) pushing them up to 45th created more problems than it solved. Putting in bollards to stop people from making a right from Lincoln onto any of the avenues from La Playa to 41st Ave created more problems. I think the fatality on Lincoln could be attributed to this change.

- **Northern Extension:** I haven't seen any real plans that address this area, guess it's too historic to shut down. One of our Cities tourist attractions was the 49 mile scenic route. Guess historic San Francisco doesn't have any appeal anymore. But at the same time we are trying to get tourism back. I understand that the Cliff House, Sutro's and Louie's are with GGNRA but have you seen what is out there now? **NOTHING!** Between the city ignoring the smash and grab thefts and GGNRA mis-management the area is now a ghost town. Plenty of parking available here.

6. Let's talk about public trust:

- We have attended many public meetings between BOS, CTA etc and what we have found is that none of you even bother to listen to the public comments. You're all on PC's or laptops or your phone and are not paying one iota of attention to comments. In fact one of the BOS members thinks that public comment should be eliminated since none of you listen or take heed to what is being said. I think he said it was a waste of time.
- I have witnessed firsthand how Rec & Park has lied and manipulated data to fit their agenda. At one point they said that the counters on the Great Highway stopped working due to being covered by sand and that was why usage numbers

on the GH were down. However when we looked at cell phone data the same low numbers of users was recorded. **Why lie about it?**

- We now have 6 members of city government that have been arrested, jailed or have been forced to resign. How far does this corruption go?
- We have non profits that are funding elected officials to convince them to support their projects. The Park Alliance was a part of why the head of DPW ended up in jail.
- The SFBC wanted a seat at the table and they have taken over the table. How many motorists have been appointed to a seat at any of these commissions? I'd guess **NONE**. I think it was SF Walk that got in trouble for donating and lobbying city hall illegally and had to take back the donation. Oh that was just a mistake. Well it's a mistake that an awful lot of them are making these days. All these non profits are really just lobbing groups trying to buy political support. They need to go.

7. **Now shall we talk about how screwed up the city is** because of all these progressive positions.

- A bowling alley at Nordstrom's, really. A skate park in Civic Center. More new parks being created. These remind me of Rome when the politicians built entertainment arenas for the populist to keep them sedated.
- Closing Market St. to cars really helped the area, did it really? I don't think so.
- The intersections of Market/Octavia and Market/Gough have had 43 and 41 incidents. Much more than any other intersection in the city and both of them were gone over by SFMTA and made worse by their changes.
- Market/7th st. 15 of the 23 accidents at this location involved cyclist
- Going through this data base sure tells me that the city has many more problems in the East side of town and maybe the emphasis should be placed there. I know this isn't your area but I think a wider view for supervisors is a good thing considering all the emphasis being put on safety and reducing fatalities. There is already a push going on that wants to have city wide supervisors.
- Finally I see that some politicians are getting on board with cleaning up all the Fentanyl and other drug usage and getting the mentally unstable off the streets and into programs that will actually help. We need to prosecute these thieves going into the stores and robbing them along with the car break-ins.
- The removal of any and all safe consumption sites needs to happen. Safe consumption is enabling. How many times does an addict get to overdose, how many times can we administer naloxone (Narcan) to drug addicts? I think there are a lot of people who are feed up with the city enabling all of these problems.
- There is no balance in our city government. It's really one progressive after another. Do you think a centralist or someone on the right could get elected in SF?

NO WAY. But people are getting feed up with the progressive politics and balance needs to be restored to city hall.

Here is a screenshot of the SF TransBASE Dashboard of all traffic incidents from 4/1/2018 to 3/31/23. If you're worried about safety then this screen shot clearly shows where your emphasis should be and where it shouldn't.



We need to stop wasting our tax dollars to appease these zealots who have infiltrated our government. Cyclist represent less than 3% of the residence in SF, currently contribute zero to the tax base and yet we are expected to spend billions on meeting their demands.

Thanks and sorry this got so long but it barely covers the problems.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Laguna Honda must not be jeopardized again-File No. 230035 - Hearing - Committee of the Whole -
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:34:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Teresa Palmer regarding File No. 230035.

> **File No. 230035 -** Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan - September 26, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

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

From: Teresa Palmer <teresapalmer2014@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:45 PM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Laguna Honda must not be jeopardized again-File No. 230035 - Hearing - Committee of the Whole -

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

Our Public Nursing Home Must Not Be Jeopardized Again

To: Board of Supervisors

Copy to:Clerk of the Board-please place in meeting file: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

File No. 230035 **- Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan - September 26, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.**

Given the dire shortage of nursing home beds in San Francisco, the people of our city must be certain that all beds at Laguna Honda will be there for their use.

Given the sickness and death, and the horrible stress and expense that the situation at LHH has engendered since 2021 and even before, we ask the Board of Supervisors these questions:

1. How to create a system of oversight for LHH so that repeated profound mismanagement does not persist or recur? The Health Commission was not up to this. We would like to hear a plan. There will be ongoing budgetary incentives to cut corners.

2. Shouldn't any nursing home eligible San Francisco resident who has had to leave the county for care have priority for care in SF? Why can't they get priority at LHH?

3. Will admission of acutely behaviorally unstable residents to LHH from ZSFG resume? ("The flow project.") **The only reason to jeopardize LHH's continued existence with these inappropriate admissions is to jettison hard to place people from our county hospital.** This is inhumane to all involved. Better services must be developed, and not at the expense of LHH or of these most vulnerable persons that need treatment and shelter.

4.Has CDPH/State of California clarified how ongoing failure to keep up with LHH problems will be rectified? State of California/CDPH's inability to offer timely feedback about problems at LHH contributed to this mess!

5.Can the Board of Supervisors closely monitor the submission of a waiver to prevent the 120 bed loss; San Franciscans cannot afford to lose these beds!

Thankyou.

Teresa Palmer M.D. - Former Laguna Honda Physician
Family Medicine/Geriatrics
1845 Hayes St.
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject: FW: CVS
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:58:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Philip Cropp regarding retail closures.

Sincerely,

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

From: Philip Cropp <prcropp@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:56 AM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: SFPD, Chief (POL) <sfpdchief@sfgov.org>
Subject: CVS

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

Congratulations...

https://www.sfgate.com/local/article/downtown-san-francisco-cvs-closure-18378866.php



LOCAL

Downtown San Francisco CVS to close next month

By **Sam Mauhay-Moore**

Sep 20, 2023

CVS' location at 601 Mission St. will close by Oct. 23, a spokesperson for the company confirmed.

Screen shot via Google Maps

Sent from AOL on Android

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 5.25
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:57:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 5.25.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding SFPD DGO 5.25, Foot Pursuits.

Sincerely,

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

From: Ali Mandvi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:16:20 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent	Ali Mandvi
Email	samali48@yahoo.com
I live in District	District 6

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data. Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit…walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question…what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using “officer safety” as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of “officer safety?” By using “concern for officer safety” as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of “officer safety” to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of “officer safety,” with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: Douglas Lambert
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 5:00:49 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent	Douglas Lambert
Email	douglasl02@gmail.com
I live in District	District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data. Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit…walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question…what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using “officer safety” as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of “officer safety?” By using “concern for officer safety” as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of “officer safety” to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of “officer safety,” with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 9.07
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:05:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 9.07.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding SFPD Department General Order 9.07, Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Alison Goh
To:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); CMS, SFDPA (DPA); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	LWVSF Advocacy
Subject:	Police Commission, Department General Order 9.07 - Meet & Confer Delays Are Unacceptable
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:09:08 PM

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

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, Department of Police Accountability, and Board of Supervisors,

In January 2023, the San Francisco Police Commission voted to prohibit racially-biased traffic stops. Over 7 months later, the policy has yet to be implemented and the Police Commission has not brought the policy back for its second and final vote. Instead, it's been allowed to languish in negotiations between the Commission and the Police Officer's Association. San Francisco over-polices communities of color via pretextual stops, which involve racial profiling scenarios such as stopping someone for something like an air freshener hanging from a rearview mirror as a pretext to question and search the person.

Why is DGO 9.07 still in meet and confer seven months later?

Since 2018, SFPD has stopped Black people at least six times the rate of white people, searched Black people at least 10 times the rate of white people, and were at least 12 times more likely to use force on Black people than white people. Each time the Police Commission meets and does not bring the policy back for final approval, it allows harm against communities of color to continue.

There has been plenty of time to reach agreement and move forward. That is why I am asking you to use your influence to ask for DGO 9.07 to be brought back for a final vote and implementation at the next Police Commission meeting.

I am also sending a message to the Police Commission.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Alison

Alison Goh
President
president@lwvsf.org
pronouns: she/her

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
582 Market Street, Suite 615, San Francisco, CA 94104
415-989-8683 ▪ Facebook ▪ Twitter
Empowering voters. Defending democracy. Learn more at **lwvsf.org**.

From:	Jennifer Waggoner
To:	SFPD, Chief (POL); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	CMS, SFDPA (DPA)
Subject:	Police Commission, Department General Order 9.07 - Meet & Confer Delays Are Unacceptable
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:24:16 AM

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

Dear Mayor, Chief & Board of Supervisors,

Why is DGO 9.07 still in meet and confer seven months later?

In January 2023, the San Francisco Police Commission voted to prohibit racially-biased traffic stops. Today, over 7 months later, the policy still has not been implemented. The Police Commission never brought the policy back for its second and final vote. Instead, it's been allowed to languish in negotiations between the Commission and the Police Officer's Association. San Francisco over-polices communities of color via pretextual stops, which involve racial profiling scenarios such as stopping someone for something like an air freshener hanging from a rearview mirror as a pretext to question and search the person.

Since 2018, SFPD has stopped Black people at least six times the rate of white people, searched Black people at least 10 times the rate of white people, and were at least 12 times more likely to use force on Black people than white people. Each time the Police Commission meets and does not bring the policy back for final approval, it allows harm against communities of color to continue.

There has been plenty of time to reach agreement and move forward. **That is why I am asking you to use your influence to ask for DGO 9.07 to be brought back for a final vote and implementation at the next Police Commission meeting.**

I am also sending a message to the Police Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

-JDub

Jennifer “JDub” Waggoner (she/her or they/them)
LWV San Francisco member interested in policing practices
jdublwv@gmail.com
Skype jwaggo or +1-415-644-5094

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	30 Letters regarding Supervisor Dorsey"s request concerning taxpayer-funded legal council
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:24:00 PM
Attachments:	30 Letters regarding Supervisor Dorsey"s request concerning taxpayer-funded legal council.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 30 letters regarding Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for the study of drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Sincerely,

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

From: Thomas Henderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:12:24 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Thomas Henderson

Email: t.stephen.henderson@gmail.com

I live in District: District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Susan McDonough
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 10:35:04 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Susan McDonough

Email: susan@mcdfaa.com

I live in District: District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Peter Anderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:22:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Peter Anderson

Email: findflowform@gmail.com

I live in District: District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: LAUREN PIERIK
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 4:51:58 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: LAUREN PIERIK

Email: laurenpierik@yahoo.com

I live in District: District 8

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Gnarity Burke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:50:37 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Gnarity Burke

Email: urban42n81@gmail.com

I live in District: District 5

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Ann Poletti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:20:48 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Ann Poletti

Email annpoletti@gmail.com

I live in District District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Jennifer Kriz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:14:33 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Jennifer Kriz

Email jenniferkriz@sbcglobal.net

I live in District District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Solange Levy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:25:49 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Solange Levy

Email: solange94121@hotmail.com

I live in District: District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Tamara Greenberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:13:31 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Tamara Greenberg

Email tamaragreenberg@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Ron Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:22:33 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ron Lee

Email: rlee288@aol.com

I live in District: District 8

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: JeNeal Granieri
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:04:59 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent JeNeal Granieri

Email jenealann@att.net

I live in District District 7

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Donna Crowder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 7:19:54 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Donna Crowder

Email dona@donacrowder.com

I live in District District 8

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Ali Mandvi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:13:58 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ali Mandvi

Email: samali48@yahoo.com

I live in District: District 6

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Diane Sargent
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:39:15 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Diane Sargent

Email: diane.sargent@gmail.com

I live in District: District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Sincerely,
Diane Sargent
District 1 resident and engaged voter

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Michael Anders
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:42:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michael Anders

Email: mja712@gmail.com

I live in District: District 5

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Donna Hurowitz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 1:21:11 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Donna Hurowitz

Email: donnabhurowitz@comcast.net

I live in District: District 4

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Linda Showaihat
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:40:58 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Linda Showaihat

Email linda@lsdds.com

I live in District District 7

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

PLEASE STOP THE MADNESS AND SAVE OUR CITY. I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office. As we have seen in the past under Jeff Adachi, we know something is amiss in that department. Remember he died on a Friday with alcohol, cocaine, edibles and two "friends"! Was that a present for the free legal representation he was giving!

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to

legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our “Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects).”

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties’ standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst’s report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender’s office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Arjun Banker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:53:20 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Arjun Banker

Email: arjunbanker@gmail.com

I live in District: District 8

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Ari Kanter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:34:17 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ari Kanter

Email: arikanter@gmail.com

I live in District: District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Donna Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:31:06 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Donna Brown

Email: donna.brown05@gmail.com

I live in District: District 7

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Sunita Giri
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:26:30 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sunita Giri

Email: sunita.pradhan.giri@gmail.com

I live in District: District 1

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: William Muits
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:20:55 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: William Muits

Email: billmuits@gmail.com

I live in District: District 4

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Karen Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:20:55 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karen Schwartz

Email: kielygomes@yahoo.com

I live in District: District 8

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: david bancroft
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:10:39 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: david bancroft

Email: sfdavidbancroft@gmail.com

I live in District: District 2

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Barbara Seegal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:01:04 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Barbara Seegal

Email barsee28@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: samuel manzano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:55:53 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: samuel manzano

Email: sman94121@gmail.com

I live in District: District 7

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Christina Tucker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:55:49 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Christina Tucker

Email: ctucker.0306@gmail.com

I live in District: District 5

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Sebastiano Scarampi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:55:41 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent	Sebastiano Scarampi
Email	scarampi@gmail.com
I live in District	District 2

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Arnold Cohn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:50:09 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Arnold Cohn

Email: sfamc2@gmail.com

I live in District: District 2

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

In addition, San Francisco's policy of not deporting any non U.S. citizen convicted of drug dealing totally wrong. This policy results in more deaths of U.S. citizens because of their drug usage.

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: Shea English
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:43:20 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Shea English

Email: shea@sheaenglish.com

I live in District: District 3

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as $350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay. In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: People living on my sidewalk
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:35:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Philip Kuttner regarding homelessness on Bartlett Street.

Sincerely,

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

From: Philip Kuttner <philkuttner@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2023 9:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: People living on my sidewalk

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Four people have been living with piles of junk on the sidewalk at 321 Bartlett Street for a week. I saw some outreach people talking to them a few days ago but they are still here. Please take steps to remove them as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

Philip Kuttner
363 Bartlett St #5

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: JFK Drive
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:37:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Michael Meiktas regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

Sincerely,

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

From: Michael Me iktas <Michael.Meiktas.497171867@p2a.co>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 6:47 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: JFK Drive

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The current closure of JFK Drive severely impacts people with disabilities, seniors, and communities not directly neighboring Golden Gate Park.

As we emerge from COVID, it's time to reopen JFK Drive. Golden Gate Park belongs to the people of San Francisco, not just a few.

I strongly encourage you to support JFK Drive returning to the conditions pre-COVID, with all roadways open to vehicle traffic and street closures on Sundays, holidays and Saturdays, 6 months of the year.

Regards,
Michael Me iktas

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	2 Letters from Mira Martin-Parker
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:42:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters from Mira Martin-Parker.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters from Mira Martin-Parker regarding various topics.

Sincerely,

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

From: Mira Martin-Parker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Fwd: Three rubles
Date: Saturday, September 16, 2023 9:29:30 AM

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

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mira Martin-Parker** <tartarthistle@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Sep 16, 2023 at 9:21 AM
Subject: Three rubles
To: <gkelly@sfstandard.com>
Cc: tips <tips@missionlocal.com>, tips@missionlocal.com <cgraf@sfexaminer.com>, <tips@sfstandard.com>, <tips@sfist.com>, Tim Redmond <tim@48hills.org>, <blogger@nakedcapitalism.com>, editor <editor@sfbayview.com>, Michael Durand <Editor@richmondsunsetnews.com>, letters <letters@nytimes.com>, letters <letters@sfexaminer.com>

Tell this poor student the next time this happens, give the officer at the front desk three rubles. He'll spring to life like a Jack-in-the box and have the goods returned to his doorstep the same afternoon.

Has he never dealt with American Cossacks before?

San Francisco Filmmaker Blasts Cops After Tracking $24K of Stolen Gear to Alleged Fencing Operation

Written by George KellyPublished Sep. 15, 2023 • 12:19pm

“When I said [an address on] Leavenworth [in the Tenderloin], he said, ‘Oh, yeah, that’s a known major fencing operation,’ and my head exploded,” Schuck said.

From:	Mira Martin-Parker
To:	Tim Redmond; info; tips@sfstandard.com; michaelshellenberger@proton.me; Michael Durand; mickey@projectcensored.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); tips; tips@missionlocal.com; tips@sfist.com; letters; letters; letters@kpfa.org
Subject:	Is there even a left left in San Francisco?
Date:	Saturday, September 9, 2023 11:56:14 AM

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

So these right wing forces Tim refers to below must be within the Democratic Party (i.e. Gary Tan, Michael Moritz, etc). Are you ever going to write about that, Tim Redmond? Who is the right wing in San Francisco? And what is this "radical left" that people constantly claim is governing the city? There's only poor lone Dean Preston, and no offense to Dean, but I personally would describe his politics as moderate (I mean, REALLY moderate). The right wing you refer to is mainly in the Democratic Party. Is there even a meaningful left existing in San Francisco anymore? I mean actual RADICALS. Seems to me, there's just a handful of older activists barely hanging on, in rent-controlled apartments. There are young socialists, but these "socialists" are not even anti war and haven't too much to say about the radical income inequality existing in the City. This is primarily a radical right wing city. And it's the Democratic Party that governs it. Former Governor Moonbeam is right wing now. He simply IS. Pretty much all of the old left has morphed into war mongers, property owners, and bizarre libertarian tech cult fanatics. Will you write about this? Will anyone?

Are we allowed to psychologically acknowledge this glaring truth, or does the Party forbid that? Thought crime?

This is flaccid. Pathetic. Unworthy of even being considered politics. It's sheer force. Brutality. It's not politics.

The right-wing forces can’t blame their DA or their mayor, so they are attacking judges

Ousting Chesa Boudin and creating a new War on Drugs isn't working, so now they are seeking someone else to blame

By Tim Redmond
September 7, 2023

From: Monica D
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Ferris wheel
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 12:30:16 AM

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

No one wants to go to Fisherman's Wharf if your car is going to get broken into and your things are going to be stolen! So save taxpayers money on this stupid move! Duh!

San Francisco Wants To Move Golden Gate Park's Ferris Wheel
sfstandard.com

2024**, here we come!**

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Safety first
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 9:29:16 AM

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

I have a grand slam idea! MAKE SAN FRANCISCO SAFE AGAIN FIRST! Nobody is going to go out there if they expect to get mugged, robbed, or killed by your criminals! It's that SIMPLE!

Empty Downtown San Francisco Space Becomes Art Oasis
sfstandard.com

***2024*, here we come!**

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Gavin Newsom & retail theft
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 7:58:09 PM

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

Newsom announced a new $267 million investment to combat crime!!! That's $267 M of our tax money, peeps! Newsom shouldn't have signed all these pro-criminal bills into law, then he wouldn't have to be throwing $267 M of our tax $ to solve this problem that he created! Oh and he does this right before the election, trying to pretend to work? LOL.

San Francisco awarded more than $17M to help fight organized retail crime
abc7news.com

***2024*, here we come!**

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Sharon Lai
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 7:46:34 PM

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

We are NOT voting for another woke board of supe, Sharon Lai. Having someone like "F*ck the Police" Sandra Fewer, and just as woke as Commie Connie Chan and Myrna Melgar behind her says it all— all were in support of fraudster Chesa Boudin. Asians nowadays are NOT voting for her just coz she's Asian—- get that in your thick heads.

Former SF Transit Official Runs for Downtown District Supervisor
sfstandard.com

***2024*, here we come!**

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Monica D
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); SFPD, Chief (POL); District Attorney, (DAT); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Elias, Cindy (POL); Carter-Oberstone, Max (POL); Yee, Larry (POL); Byrne, Jim (POL); Yanez, Jesus (POL); Benedicto, Kevin (POL); Walker, Debra (POL); SFPD, Commission (POL); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject:	Retail theft
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 5:14:56 PM
Attachments:	Screenshot-2023-09-15-at-1.14.18-PM.png

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

Well, TGIF!

Vehicle Smashes Through San Francisco CVS in Brazen Robbery Attempt
sfstandard.com

***2024*, here we come!**

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	75 Letters regarding Vehicular Turns at Red Lights
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:48:00 PM
Attachments:	75 Letters regarding turns on red lights.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 75 letters regarding vehicular turns at red lights.

Sincerely,

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

From: Ariana Austin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:58:48 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Ariana Austin
ariana.austin@gmail.com
377 Noe Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	James Rhoads
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:44:55 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

James Rhoads
jr1945j@aol.com
83 DOWNEY STREET
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Michael Hawley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:38:35 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco.

Although I no longer live in San Francisco, I did live there for 43 years (1975 to 2018). During that time I was struck by cars twice as a pedestrian. Both times it was because drivers making a right hand turn were so focused on oncoming traffic from the left, they neglected to look right to see if anyone was in the crosswalk crossing the street. Both times I had the green light/walk sign.

Thank you,

Michael Hawley
michaelhawley53@gmail.com
7132 W Butte Ln
Boise City, Idaho 83704

From:	Terry Holtz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:31:07 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Terry Holtz
terry.holtz@gmail.com
361 Duncan St
San Francisco, California 94131

From:	Matthew Ringard
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:07:09 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Matthew Ringard
District 8 Resident, San Francisco

Matthew Ringard
matt.ringard@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From:	MAHDI SALMANI RAHIMI
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:02:12 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

MAHDI SALMANI RAHIMI
m.s.rahimi@gmail.com
521 ELLSWORTH ST
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Nathan Spindel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 10:56:41 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Nathan Spindel
nathans@gmail.com
10 Grossland Way
Petaluma, California 94952

From:	Natasha Avery
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:13:45 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Natasha Avery
natashagavery@gmail.com
520 Eugenia Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Michael Christensen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:06:20 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Michael Christensen
machristensen23@outlook.com
193 Hartford Street
San Francisco, California 94114-2554

From:	Shaw Yu
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 8:48:17 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Shaw Yu
shaw.yu@gmail.com
3500 Market St #303
San Francisco, California 94131

From:	Roderick Lemaire
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:57:49 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Roderick Lemaire
james.roderick.lemaire@gmail.com
3685 17th St #12
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	Aaron Baucom
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:43:24 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Aaron Baucom
aaronbaucom@gmail.com
1434 28th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From:	Brian Tobin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:40:14 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Brian Tobin
coffee5012@gmail.com
406 Buchanan
San Francisco, California 94102

From:	Agnieszka Krajewska
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:39:15 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco.

In addition to all the good reasons laid out below, this one is personal for me. I've had many close calls crossing the street when I had the light and right turning drivers, focused on the car cross traffic didn't see me and nearly hit me, in neighborhoods where I've lived and worked in San Francisco over the last 22 years, but especially downtown and in the Mission. I've witnessed it happen to even more people. And I've seen a bicyclist with the right of way struck by a turning car on Valencia and 24th, an upsetting memory I'm unlikely to ever forget.

No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Agnieszka Krajewska

rubrics-crasser.09@icloud.com
55 28th Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Andrea Steele
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:30:09 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Andrea Steele
adsteele2020@gmail.com
746 Portola Street, A
San Francisco, California 94129

From:	Ben Durbin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:29:35 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Ben Durbin
bpdurbin@gmail.com
2944 Judah Street
San Francisco, California 94122

From:	Gregory Bodin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:27:38 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Gregory Bodin
gregbodin@gmail.com
3685 17th St Apt 12
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	Alexandra Ulmer
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:14:44 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Alexandra Ulmer
alexandra.ulmer@gmail.com
11 Divisadero Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Sarah Maloney
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 6:18:30 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Sarah Maloney
forgottenfootprints@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94107

From:	Christopher Romp
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:13:25 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Chris Romp

Christopher Romp
chrisromp@gmail.com
718 15th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	Patricia Toy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:42:15 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Patricia Toy
patriciatoy@yahoo.com
570 Beale Street
San Francisco, California 94105

From:	Jonathan Dirrenberger
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:40:27 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jonathan Dirrenberger
jonathan.dirrenberger@gmail.com
3528 22nd St
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	Tommaso Boggia
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:08:54 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

Hi!

I live in Oakland so you don't owe me anything as a constituent, but I love San Francisco and would visit a lot more often if:
A. I could get there and back without panicking about BART times either because BART runs longer hours or because you finally build a Bay Bridge bike lane.
B. Getting around while in the city wasn't the most dangerous urban riding I ever do.

Stopping cars from turning on red would be a game-changer in forcing drivist to wait a second and pay attention to the intersection they are in. It's rare these days to see a drivist who isn't looking at their phone while driving these days which, combined with larger and larger vehicles, means you have a lot of squishy humans under needlessly large tanks driven by people who just have to send that text message.

But I digress, please start caring about people walking around and enjoying your city and stop focusing every single decision through the lens of VROOOM VROOOM BEEP BEEP.

Tommaso Boggia
tboggia@gmail.com
248 Third Street #616
Oakland, California 94607

From:	Anthony Perry
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:31:37 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Anthony Perry
perryanthonyj@gmail.com
1669 Motta Street
Woodland, California 95776

From:	allison arieff
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:30:44 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Allison Arieff

allison arieff
aja@modernhouse.com
2 Roanoke Street
san francisco , California 94131

From:	David Miller
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:29:07 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

David Miller
dwarnermiller@gmail.com
215 1/2 Fair Oaks Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Jason Dewees
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:26:50 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am a daily driver writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jason Dewees
jjuania@yahoo.com
1326 - 6th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From:	Patrick Linehan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:12:37 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Patrick

Patrick Linehan
plinehan@plinehan.com
251 Foerster St
San Francisco, California 94112

From:	Karolina Zatz
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:07:28 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Karolina Zatz
karolinazatz@gmail.com
28 Alma St
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Donald Robertson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 3:32:57 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Donald Robertson
DonaldFR@DonaldFRobertson.com
255A Henry Street
San Francisco, California 94114-1231

From:	Tyler Moselle
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:58:54 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Tyler

Tyler Moselle
tyleranneliese@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From:	John Kirn
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:51:37 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

John Kirn
jfk3va@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94158

From:	Will Ashley
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:46:54 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Will Ashley
willashley23@gmail.com
3470 20th St, #2
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Amy O"Hair
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:08:15 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Amy O'Hair

Amy O'Hair
amyohair@ohair-sherman.com
432 Flood Avenue
San Francisco, California 94112-1335

From:	Ryan James
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:35:50 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Ryan James

Ryan James
ryanwilsonjames@gmail.com
4118 Montgomery St
Oakland, California 94611

From:	Kay Hoskins
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:33:06 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Kay Hoskins
kayhoskins66@gmail.com
353 Church Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	Adrian Daub
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 9:44:52 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Adrian Daub
adrian.daub@gmail.com
3887 17th Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	Jackie Bona
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:24:20 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jackie Bona
jackiebona@gmail.com
1732 fell st
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Mariana Prutton
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:30:45 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Mariana Prutton
marprutton@gmail.com
98 Stoneman St
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Daniel Rechtschaffen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:06:56 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Daniel Rechtschaffen
drechtsc@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From:	Amanda Lopez
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:40:46 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Amanda Lopez
amandaklopez117@gmail.com
2297 E Cromwell Ave
Fresno, California 93720

From:	Tyler Goodman
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:34:26 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Personally, i've had cars creep up on my ankles as they try to make a turn on a red. This makes me feel incredibly unsafe, especially when i'm walking my dog - which many cars in SF have come close to hitting as they try to make the turn as fast as they can.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Tyler Goodman
tygoodman@protonmail.com
793 S Van Ness Ave, Apt 307
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Leslie Ernst
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:16:58 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Leslie Ernst
leslieernst@gmail.com
119 Germania st
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Simranjit Chadha
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:54:32 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Simranjit Chadha
simranjit06@gmail.com
410 Scott St
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	L.A. Nelson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:43:25 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

L.A. Nelson
intomykitchen@yahoo.com
1501 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, California 94122

From:	L.A. Nelson
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:37:18 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

L.A. Nelson
intomykitchen@yahoo.com
1501 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, California 94122

From:	Philip Meserve Platt
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:40:32 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Philip Meserve Platt
meservep@gmail.com
1271 Church Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	Rita Devlin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:37:02 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Rita Devlin & family

Rita Devlin
rita.devlin.marier@gmail.com
84 webster, san francisco
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Megha Mehrotra
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:05:48 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Megha Mehrotra
mlmehrotra@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Matthew Garza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:40:58 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

As an avid runner and cyclist here in San Francisco, I love being able to enjoy our beautiful city each and every day. When we implemented Slow Streets during the COVID-19 pandemic, I feel like for the first time in my life, I saw just how incredible pedestrian-focused initiatives could be at building community, making our city safer, and encouraging people to get outside and get moving. No Turn On Red could be our next step to making more of this a permanent reality for this amazing city we all get to call home.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Matthew

Matthew Garza
matthewgarza98@gmail.com

973 Haight St., Apt 6
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Maxwell Gara
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:37:08 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Maxwell Gara
maxwell.gara@gmail.com
638 Kains Ave
Albany, California 94706

From:	Elizabeth Strand
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:28:05 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Elizabeth Strand
sfragazza@me.com
221 24th Ave Apt 202
San Francisco, California 94121

From:	Jonathan Gaull
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:06:32 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jonathan Gaull
jonbeesh@gmail.com
117a Bartlett st
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Sameer Manek
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 9:15:04 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Sameer Manek
sameer.manek@gmail.com
1714 Bryant St
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Eugene Gregor
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 9:02:54 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I write to support no turn on red signs implementation throughout SF as soon as practicable.

I also note for you that the compromise 6/30/24 implementation date for ab43 speed limit reductions by right is fast approaching.

Fulton street along the park should be posted as 25 mph immediately on July 1, 2024. What are the city authorities doing now to make this happen?

Just this afternoon there was a collision at 11th avenue and Fulton intersection that would have been ameliorated or avoided if traffic on Fulton was not regularly exceeding 40 mph.

Best regards.

ECG

Eugene Gregor
eugene.gregor650@gmail.com
771 11th avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	Akshaya Natarajan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 8:50:46 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Akshaya Natarajan
akshaya.natarajan495@gmail.com
923 Fulton
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Joey Kotfica
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 7:46:39 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Joey Kotfica
j_kotfica@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Lizzie Siegle
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 6:07:22 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Lizzie Siegle
lizzie.siegle@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94108

From:	Peter Robinett
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 4:39:04 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Peter Robinett
peter@robinett.us
888 Haight St
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Felix Sargent
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 4:36:47 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Felix Sargent
felix.sargent@gmail.com
6 Ramona Ave
San Francisco, California 94103-2215

From:	Jonathan Tyburski
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 4:33:10 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jonathan Tyburski
jtyburski@gmail.com
1849 Page Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Bradley Golden
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 4:21:02 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Bradley

Bradley Golden
bradleyrgolden@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Kunaal Mithal
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 4:16:24 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Kunaal Mithal
kmithal14@gmail.com
100 Van ness avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

From:	Rangaraj Tirumalai
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 3:42:16 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Rangaraj Tirumalai
rangaraj.t@gmail.com
333 Haight St
San Francisco, California 94102

From:	corbin muraro
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 3:07:51 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

corbin muraro
corbinmuraro@gmail.com
503 waller
, California 94117

From: kaylebarnes@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 2:35:42 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

kaylebarnes@gmail.com
1855 Turk Street #9
San Francisco, California 94115

From:	Stephanie Kuyper
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:35:30 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Stephanie Kuyper
Skuyper11@gmail.com
1514 Pershing St
San Francisco, California 94129

From:	Evan Goldin
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 2:34:36 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Evan Goldin
evan.goldin@gmail.com
41 Federal St
San Francisco, California 94107

From:	Susan Latham
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2023 10:30:00 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to STRONGLY urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Susan Latham
sdlatham@yahoo.com
1965 PAGE STREET #301
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Kaly Trezos
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Sunday, September 17, 2023 10:54:14 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Kaly Trezos
ktrezos@gmail.com
27 Starview
San Francisco, California 94131

From:	Aidan Mc Guire
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Saturday, September 16, 2023 6:58:29 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. I am born and raised in San Francisco but my family and I moved to Germany years ago. On my trip back to San Francisco to meet family and friends I have noticed how uncomfortable I felt with cars carelessly driving on the part of the road that I want to cross on, despite me having a green "Ampelmännchen" and them having a red light. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Aidan Mc Guire
16aidanmcguire@gmail.com
Mariposa
Westerngrund, Bayern 63825

From: Marc Haumann
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date: Saturday, September 16, 2023 10:26:21 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Marc Haumann

Marc Haumann
marchaumann@gmail.com
439 Dolores St
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	Eric Straw
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Friday, September 15, 2023 11:00:32 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Eric Straw
eric.straw459@gmail.com
4368 23rd St.
San Francisco, California 94114

From:	Lauren Murdock
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...
Date:	Thursday, September 14, 2023 11:24:33 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Lauren Murdock
murdock_ls@hotmail.com
3940 Via Lucero, Apt #16
Santa Barbara, California 93110-1669

From: Enia Titova
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide
Date: Thursday, September 14, 2023 3:44:25 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I've struggled for a very long time to write this email.

What do you say to convince someone that a 4-year old child dying in the middle of a city intersection is unacceptable? Why do you even have to convince someone in a position of making change?

It's time to mandate a No Turn on Red citywide policy in San Francisco.

I know each of you counts yourself a progressive. At the national level, we often point fingers at the other side when refuse to take action on gun safety, an issue that similarly harms and kills children. We tell them time and again: "when you didn't act after Sandy Hook, when you didn't act after 6-year olds were gunned down in their classroom, you showed us where your priorities lie."

What are you telling the residents of San Francisco when you allow a child to die and do nothing?

No Turn on Red is a policy that works other places. If it works in a place as busy as New York City, it can work in San Francisco on a citywide level.

Individual "no right on red" signs don't work. Drivers don't expect them and so they ignore them. I've sat at intersections like that. Drivers either ignore/don't see the sign and make the turn anyway. Or when the car in front of them observes it, they honk because they don't understand why someone is blocking the turn, creating immense peer pressure to violate the signal.

It's time to send a unified message: in San Francisco, you can't turn right on red.

To our city officials, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors: I urge you to vote on this issue immediately.

Supervisor Melgar, I look forward to hearing from your office directly.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,
Enia Titova
San Francisco, District 7 resident

Enia Titova
enia.titova@gmail.com
821 Taraval St
San Francisco, California 94116

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding File No. 230986
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:53:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding File No. 230587.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding File No. 230587.

Sincerely,

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

From: My Huynh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); sfneighborhoodgroup@gmail.com
Subject: I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:34:36 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA

From your constituent: My Huynh

Email: maycheung7@gmail.com

I live in District:

I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor Breed, Mr. Tumlin and SFMTA Board Members,

I write to oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours and to support the Board of Supervisors' resolution 230587. Extending meter hours will negatively impact local businesses, discourage out-of-town visitors and add financial stress to local residents who already feel the instability and impact of an impending recession.

San Franciscans and tourists visit neighborhood business districts in the evenings to relax, unwind, and share a meal with their loved ones. Expanded parking meter hours will burden potential customers (especially seniors, the disabled, and families) with an additional cost, detracting from their overall enjoyment and inhibiting them from such activities.

Meter hours until 10pm will materially impact restaurant and retail workers who will be feeding meters and spending 2 to 3 times more on parking. Many service employees live outside San Francisco, and public transportation is frequently not an option.

If we want to boost our local economy and revitalize restaurants and tourist areas, we need to incentivize evening and Sunday customers, take care of workers, and not pile on additional costs at a time

when rents and the price of food and necessary items are already so high.

I sincerely hope the Board of Supervisors votes to reject this plan. Please consider the needs of our local businesses and residents, as well as the overall interests of San Francisco. Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

From: Wen Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); sfneighborhoodgroup@gmail.com
Subject: I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!
Date: Thursday, September 14, 2023 8:55:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA

From your constituent Wen Lee

Email jello_sabor@hotmail.com

I live in District

I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor Breed, Mr. Tumlin and SFMTA Board Members,

I write to oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours and to support the Board of Supervisors' resolution 230587. Extending meter hours will negatively impact local businesses, discourage out-of-town visitors and add financial stress to local residents who already feel the instability and impact of an impending recession.

San Franciscans and tourists visit neighborhood business districts in the evenings to relax, unwind, and share a meal with their loved ones. Expanded parking meter hours will burden potential customers (especially seniors, the disabled, and families) with an additional cost, detracting from their overall enjoyment and inhibiting them from such activities.

Meter hours until 10pm will materially impact restaurant and retail workers who will be feeding meters and spending 2 to 3 times more on parking. Many service employees live outside San Francisco, and public transportation is frequently not an option.

If we want to boost our local economy and revitalize restaurants and tourist areas, we need to incentivize evening and Sunday customers, take care of workers, and not pile on additional costs at a time

when rents and the price of food and necessary items are already so high.

I sincerely hope the Board of Supervisors votes to reject this plan. Please consider the needs of our local businesses and residents, as well as the overall interests of San Francisco. Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Letters regarding the Landmarking of Sacred Heart Church
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:24:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding the Landmarking of Sacred Heart Church.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding the landmarking of Sacred Heart Church.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Arthur Levy
To:	Matsuda, Diane (CPC); Nageswaran, Ruchira (CPC); Foley, Chris (CPC); Vergara, Robert (CPC); Wright, Jason (CPC)
Cc:	Ferguson, Shannon (CPC); San, William (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Francine Sosa-Lewis; ropritchard@gmail.com; J T Elderkin; merle easton; Bertha Canty; Sandra Finegan; Bobby Fischer; Patricia Welsh; Julie Welsh; Kendall Goh
Subject:	Landmark Sacred Heart Church! 2015-005890DES, Hearing Sept. 20, 2023
Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2023 7:58:59 AM

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

Dear Commissioners,

St. Peter and Paul Church in North Beach embodies the spirit and soul of Italian Catholic San Francisco.

Sacred Heart Church embodies the spirit and soul of Irish Catholic San Francisco.

Sacred Heart evokes a neighborhood, a community, a time and place in the City's history that is more than worthy of commemoration and celebration. Landmarking this architectural masterpiece falls short in that mission, but it is nevertheless a critical recognition of a community of San Franciscans who lived, worked, and prayed in the Western Addition.

Once landmarked, the spire of Sacred Heart will announce to the world that San Francisco has not forgotten them.

Respectfully,

Arthur Levy

Arthur D. Levy
3950 Broadway
Suite 200
Oakland, California 94611
Telephone: (415) 702-4551
Facsimile: (415) 814-4080

From: merle easton
To: Ferguson, Shannon (CPC); San, William (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Francine Sosa-Lewis; Robert O. Pritchard; Arthur Levy
Subject: Re: Support the Designation of Sacred Heart Parish Complex as a Landmark
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:54:10 PM

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

September 19, 2023

Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA

Re: Support the Designation of Sacred Heart Parish Complex as a Landmark

We have been waiting a long time and are thrilled that this designation will come before before your Board tomorrow.

I have been involved with the Sacred Heart Church professionally as an architect since 2004 and also, personally before and since as a community member. I live in the Western Addition neighborhood District 5.

In 2004-05 I recruited structural engineers to voluntarily tour the church building with me and be available to advise and assess the cost of a structural retrofit. Four engineers responded and we inspected it from basement and crawl space to the attic and top of campanile. It is an amazing building with a rich cultural and architectural history.

When the Church was closed in 2005 a group of us formed "Save Our Sacred Heart" advocacy group to keep the community informed and to seek Historic Preservation for the building and it's treasures. City Landmark Designation was one of our primary goals. We attended many meetings of the HPC which recommended it to your Board for adoption in 2018.

In 2010 Christopher Ver Planck wrote the nomination for The Register of National Landmark Status, which went to Sacramento in front of the State Historical Resources Commission. It was designated Eligible for National Register for Historic Places. Your approval will protect this complex for the City and Nation. Thank you!!

I strongly urge you to support this designation of the Sacred Heart Complex as a City Landmark!

Merle Lynn Easton, AIA, Architect
1132 Broderick St.

San Francisco, CA 94115

From:	Francine Sosa-Lewis
To:	Ferguson, Shannon (CPC); San, William (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Designation of Sacred Heart Parish Complex as a Landmark
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:21:15 PM
Attachments:	Sacred Heart Last Mass (1).mov

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and Historic Preservation Commission,

I am writing to passionately recommend the designation of the Sacred Heart Parish Complex, particularly the Sacred Heart Church, as an individual landmark within our beloved community. The Sacred Heart Church holds a profound significance in the history and development of the Western Addition, and it stands as a symbol of the civil rights movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

My personal connection to this historic site runs deep, I have been a Parishioner since birth and all my family baptism, communions, wedding and funeral have been held at that scared building.

One cannot overstate the architectural and cultural significance of the Sacred Heart Church's (bell tower), Campanile. It stands tall as a beacon for all, visible from miles around and an integral part of the iconic skyline of Hayes Valley. Its presence serves as a constant reminder of the rich heritage and vibrant history of our community.

By designating the Sacred Heart Parish Complex, especially the Sacred Heart Church, as an individual landmark, we not only honor its historical importance but also ensure that future generations can appreciate and learn from the pivotal role it played in the civil rights movement and the growth of our neighborhood.

Preserving the Sacred Heart Church as an individual landmark is an investment in our community's heritage and a testament to our commitment to preserving the values and stories that have shaped us. I urge you, members of the Board of Supervisors, to consider this recommendation with the utmost care and dedication.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter, and I look forward to seeing the Sacred Heart Parish Complex recognized and protected for generations to come. See the attached movie of the last mass at our beloved church.

Sincerely,

Francine Sosa-Lewis
originally born at,
527 Fillmore Street
San Francisco, CA

Thank you, Francine Sosa-Lewis 510-528-8182

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	35 Letters regarding the Hiring of Patrol Special Officers
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:30:00 PM
Attachments:	35 Letters regarding the hiring of Patrol Special Officers.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 35 letters regarding the hiring of Patrol Special Officers.

Sincerely,

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

From: Amy Chau
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 10:11:34 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 6
From your constituent	Amy Chau
Email	amy4evacute@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Gianluca billante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:25:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	Gianluca billante
Email	gcb75@cornell.edu

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: elizabeth billante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:48:00 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	elizabeth billante
Email	ecbillante@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: frank billante
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:46:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	frank billante
Email	francob7@aol.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Maria Cruz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 7:43:04 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 6
From your constituent	Maria Cruz
Email	mdc94106@gmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Peter Elden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:23:04 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	Peter Elden
Email	peterelden@sbcglobal.net

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Dorothy Chan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:10:52 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	Dorothy Chan
Email	dorothywaichan@aol.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Robert Chan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:07:10 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	Robert Chan
Email	robertychan@aol.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Rodney Leong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:50:25 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 1
From your constituent	Rodney Leong
Email	rleong@rocketmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856 and predates the SFPD by two years. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special

Officers are an excellent resource and our City needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Kathy Kelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:21:28 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Kathy Kelly
Email	kathykelly44@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Susan OHara
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:17:27 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 5
From your constituent	Susan OHara
Email	sj_ohara@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,
Susan O'Hara

From: Ed Wang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:21:05 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Ed Wang
Email	lined065@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Leanna Dawydiak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:37:43 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 1
From your constituent	Leanna Dawydiak
Email	LDawydiak@gmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Gnarity Burke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:06:15 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 5
From your constituent	Gnarity Burke
Email	urban42n81@gmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Diana Ruiz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 10:23:58 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Diana Ruiz
Email	druizassoc@vom.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: JEFFREY RICKER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 10:10:34 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	JEFFREY RICKER
Email	THE_DREADNOUGHT@YAHOO.COM

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Sherry Bijan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 8:59:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 1
From your constituent	Sherry Bijan
Email	Sherrybijan@gmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Oren Yunger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 8:00:58 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	Oren Yunger
Email	orenyunger@gmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Kaaren alvarado
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 7:25:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Kaaren alvarado
Email	kaaren25@att.net

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Kaaren alvarado
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 7:25:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Kaaren alvarado
Email	kaaren25@att.net

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Kaaren alvarado
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 7:22:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Kaaren alvarado
Email	kaaren25@att.net

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Daniel O'Donnell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 7:07:58 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	Daniel O'Donnell
Email	dodonnell88@hotmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Ding Ma
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 6:45:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Ding Ma
Email	dingm0942@gmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Purvi Sahu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 6:26:24 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 2
From your constituent	Purvi Sahu
Email	purvisahu@icloud.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Andrew Lipsett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 6:09:56 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 4
From your constituent	Andrew Lipsett
Email	duh86@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Michael Goodwin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 6:05:38 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 3
From your constituent	Michael Goodwin
Email	mgoodwin@gmx.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: SG Quinn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 5:29:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 7
From your constituent	SG Quinn
Email	sgq133@msn.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Erin OGrady
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 5:11:09 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 7
From your constituent	Erin OGrady
Email	erogrady@pacbell.net

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Helen Timen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 5:11:04 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 3
From your constituent	Helen Timen
Email	helentimen@hotmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Leanna Louie
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 5:00:51 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 11
From your constituent	Leanna Louie
Email	leannalouie28@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Joe Greene
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 4:42:39 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 8
From your constituent	Joe Greene
Email	joebengreene@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Angela Tickler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 4:20:40 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 1
From your constituent	Angela Tickler
Email	angela.tickler@yahoo.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Louella Fung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 4:15:04 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 7
From your constituent	Louella Fung
Email	loufung628@icloud.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Nancy Yarmak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 3:06:03 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 1
From your constituent	Nancy Yarmak
Email	nancy94121@gmail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From: Ron Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject: I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 2:30:48 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District	District 8
From your constituent	Ron Lee
Email	rlee288@ail.com

I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the CIty Charter since 1856. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time…time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

SIncerely,

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Letters regarding Street Conditions
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:33:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding Street Conditions.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding street conditions.

Sincerely,

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

From: Philip Kuttner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Re: People living on my sidewalk
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:40:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

You should know that notwithstanding the Court's temporary injunction against clearing encampments on the sidewalks of San Francisco, **with 72 hours notice the city can clear streets for access, whether that's for fire and police personnel in the event of an emergency or for ADA compliance, meaning enough space is left on the sidewalk for a wheelchair to pass, for example.**

This is clearly the case for the encampment on my block shown above.

I await your timely response.

Philip Kuttner
363 Bartlett St #5
San Francisco CA 94110

On Sat, Sep 16, 2023 at 9:08 PM Philip Kuttner <philkuttner@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Board of Supervisors:
>
> Four people have been living with piles of junk on the sidewalk at 321 Bartlett Street for a week. I saw some outreach people talking to them a few days ago but they are still here. Please take steps to remove them as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.
>
> Philip Kuttner
> 363 Bartlett St #5
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Sawyer, Jason (POL); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Souza, Sarah (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Bring your pup to new Larkin/ Myrtle Alley Bark!et!!!!
Date:	Sunday, September 17, 2023 6:48:36 PM

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

How safe is this though?
With all the encampments/crackheads around!

All encampments neighborhood and city wide need to be removed immediately.

Make it happen.

> On Sep 17, 2023, at 18:42, Lower Polk Neighbors <lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> September 21st, 2023 Myrtle Bark!let
>
> View this email in your browser

Hello Neighbors-
Who let the dogs IN?
Who who who who who?

We did! Bring your pup to new Larkin/ Myrtle Alley Bark!et!!!!

Soft Opening:
Thursday, September 21st @12pm
Come by for treats, meets, greets
and celebrate with the PoCo (Polk Corridor) Community!

Sponsored by:
INTERSTICE Architects
Lower Polk Community Benefit District - LPCBD

Polk Neighbors
lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com

Follow us on Facebook

If you have any questions please contact us-
lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com

Copyright © 2021 Lower Polk Neighbors, All rights reserved.

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list

This email was sent to julien.defrance@gmail.com
why did I get this? unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences
Lower Polk Neighbors · PO Box 642428 · San Francisco, CA 94164-2428 · USA

From:	Richard B. Allen
To:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Joel Engardio
Subject:	Quote of the week.....
Date:	Saturday, September 16, 2023 12:06:07 PM

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

"Still, Benioff questioned why “the city cannot be this clean and safe every single day.” Mayor London Breed quickly
responded that the city is making progress,....."
Mayor Breed, please give the City residents a timeline, measurable goals, who is in charge, and consequences if goals are not met.

Dick Allen, San Francisco

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Letters regarding Window Replacement Standards
Date:	Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:37:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding Window Replacement Standards.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding window replacement standards.

Sincerely,

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

From: Nick Panagopoulos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reform SF Window Replacement Standards to Improve Health, Climate, Comfort, and Lower Cost
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:19:55 AM

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

Board of Supervisors ,

I urge you to reform San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards.

Every San Francisco resident deserves windows that aren't leaky, are insulated to reduce heating bills, noise, and condensation, and reduce fossil fuel heating needs – at an affordable price.

But San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards unnecessarily raise the price to replace street facing windows in many San Francisco homes. Exorbitant costs mean less window upgrades, meaning homeowners and renters are stuck with old, leaky windows that harm health, comfort, and the climate. All for barely-noticeable aesthetics in the name of "neighborhood character".

**Costlier for Homeowners: The standards increase the cost of replacing street-facing windows by 50-100%. 70% of San Francisco's occupied 350,000 homes were built in the 1960s or before.

**Costlier for Renters: Costlier window replacements are passed on in the form of higher rent. More likely, exorbitant costs means tenants are stuck with draftier interiors, and higher heating bills and carbon emissions. Over half of San Francisco's renters live in housing units built before 1970 in SF.

**Bad for the Climate: Residents burn more fossil fuels to heat their homes as older windows are more likely to be poorly sealed, leaky, and uninsulated single pane glass. 56% of occupied homes in San Francisco are heated with fossil fuels, mostly with natural gas.

**Bad for Health: Older single-pane windows are more likely to condense, leading to indoor mold. They're also more likely to leak, allowing heat or air-conditioned air to escape, and polluting particulates from nearby highways inside.

**Bad for Comfort: In addition to leaking air in-and out, older windows block less noise. This is increasingly important as San Francisco accommodates more housing.

Thank you,

Nick Panagopoulos
npanagopoulos@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94108

From: evan.goldin@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please update SF"s window replacement standards
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:01:04 PM

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

Board of Supervisors ,

Hey folks,

I strongly urge you to reform San Francisco’s Window Replacement Standards.

Especially with bad air outside today and my son at a daycare with crappy, old windows, it's a good reminder that these rules need to change. It's absolutely absurd we make it so difficult to modernize our windows — for health and for comfort.

Please fix these rules, and allow people to use modern windows with ease! It's more important than strange old rules designed to protect the "look and feel" of SF.

Thank you,
Evan
D6

evan.goldin@gmail.com

,

From: Natalie Farren
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reform SF Window Replacement Standards to Improve Health, Climate, Comfort, and Lower Cost
Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:22:51 PM

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

Board of Supervisors ,

I urge you to reform San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards.

Every San Francisco resident deserves windows that aren't leaky, are insulated to reduce heating bills, noise, and condensation, and reduce fossil fuel heating needs – at an affordable price.

But San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards unnecessarily raise the price to replace street facing windows in many San Francisco homes. Exorbitant costs mean less window upgrades, meaning homeowners and renters are stuck with old, leaky windows that harm health, comfort, and the climate. All for barely-noticeable aesthetics in the name of "neighborhood character".

**Costlier for Homeowners: The standards increase the cost of replacing street-facing windows by 50-100%. 70% of San Francisco's occupied 350,000 homes were built in the 1960s or before.

**Costlier for Renters: Costlier window replacements are passed on in the form of higher rent. More likely, exorbitant costs means tenants are stuck with draftier interiors, and higher heating bills and carbon emissions. Over half of San Francisco's renters live in housing units built before 1970 in SF.

**Bad for the Climate: Residents burn more fossil fuels to heat their homes as older windows are more likely to be poorly sealed, leaky, and uninsulated single pane glass. 56% of occupied homes in San Francisco are heated with fossil fuels, mostly with natural gas.

**Bad for Health: Older single-pane windows are more likely to condense, leading to indoor mold. They're also more likely to leak, allowing heat or air-conditioned air to escape, and polluting particulates from nearby highways inside.

**Bad for Comfort: In addition to leaking air in-and out, older windows block less noise. This is increasingly important as San Francisco accommodates more housing.

Thank you,

Natalie Farren
natalie.r.raps@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94115

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT)
Subject:	FW: SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:46:00 PM
Attachments:	QADR Q2 2023 Finalv3.pdf Victim Demographics Q2 2023.pdf SFPD_2023_Q2_Coverletter_Signed.pdf

From: Cunningham, Jason (POL) <jason.cunningham@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 8:58 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting

Good evening, Madam Clerk,

On behalf of Chief William Scott, the attached reports for Quarter 2 2023 are being submitted pursuant to Admin Code Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting,

It is respectfully requested these documents be shared with the President of the Board as well as the other Supervisors.

Thank you for your assistance.

v/r

Jason Cunningham
Program Manager
Professional Standards & Principled Policing Bureau
San Francisco Police Department

jason.cunningham@sfgov.org
(415) 889-0024 (C)

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEADQUARTERS
1245 3RD Street
San Francisco, California, 94158

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

WILLIAM SCOTT
CHIEF OF POLICE

September 11, 2023

The Honorable London N. Breed
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Aaron Peskin
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Cindy Elias
President, Police Commission
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

Director Sheryl Davis
Executive Director, Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Breed, Supervisor Peskin, Commissioner Elias, and Executive Director Davis,

RE: Second Quarter 2023 Report per Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements – Stops Data, Use of Force, Crime Victim, and Domestic Violence

As required by Administrative Code Chapter 96A, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is submitting the attached Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR). The report is being submitted past the required date (1st Tuesday in August) due to the increased complexity of the reporting requirements.

This report includes expanded use of force data points (transitioning to the new Use of Force standard adopted by the police commission and in effect for the first full quarter) required under the updated Department General Order, Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person. As such, the analysis required additional time and review as the changed reporting standards resulted in a need to recalculate previously used methodologies.

The 96A quarterly information and comparisons provide an opportunity to analyze the progress of reforms indirectly correlated with policing engagements. In 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to pass local legislation supporting police reforms and specified law enforcement reporting requirements pertaining to stops, searches, arrests, uses of force, and alleged bias-related complaints.

We appreciate the commitment the Mayor and Board of Supervisors has expressed toward the reform initiatives being implemented by the SFPD. We believe these efforts are in alignment with the values of our department and create a closer step to re-envisioning policing to better serve all our communities.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff, Director of Policy and Public Affairs, Diana Oliva-Aroche at diana.oliva-aroche@sfgov.org. These documents will be posted online at www.sanfranciscopolice.org.

Sincerely,

DAVID LAZAR
Assistant Chief, SFPD

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Quarterly Activity and Data Report
Quarter 2 2023

Safety with Respect

William Scott,
Chief of Police
San Francisco
Police Department

Table of Contents

Quarterly Activity and Data Report 3
Q2 Overview 4
Use of Force Data Methodology Update 5
Suspects 9
Suspects 10
2018-2022 Total Stops 14
Stops and Searches 14
Searches By Level of Discretion 19
Search Yield Rates 25
Use of Force 29
Use of Force – Current Use of Force Policy 30
Types Of Force Used 32
Total Arrests by Quarter – 2019-2023 35
Arrests 35
Arrests By District 37
Bias-Related Complaints 38
Q2 Quantitative Analysis Per Capita Population Benchmark 40
Annual Per Capita Interactions by Race 44
Q2 Quantitative Analysis 48
Per Capita Population Benchmark 48
Domestic Violence Reporting - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b 55
SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report – Additional Data Tables 57
Stops, by Self-Initiated vs Dispatched 58
Stop Data Q2 2023 58
Stops and Searches by Perceived Race/Ethnicity 60
Searches, by Self- Initiated vs Dispatched 63
Stops and Searches by District 67

Basis of Searches 68
Search Yield Rate 71
Reasons for Stops 75
Calls for Service, Q2 2023 80
Suspects, Q2 2023 82
Use of Force, Q2 2023 84
Overview by Subject Race/Ethnicity 86
Total Uses of Force-by-Force Type 89
Officers Assaulted by Quarter 92
Uses of Force by Reason 96
Arrests, Q2 2023 101
By District Data 103
Total Uses of Force, by District 105
Total Arrests by District 106
Central District 107
Southern District 110
Bayview District 113
Mission District 116
Northern District 119
Park District 122
Richmond District 125
Ingleside District 128
Taraval District 131
Tenderloin District 134
Airport 137
Outside of SF/Unknown 140
Glossary 144

Quarterly Activity and Data Report
Quarter 2, 2023

SFPD stands for safety with respect for all. We will:

- Engage in just, transparent, unbiased, and responsive policing.
- Do so in the spirit of dignity and in collaboration with the community.
- Maintain and build trust and respect as the guardian of constitutional and human rights.

Q2 Overview



146,297 Calls for Service
- 5.7% increase compared to Q2-2022

4,754 Stops
- 1085 resulting in searches (22.8%)

251 Incidents Using Force
- 0.0017% of all calls for service
- 600 total uses of force

3,416 Arrests

1 Department of Police Accountability Bias-related Complaints

Data collected during the pandemic and recovery period reflect the unique circumstances of the time. Users should take care when comparing data trends across pandemic and non-pandemic response timeframes.

Use of Force Data Methodology Update

Data collected under SFPD's Use of Force Policy has changed two times over the past 18 months, resulting in three different criteria for data collection. This exploration seeks to provide context to the changing landscape of use of force data collection, and its implications to reporting and analysis.

Policy Changes Drive Changes to Data Collection

On December 21, 2016, the San Francisco Police Commission passed a significant overhaul of SFPD's Use of Force policy, which went into effect the same day. This policy remained in place until April 12, 2022.

On January 12, 2022, the San Francisco Police Commission passed a revised policy for the use of force, called "Use of Force & Proper Control of a Person." Ninety days later, on April 12, 2022, SFPD transitioned to this new use of force standard. The April 2022 use of force policy changed multiple definitions within the policy, in most cases broadening definitions and reducing thresholds for reportable uses of force. The 2022 policy also added new categories of force, and associated definitions for collection.

On November 2, 2022, the San Francisco Police Commission passed additional revisions to the policy, in most cases narrowing definitions and increasing thresholds for reportable uses of force. This revised general order went into effect on December 8, 2022.

What Policy Changes Were Made?

As noted in DN 22-111 and DGO 5.01, Use of Force and Proper Control of a Person (12/8/22), the following policies changed:

- Revised Threshold for Reportable Force - The threshold for reportable force has been changed so that some common types of low-level physical interactions with a person are not reportable force.
- Revisions to Drawing and Exhibiting vs. Pointing a Firearm - The definitions have been revised to provide clearer guidance on whether the presentation of a firearm is considered a circumstance of Drawing and Exhibiting or Pointing a Firearm. Under the revised definitions, the Low Ready position is reclassified as Drawing and Exhibiting, rather than a circumstance of Pointing a Firearm, and is reported, albeit not as a use of force.
- Revisions to Safeguarding Dignity - This section has revised guidance for when and how officers may direct a subject involuntarily to the ground, and how to follow-up and document the circumstance.
- Supervisory Evaluations and Review of Video -The procedures for the Supervisory Evaluation of circumstances of Use of Force and Drawing and Exhibiting have been modified to reduce administrative burdens on members.

The full text of the current version of DGO 5.01 can be found on the SFPD website.

Technical Notes

The April 2022 policy, continuing through the December 2022 policy, allowed the department to transition to an electronic entry system for use of force data, as opposed to paper forms that were filled out and routed for entry into an electronic system. This new functionality in a department-wide system is part of continual improvement that builds on the 2016 USDOJ Recommendation 4.1, which notes "…the department needs to create an electronic use of force reporting system so that data can be captured in real time."

The use-of-force data system is an extension of SFPD's crime data warehouse, which is the department's incident report system of record. The Airport Bureau uses the San Mateo County's incident report system. In the coming two years, SFPD will transition to a new records management system and use-of-force reporting system, and the Airport Bureau will use that system as well.

Data Exploration

Dataset Handling and Adjustments

The QADR 2022 Q4 report consisted of a new UoF dataset, a new structure, and all new uses, that required the data be assessed for duplication, and whether there was a need for restructure of the data for analysis. Where technical corrections to the collection interface or structure were necessary, they were provided to the SFPD Technology applications team for remediation. The following adjustments were necessary after this review.

Field(s)	Application or Caveat
UoF Subject	Fields unpopulated: Records entered with no UoF Subject were manually reviewed to ensure accuracy. There was only 1 incident without Subject info where a subject was associated with a use of force. This incident was included in the report.
Reason for Drawing/Exhibiting firearm description	Double counting correction: In certain instances, records will contain multiple "Officer Reason for Drawing Firearm Description" fields, which can lead to duplicated uses of force in situations where both a drawn/exhibited entry AND a UoF entry are generated by a single officer on a single subject. Only one of each type of UoF per reason for drawing firearm, per officer, per subject is counted.
Airport Data	Airport Bureau Supervisory Use of Force Evaluation forms require a paper form submitted centrally and entered manually. As of publication, data from the Airport has not been integrated into the rest of the department's use of force data. Reporting will be provided in the quarter it becomes available and is analyzed.

Qualitative Notes

As with any major change to a reporting system, data collected immediately after a significant change to definitions, policy or process should be considered carefully as individuals who enter the data adjust to new requirements.

Data Exploration

Reporting and Historical Data

With a new use-of-force standard in effect, this report will;

- Continue to present historical use-of-force data, and
- Trend data and comparisons across years will use only the same Use of Force data standard. This means that this report and all future reports will conform to the following when comparing across time periods:
    - the 2016 use-of-force standard would only be compared to previous data
    - the April 2022-December 8, 2022, standard would be compared to itself
    - all data collected after December 8, 2022, would be compared to subsequent time periods.

Future Analysis

With a settled use-of-force standard and a more robust data set, this report may provide more in-depth analyses, as additional use-of-force data becomes available.

Suspects

Suspects Observed or Reported

The suspect information provided includes descriptions provided by members of the public or observed by department members and documented in police incident reports.

Suspects by Race/Ethnicity			April 1, 2023 - June 30, 2023		
DESCRIPTION	Apr	May	June	Q2 2023 Suspects	% of Total Suspects Q2 2023
Asian/ Pacific Islander	107	115	101	323	4.2%
Black/ African American	944	979	1023	2946	37.9%
Hispanic/ Latino	444	480	409	1333	17.2%
Native American	7	6	1	14	0.2%
White	476	542	531	1549	19.9%
Others	507	468	631	1606	20.7%
Total	**2,485**	**2,590**	**2,696**	**7,771**	**100.00%**

Total suspects observed and reported in Q2 2023 (7,771) decreased by almost 3% from Q2 2022 (7,992). Black/African Americans accounted for approximately 38% of all suspects observed and reported in Q2-2023. Unknown suspects and suspects with unknown race or ethnicity are not included. Review of suspect data indicates 4,864, or 38%, of all suspects (12,635) are either unknown suspect, or race/ethnicity unknown.

Suspects



	Q1 2022	Q2 2022	Q3 2022	Q4 2022	Q1 2023	Q2 2023
Asian/ Pacific Islander	361	326	377	301	295	323
Black/ African American	3,074	2,982	3,175	2,993	2,926	2,946
Hispanic/ Latino	1,349	1,420	1,421	1,289	1,202	1,333
Native American	19	11	11	20	16	14
White	1,811	1,740	1,710	1,563	1,482	1,549
Others	1,401	1,513	1,605	1,715	1,488	1,606
Total	8,015	7,992	8,299	7,881	7,409	7,771

Note: Subject data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Suspects



	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Asian/ Pacific Islander	1,713	1,727	1,318	1,399	1,365
Black/ African American	15,750	15,211	12,206	12,149	12,224
Hispanic/ Latino	5,129	5,217	4,461	5,005	5,479
Native American	89	72	71	79	61
White	7,429	7,032	6,007	7,061	6,824
Others	5,947	6,229	5,013	5,945	6,234
Total	36,057	35,488	29,076	31,638	32,187

Note: Subject data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Suspects



In Quarter 2 of 2023, there were 69 Black/African American individuals listed as suspects per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco, as compared to 4 White suspects per 1000 White residents.



Citywide suspect data over the past 6 quarters shows suspects are listed as Black/African American individuals 13.8-15.6 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

Suspects



Citywide suspect data shows that from Q1 2022 through Q2 2023, Suspects are listed as Black/African American individuals 68.5-73.6 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each

Stops and Searches

2018-2022 Total Stops

Starting in 2019, there is a consistent yearly decrease in stops for all individuals across perceived race/ethnicities. Specifically, when comparing the data for 2022 to 2021, there was an overall decrease of 45% across all perceived race/ethnicities.



	2018*	2019	2020	2021	2022
Asian	6,770	12,859	4,406	3,350	2,005
Black/African American	14,464	24,180	10,429	6,796	3,464
Hispanic/Latino	10,477	19,482	7,562	5,665	3,204
White	19,878	35,243	13,277	9,691	4,892
Other	4,604	10,297	3,014	2,041	1,556

**2018 stats only account for Q3 and Q4 2018. AB953, the legislation requiring data collection, went into effect for SFPD on July 1st, 2018.*

Stops and Searches

Q2 2023 Total Stops:

In Quarter 2 of 2023, April 1 – June 28 1159hrs, 4,754 stops were conducted. Of those stops, 970 resulted in searches (23.6%). White individuals accounted for 32% of all stops and 27% of all searches. Black individuals accounted for 23% of stops and 37% of searches.



Due to a data system cutover in late Q2, 2023, all stops data in this report includes data from April 1 thru June 28th at 1159hrs. Data not included in this report will be rolled into the next QADR report when available.

Stops and Searches



	Q1	Q2*	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2*
	2022				2023	
Asian	457	400	553	595	504	544
Black/African American	876	793	958	837	927	1,017
Hispanic/Latino	747	719	822	916	969	1,312
White	1326	980	1416	1170	1299	1,350
Other	363	236	476	481	394	531

**Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Quarter 2 of 2022, the percentage of total stops in Q2 of 2023 increased by 28.2% for Black/African American individuals and increased by 32% for White individuals.

Stops and Searches



Citywide stops data shows in Quarter 2 of 2023, 23.8 Black individuals, per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be stopped, as compared to 4 White individuals per every 1000 White residents



Citywide vehicle and pedestrian stop data shows that since Quarter 1 of 2022, Black/African American individuals are stopped 5 to 6 times more often than White individuals.

Stops and Searches



Citywide vehicle and pedestrian stop data show that from Quarter 1 2022 through Quarter 2 2023, on average Black/African American individuals may be stopped 22.0 times per 1000 Black/African American residents.

Stops and Searches

Searches By Level of Discretion

The department classifies the various types of searches into three categories:

1. **Discretionary searches,**
2. **Administrative searches, and**
3. **Other searches.**

Discretionary searches require an officer to ask and receive consent to search. In such cases, officers have the most flexibility in determining who to search and include only those occurrences where consent is the only basis provided. Administrative searches include those that occur because of a search warrant, arrest, or vehicle inventory. Other searches have a variable range of discretion and include reasons such as officer safety, suspected weapons, visible contraband, evidence of crime, etc**.**

Discretionary Searches	Administrative Searches	Other Searches
*Consent Given	*Incident to Arrest	*Officer Safety/ Safety of Others
	*Search Warrant	*Suspected Weapons
	*Vehicle Inventory	*Visible Contraband
		*Odor of Contraband
		*Canine Detection
		*Evidence of Crime
		*Emergency
		*Suspected Violation of School Policy
		*Condition of Parole/ Probation/ PRCS/ Mandatory Supervision

Current Quarter vs 1 year ago, % Change by Race/Ethnicity

	STOPS			SEARCHES		
Perceived Race / Ethnicity	Q2-2022 (n=3,128)	Q2-2023 (n=4,754)	%Δ from Q2-2022	Q2-2022 (n=963)	Q2-2023 (n=1,085)	%Δ from Q2-2022
Asian	13%	11%	-1.3%	7%	6%	-1%
Black/ African American	25%	21%	-4.0%	32%	32%	0%
Hispanic/ Latino	23%	28%	4.6%	28%	28%	-1%
White	31%	28%	-2.9%	28%	25%	-3%
Other	8%	11%	3.6%	4%	9%	5%

Note: "Perceived" identifiers are used to categorize demographic information specific to Stop Data Collection System

Stops and Searches

The 1,085 total searches conducted in Q2-2023 were categorized into 3 search categories listed below. When multiple bases for search are present during a stop, officers are able to select multiple bases for search. In these cases, one search is counted in each basis. . As a result, a stop may appear in two or all three search categories listed below. From 1,085 total searches, there were 1,598 bases for search selected, which fell into 3 search categories, Discretionary, Administrative, and Other Searches.

Total Basis of Search	Total	% Total
Consent given	59	4%
Officer safety/safety of others	276	17%
Search warrant	52	3%
Condition of parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision	90	6%
Suspected weapons	88	6%
Visible contraband	67	4%
Odor of contraband	9	1%
Canine Detection	3	0%
Evidence of crime	163	10%
Incident to arrest	729	46%
Exigent circumstances/emergency	9	1%
Vehicle inventory	53	3%
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0%
***Distinct Count of Searches**	**1,085**	
Total Count of Basis for Search	**1,598**	

***There may be more than one basis for search**

Type of Search	Distinct Count	% Total
Discretionary (Consent Given) Searches	59	4.27%
Administrative Searches	816	59.09%
Other Searches	506	36.64%
***Distinct Count of Searches**	**1,381**	**100%**

Stops and Searches



**Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Q2-2022, Administrative Searches for individuals of “Other" race in Q2 of 2023 have increased by 96% and Black/African American individuals by 22%. There was also an increase by 25% of Administrative Searches for White individuals.

Stops and Searches



**Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Q2-2022, Discretionary Searches for all individuals decreased in Q2-2023, where Asian individuals saw a 29% decrease, Black/African American individuals saw a 32% decrease, Hispanic/Latino individuals saw a 66% decrease, White individuals saw a 33% decrease, and Other individuals saw a 40% decrease.

Stops and Searches



**Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Q2-2022, Asian individuals saw a 10% decrease, Black/African American individuals saw a 7% increase, Hispanic/Latino individuals saw a 16% decrease, White individuals saw a 15% decrease, and Other individuals saw a 174% increase.

Stops and Searches



	2018 Q3 - Q4 Average	2019 Q1-Q4 Average	2020 Q1-Q4 Average	2021 Q1-Q4 Average	2022 Q1-Q4 Average
Asian	23%	29%	33%	36%	38%
Black/ African American	29%	32%	36%	40%	48%
Hispanic/ Latino	29%	37%	41%	45%	51%
White	27%	32%	34%	36%	42%
Other	29%	33%	36%	31%	47%

Search yield rates have increased year over year since mid-2018, suggesting an increase in the use of objective factors. Objective factors are clearly defined and articulable behaviors an officer can observe to inform the decision to conduct a search. Including objective factors in training and/or policies is reflective of one of SFPD's proposed solutions for reducing the influence of bias in decision-making surrounding stops and searches.

Search Yield Rates

The average yield rate for all searches was 57% in Quarter 2 of 2023. The yield rate was 47% for Discretionary (Consent only) searches, 61% for Administrative (Supervision) searches, and 64% for Other searches.



	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Other	TOTAL
Discretionary Searches	40%	24%	70%	69%	43%	47%
Adminstrative Searches	40%	58%	70%	59%	62%	61%
Other Searches	39%	62%	77%	59%	65%	64%

As noted in the Phase III SFPD Collaborative Reform Initiative report:

"The assumption among researchers is that if the rate of discovering contraband during searches of a particular identity group is low, then those people are "objectively less suspicious and may be searched, at least in part, because of their perceived identity."
HTTPS://OAG.CA.GOV/SITES/ALL/FILES/AGWEB/PDFS/RIPA/RIPA-BOARD-REPORT-2021.PDF AT PAGE 48.

In turn, if the hit/yield rate for a particular identity group increases, that means that officers are using more objective factors – and not a person's perceived identity – to make the decision to search a person. In short, higher hit/yield rates suggest that officers are less likely making a biased decision to search, but are rather using objective factors to inform their decision-making.[1]"

[1] SFPD Collaborative Reform Initiative Phase III – Final Assessment Report, Hillard Heintze, 2022, p 6, footnote 11.

Stops and Searches



	Q1	Q2*	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2*
	2022				2023	
Asian	44%	36%	32%	43%	40%	36%
Black/ African American	42%	43%	47%	54%	48%	53%
Hispanic/ Latino	48%	47%	52%	51%	51%	69%
White	38%	41%	41%	48%	43%	54%
Other	50%	19%	42%	49%	55%	58%

*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

As compared to Q2 2022, the yield rate for all searches increased in Quarter 2 of 2023 for Black/African American and White demographic groups. This yield rate increased by 39% for Other and increased by 22% for Hispanic/Latino, while staying the same for the Asian.

Stops and Searches



Citywide search data shows in Quarter 2 of 2023, per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco, roughly eight searches of Black/African American individuals may occur. For every 1000 White residents, less than 1 search of a white individual per 1000 white residents occurs.



Citywide search data shows that from Q1 2022 through Q2 2023, Black/African American individuals on average may be searched 8 times per 1000 Black/African American residents.

Stops and Searches



Since Quarter 1 of 2022, individuals searched are listed as Black/African American individuals 8.3-11.0 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each

Use Of Force – Historical



Unless otherwise noted, the term "total uses of force" refers to the number of times force is applied by an officer against an individual to compel compliance. Per the April 2022 Use of Force Policy, during Q4-2022, and including the October 1 through December 7, 2022, period, there were 504 incidents where force was used 1,408 times by 615 officers against 579 individuals.

Changes to the Use of Force Department General Order and associated data collection is discussed in the data exploration section of this report and should be kept in mind when interpreting these data.

Use of Force

Use of Force – Current Use of Force Policy



During Quarter 2 of 2023, the department responded to 146,297 total calls for service. Department officers were assaulted 57 times and force was used in 251 incidents which represented 0.017% of all calls for service. Of those 251 incidents, force was used 600 times by 322 officers against 305 individuals.

There were two Officer Involved Shooting incidents during Quarter 2 of 2023 resulting in injury or death.

Use of Force



Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Subject to a Use of Force, Q2 2023

Race/Ethnicity	Apr-23	May-23	Jun-23
Asian	17.1%	3.8%	12.0%
Black/African American	43.8%	36.1%	50.9%
Hispanic/Latino	20.3%	38.0%	22.9%
White	15.2%	20.2%	12.6%
Other	3.7%	1.9%	1.7%

Per the most recent 2022 December Use of Force policy, during Q2 of 2023, White individuals represented 16% of total number of individuals subject to uses of force. This rate is 43% for Black/African American individuals, 27% for Hispanic/Latino individuals, and 11% for Asian individuals.

Types Of Force Used

Under the December 2022 use of force policy, Physical Control Hold/Take Down and Firearm Pointing were the top two types of force used and accounted for 85% of total Uses of Force during Q2 2023.

Use of Force by Type of Force Description December 2022 UoF Policy Standard	
Type of Force Description	**Q2 2023**
Chemical Agent	17
ERIW	5
ERIW 40mm	2
Firearm Pointing	260
Impact Weapon	4
Other	19
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	251
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	27
Vehicle Intervention	13
Firearm OIS	2
Grand Total	**600**

Use of Force



Citywide Use of Force data shows in Quarter 2 of 2023, 6.1 Black individuals per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be subject to a use of force, as compared to .29 per 1000 White residents.



Under the current Use of Force policy, in Q2, 2023, individuals receiving force are listed as Black/African American individuals 21.2 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

There were two Use of Force incidents that resulted in death during Quarter 2 of 2023.

First Incident - SAN FRANCISCO (May 19, 2023):

At approximately 2:20 pm SFPD officers responded to the 100 block of Bosworth St. regarding a person armed with a firearm who entered a residence. The person who discovered the suspect was able to exit the residence and contacted the police. Officers arrived on scene and made contact with the armed suspect who had refused to comply with officers for approximately 3 and a half hours. Additional SFPD resources and SFFD medics were on scene to assist with the incident. As officers were attempting to negotiate with the subject, an officer involved shooting occurred. The subject was transported to the hospital. Despite the life-saving efforts of the emergency responders and medical staff, the subject succumbed to his injuries and was declared deceased.

Second Incident - SAN FRANCISCO (JUNE 22, 2023):

On Thursday, June 22, 2023, at approximately 2:39 a.m., SFPD officers from Richmond Station were dispatched to a residence on the 700 block of 31st Avenue for a report of an aggravated assault in progress. An officer arrived on scene and made contact with an 84-year-old male victim in the doorway of the home. During the interaction, the 37-year-old subject, who was armed with a knife, advanced toward the officer and the victim from inside the home and an officer involved shooting occurred. Additional officers arrived on scene and began rendering aid to the subject and summoned medical personnel to the scene.

The victim told officers that the subject had assaulted a 76-year-old female victim inside the home. Officers entered the home and discovered the female victim deceased. A dog was also found deceased inside the home. Medics transported the subject to a local hospital where he was later pronounced deceased. The male victim was transported to a local hospital and treated for non-life-threatening injuries.

Arrests

Total Arrests by Quarter – 2019-2023



There were 3,416 arrests during Quarter 2 of 2023, a 15% increase from Q2-2022 (2,982). Black/African American individuals and Hispanic individuals accounted for 64% of all arrests.[2]



[2] Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported in San Mateo County data and are not included in these data.

Arrests

Percentage of Total Arrests			
Race/ Ethnicity	Q2-2022 (n=2,982)	Q2-2023 (n=3,416)	%Δ from 2022
Asian	7%	6%	-1%
Black/ African American	34%	32%	-2%
Hispanic/Latino	30%	32%	2%
White	26%	27%	1%
Unknown	4%	4%	0%

Overall arrests of Hispanic/Latino individuals increased by approximately 2% in Quarter 2 of 2023 compared to Quarter 2 of 2022.

**Detailed data regarding age groups and gender can be found later in this report.*



Citywide arrest data shows that from Quarter 1 of 2022 through Quarter 2 of 2023, 25.5 Black/African American individuals may be stopped per 1000 Black/African American residents.

Arrests

Arrests By District

It is important to note that arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are investigated by and reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

The "Outside SF/Other" category includes arrests made by department members outside of the City and County of San Francisco by SFPD as well as some arrests made inside the City and County of San Francisco by agencies other than SFPD that are captured by our Incident Reporting system.

Arrests made by department members within the City and County of San Francisco jurisdiction increased in Quarter 2 of 2023 compared to Quarter 2 of 2022 by 15%.

Arrests By District, Q2 2022 vs Q2 2023			
District	**Q2 2022**	**Q2 2023**	**% change**
Co. A - Central	363	420	16%
Co. B - Southern	431	544	26%
Co. C - Bayview	271	250	-8%
Co. D - Mission	454	536	18%
Co. E - Northern	272	372	37%
Co. F - Park	98	78	-20%
Co. G - Richmond	110	126	15%
Co. H - Ingleside	181	230	27%
Co. I - Taraval	155	146	-6%
Co. J - Tenderloin	590	685	16%
Outside SF	57	29	-49%
Total	**2,982**	**3,416**	**15%**

Bias-Related Complaints

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

The department is required to obtain information from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) regarding the total number of complaints received during the reporting period that it characterizes as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity. The department also is required to include in its report the total number of complaints DPA closed during the reporting period that were characterized as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity, as well as the total number of each type of disposition for such complaints.

Cases Received in Q2-2023

Type of Case Received	# of Cases
Racial Bias	1
Gender Bias	0
Transphobic Bias	0
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
TOTAL	1

DPA received 188 total cases for the quarter.
2 Officer(s) were named for allegations of racial or gender bias.
Total Cases received in 2023 involving Racial or Gender Bias: 2 Case(s)

During Quarter 2 of 2023, DPA completed 6 complaint investigation cases in which there was an allegation of racial or gender bias. There were no sustained allegations of racial or gender bias in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Q2-2023 Case Closures & Dispositions

Type of Case	Sustained	Withdrawn	Unfounded	No Finding	Insufficient Evidence	Proper Conduct	Referral	TOTAL
Racial Bias	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	**5**
Homophobic Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**
Transphobic Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Racial, Homophobic , Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
TOTAL	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**6**

*Source: Department of Police Accoutability
DPA closed a total of 178 cases for the quarter, including above.
DPA closed a total of 359 cases for the year, including above

Bias-Related Complaints

BIAS-RELATED COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SFPD, AND INVESTIGATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

As part of the department's commitment to transparency, the department also reports on all bias-related complaints received internally from members of the department and forwarded to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for investigation. Closed cases may include complaints received in previous quarters. Bias-related complaints are referred to as Employment Equal Opportunity (EEO) cases by DHR.

Q2-2023 Bias Cases Received

EEO Cases Received	Q2-2023
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	0
Disability Discrimination	0
Hostile Work Environment	1
Medical Discrimination	0
Gender Discrimination	0
Race Discrimination	2
Retaliation	0
Sexual Harassment	0
Sexual Orientation	0
Harassment/Non-EEO	0
TOTAL	**3**

Complainants: 3 Department Members; 0 Outside Civilians

Respondents (Named): 1 SFPD (named in 1 complaint); 1 Sworn Officer; 1 Civilian

Total Respondents: 1 SFPD Named; 1 Sworn Officer; 1 Civilian

Type of Case	Administrative Closures				
	Respondent Counseled	Rejected	Insufficient Evidence	Sustained	TOTAL
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	0	0	6	0	**6**
Gender Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Gender Identity	0	0	0	0	**0**
Hostile Work Environment	0	0	1	1	**2**
Marital/Parental Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Medical Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Race Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Race / Sex Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Retaliation	0	0	0	0	**0**
Sexual Harassment	0	0	0	1	**1**
Sexual Orientation	0	0	0	0	**0**
Slurs/Inappropriate Comment	0	0	0	0	**0**
Weight Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Harassment/ Non-EEO	0	0	0	0	**0**
TOTAL	**0**	**0**	**7**	**2**	**9**

Source: SFPD Risk Management EEO Quarterly Report

Population Benchmark Analysis, Per Capita Race/Ethnicity

The San Francisco Police Department received requests from various key community stakeholders to present a per capita population benchmark analysis. This analysis captures a particular race or ethnicity, as compared to their representation in a similar population of 1000 individuals. We adjust for population in our analysis by the race/ethnic demographic groups in our data. This analysis compares this report's quarter and all quarters with data available. A disparity analysis- the contrast between different race/ethnicity groups against each other- is also considered to generate a numerical comparison. This analysis may surface potential racial disparities when comparing policing activities with the various demographic groups. In all cases, a population benchmark analysis that presents per capita results will have challenges, as noted below.

What is a benchmark?

A benchmark is a common frame of reference, created by comparing at least two sets of data to each other, to consider trends and context presented in the data. In this analysis, we compare citywide population demographics against pre and post stop activities by SFPD, and then convert those contact ratios into a Per Capita (or by 1000) number.

Population Benchmark Weaknesses

As noted by the California Department of Justice in their RIPA 2021 report, "An assumption of this type of comparison is that the distribution of who is stopped would be similar to who resides within a comparable geographic region. However, this is not always the case, as people may travel a considerable distance from where they live for several reasons (e.g., to go to work, visit family).[3]" The supposition that the comparison of police data should reflect the residential population makeup makes several assumptions that are not addressed in this analysis, and may result in inaccurate results of the comparative disparities noted in the analysis.

Comparing against residential population does not account for individuals who travel outside their home residential district or zip code in the residential population count, potentially causing over or under representation in the data[4].

It should be noted that SFPD categorizes residential population demographics differently than other agencies. For instance, the Census American Community Survey (ACS) and

[3] 2021 RIPA Board Report - Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory (RIPA) Board (ca.gov)Pp46
[4] https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2020.pdf pp26-27

Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) have different data standards. When the RIPA board data is used, it is perceived demographic data being compared to self-reported demographics in the residential population data.

Further, "Population counts generally overestimate bias in stop decisions, as differences in poverty, education, and labor market opportunities vary across identity groups in the U.S. Because education and employment affect criminal behavior, disparities along these dimensions will lead to disparities in who commits crime. In this way, pre-existing social disparities will tend to make the fraction of Black or Latinx people in the population smaller than the fraction of Black or Latinx people who are potentially subject to being stopped, overestimating any bias in a stop decision.[5]"

Despite these known limitations in working with population data within a benchmark, it does not mean analysis using a population benchmark is invalid. These limitations should, however, be kept in mind when interpreting results of any population benchmark. Results of population benchmarks can inform future analysis' and provide insight into potential disparities, trends, and differences between geographic areas, such as SFPD districts.

Population Benchmark Strengths

A key benefit in using a population data benchmark is the intuitive ease of understanding as compared to other benchmarks. Other benchmarking techniques can utilize univariate or multivariate statistical analysis that can be hard to explain succinctly and can quickly become overwhelming.

What did SFPD do?

SFPD took a citywide demographic dataset from the 2016-2021 American Community Survey (ACS), administered by the US Census Bureau. Starting in the first quarter of 2023, all datasets are calculated against corresponding population demographics, which are based on 5-year ACS estimates (2016 ACS for 2016 dataset, 2017 ACS for 2017 dataset, etc.), except for 2020 dataset which is based on 2020 Census. 2021 data onward uses 2021 ACS population data. 2022 ACS will be released in December 2023.

Race/Ethnicity groupings are then consolidated to match current department systems, with Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander groups combined into the Asian group, and two or more races, some other race alone and American Indian/Alaska Native

[5] https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/RIPA-in-the-LAPD-Summary-Report.pdf pp12-13

combined into the Other grouping. The demographic representation in various data and generated per capita (per 1000 residents) along with a table and graph for each datapoint. Data used for comparison to the population benchmark and per capita calculation was gathered during the covered period of this report.

All available data was used for the historical per capita analysis, reaching back to either 2016 or the second half of 2018, depending on the availability of data. All available prior year data was compared with overall trends per capita against types of SFPD activity, by demographic group. In cases where policy standards have changed over time (namely with Use of Force policy), comparisons are done within policy spaces. That is, use of force data from one policy is only compared against itself. Finally, we conducted a disparity analysis by comparing per capita demographic data for certain groups against each other to determine if disparate treatment may be occurring.

Specific Methodology Notes

In addition to the general challenges of a population benchmark, noted above, SFPD would like to highlight the additional methodological notes for clarity and context.

- Census[6]/ACS data considers "Hispanic" as an ethnicity, while the suspect, stops, searches, uses of force, and arrest data considers "Hispanic" as a race.
- Suspects per District: Crime Data Warehouse was searched for persons categorized as "Suspects" on police incident reports. Suspect demographic information may be developed from calls for service, or it may be developed at a subsequent point during investigation of an incident. All police incident reports (initial or supplemental) having a data value are included. Suspects with unknown race values are not included. While some suspects are subsequently arrested, and also listed as "booked" or "cited" on police incident reports, this category is not intended to include arrestees.
- Stops information provided reflects entries into the Stop Data Collection System (SDCS), a data collection tool provided by the California Department of Justice to assist departments in complying with AB953 and the RIPA Board's data collection requirements.

[6] SFPD discovered a calculation error in Q4, 2021 when tabulating census data. The error and corrected tables are included in the Q4, 2021 QADR.

- Searches information provided reflects entries into the SDCS, with the same caveats as above.
- Uses of Force information provided reflects entries into the department use-of-force Database and account for a distinct count of uses of force broken down by District and race of subject force was used against.
- Arrests count persons “booked” and “cited” where an incident report (initial or supplemental) had a date value.

Historical Per Capita Interactions

Using the previously mentioned methodologies, the following trends are noted. Per capita interactions for the current and more recent quarters can be found in the type of interactions’ section within the QADR.

Per capita analysis for Use of Force data is presented per use of force standard to allow for an apples-to-apples comparison within each standard.

Annual Per Capita Interactions by Race

Analysis was conducted using the above methodology across all quarters from which we have useful data. In this case, starting in Q1, 2016 for Arrests, Uses of Force and Suspect data, and 2018 for Stops and Searches. We found the following trends. Note: Data labels and trend lines for the most impacted group(s) are included for context and clarity.



Citywide suspect data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have been reported as suspects of crimes significantly higher than other demographic categories. On average, however, there has been a decline over time of the per capita inclusion of Black/African American residents within suspect reporting.

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines are included in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in suspect data goes down 5.268, per 1000 Black/African America residents, per year, on average, over time.

Rate of Decrease, Suspects Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-5.268
Asian	-0.101
Hispanic	-0.243
White	-0.076
Other	-5.810

Q2 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide stops data since 2018 shows that Black/African American individuals have been stopped by SFPD at significantly higher rates per capita than other demographic categories. There has been a significant decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African American stopped in a vehicle or pedestrian stop since mid-2018.

Rate of Decrease, Stops Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-38.901
Asian	-2.724
Hispanic	-9.280
White	-6.667
Other	-14.436

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in tops data goes down 38.90, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

Q2 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide search data since 2018 shows that Black/African American individuals have been searched in connection with an interaction with SFPD at rates higher than other demographic categories. There has been a significant decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans searched since mid-2018.

Rate of Decrease, Searches Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-10.446
Asian	-0.236
Hispanic	-1.776
White	-0.852
Other	-0.870

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in search data goes down 10.446, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

Q2 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide use of force data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have been subject to a use of force at significantly higher rates as compared to other demographic categories. There has been a decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans upon whom use of force has been used since 2016.

Rate of Decrease, UoF Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-1.281
Asian	-0.036
Hispanic	-0.210
White	-0.068
Other	-0.076

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in UoF is at -1.281, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

Q2 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark

Due to the changes in the Use of Force policy, the 2016 UoF policy data is used to provide context over time, above. A separate calculation for per capita use of force is included using only the April 2022 UoF policy standard, below.



Data collected under the April 2022 Use of Force policy shows that Black/African American individuals may be subject to a use of force 16.5 times per 1000 Black/African American residents.

Q2 Quantitative Analysis

Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide arrest data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have arrested at higher rates as compared to other demographic categories. There has been a modest decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans arrested since 2016.

Rate of Decrease, Arrests Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-5.181
Asian	-0.123
Hispanic	-0.502
White	-0.484
Other	-0.127

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in Arrest data goes down 5.18, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

Yearly Per Capita Disparity Analysis

We further conduct a disparity analysis by baselining the three most represented demographics against each other to find a numerical representation of the disparity between groups, per SFPD interaction, per year. As with the other per capita analysis, Black/African American residents of San Francisco have higher rates of disparity in the data as compared to the White and Hispanic demographic groups. Please note that due to the changes in the Use of Force policy, the 2016 Use of Force policy data is used to provide context over time.



Citywide suspect data since 2016 shows that suspects are listed as Black/African American individuals 13.9-19.0 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

Q2 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide vehicle and pedestrian stop data from 2018 through 2022 shows that individuals stopped are listed as Black/African American individuals 5.6-5.9 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.



Citywide search data shows that from 2018 through 2022 individuals searched are listed as Black/African American individuals 9.2 to 11.6 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

Q2 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide Use of Force data shows that from 2016 - Q4 2022 (through Dec 7), under the 2016 Policy, individuals receiving force are listed as Black/African American individuals 9-25 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.



Citywide Use of Force data shows that from Q4 2022 (beginning Dec 8) – Q2 2023, under the December 2022 Policy, individuals receiving force are listed as Black/African American individuals 18-21 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

Q2 Quantitative Analysis

Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide arrest data shows that from 2016 through 2022, arrested individuals are listed as Black/African American individuals 9.4-10.7 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

What did we find?

We found that Black/African American individuals are more often involved in various SFPD interactions than their representation in the population, especially when compared to White residents. In some forms of contact between the department and individuals, this involvement has been decreasing over time. These findings provide context around who is involved with SFPD at various points of engagement but do not answer the question of 'why' this is the case.

It is possible that some or all factors discussed in the benchmark description section above are affecting the data in some way. The context provided gives us a common frame for conversation, mutual understanding, and a starting point from which additional analysis may occur.

What's next?

The Department looks forward to continuing the analysis of data on a quarterly basis. However, it should be noted that SFPD will need to build out analytical capacity to carry out some of this work, and timeline expectations will be shared and updated with the publishing of each quarterly report.

SFPD has also partnered with multiple academic entities to assist in academic level analyses of SFPD data, including:

- The California Policy Lab at UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles,
- Stanford's SPARQ center,
- Palo Alto University, and
- The Center for Policing Equity
- New York University

Domestic Violence Reporting
- Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

Domestic Violence Reporting - Background

In November 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved, and Mayor Breed signed, legislation amending the San Francisco Administrative Code to require certain data involving Domestic Violence be reported on a quarterly basis starting in the first quarter of 2022. The report is to be submitted on a quarterly basis to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, Office of Racial Equity, the Human Rights Commission, the Department on the Status of Women, and the PoliceCommission.

Domestic Violence Calls for Service and Investigations

Domestic Violence, also known as Intimate Partner Violence, is abbreviated as DV for brevity in this report. For the purposes of this report, Admin Code 96D defines Domestic Violence as: *"Domestic Violence" means the crime defined in Section 273.5 and the crimes punishable under Section 243 (e){1), of the California Penal Code.*

SFPD responds to calls for service (CFS) received by the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) whether as a 911 emergency or through the non-emergency line. After gathering information from the caller, DEM staff has the responsibility of determining the appropriate code for the call, based on the information provided, and to dispatch units to the location as either a Priority A (highest), Priority B, or Priority C.

Upon arrival, SFPD officers conduct a thorough investigation into the allegations of domestic violence. Per SFPD policy, calls for service are coded with a final disposition of domestic violence (DV) in cases in which DV is evident during an officer's investigation.

In some cases, a report may be taken without a call to 911 (self-reporting at a police station, forexample.) In these cases, a call for service number is generated during the report writing process.

This is a quarterly data report from 1 April 2023 through 30 June 2023.

Domestic Violence Reporting - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b Reporting Components

1(A) The number of calls for service for domestic violence that the Police Department received from the Department of Emergency Management for the period of April 1 to June 30, 2023.

Calls for Service, Final Call Code Includes "DV" April 1 - June 30, 2023				
	2023			
	Apr	May	Jun	Total
DV Calls for Service	442	479	416	**1337**

1(B) The number of domestic violence cases that the Police Department presented to the District Attorney for investigation and/or prosecution in the prior quarter, and of those cases, the number in which a child or children were present and/or a firearm or firearms were present.

DV INCIDENTS SUBMITTED TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE			
	2023		
	Apr	May	Jun
Number of DV Cases Presented to the District Attorney's Office	77	96	65
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a child was present	5	14	4
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a firearm was present	0	3	0

Confiscation of Weapons: Pursuant to Penal Code § 18250 and Department policy, officers are mandated to confiscate any firearms or other deadly weapons discovered at the scene of a domestic violence incident. The weapon is booked into the Department's Property Room as evidence. As federal and state laws prohibit individuals convicted of a domestic violence charge from owning or acquiring a weapon, the Property Room follows DOJ protocols, including a criminal records' checks, to determine if the individual is eligible for release of the weapon.

Presence of Children: SFPD Department General Order 6.09 also outlines the procedures to follow if children are present during a domestic violence incident. DGO 7.04, Children of Arrested Parents, provides guidance to minimize the negative impact and harmful stressors onchildren when a parent/guardian is arrested whether in their presence or not. This policy is considered a national model, highlighting law enforcement's responsibility to ensure a safe environment for children following a traumatic experience such as the arrest ofone's parent.

SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report – Additional Data Tables

Stop Data Q2 2023

Stops, by Self-Initiated vs Dispatched

In Quarter 2 of 2023, there were a total of 4754 stops, a 52% increase from Quarter 2 of 2022. Of those stops, 1,116 (23%) stops were made in response to dispatched calls for service, and 3,638 (77%) stops were made in response to self-initiated calls.



Stops by Perceived Race-Dispatched						
	2022				2023	
Perceived Race	**Q1**	**Q2***	**Q3**	**Q4**	**Q1**	**Q2***
Self-Initiated	2364	1292	2910	2857	2941	3638
Dispatched	1405	1836	1315	1142	1152	1116
Total	3769	3128	4225	3999	4093	4754

*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

Stop Data Q2 2023

During Q2 2023, April 1 through June 28 1159hrs, from 4754 total stops 1,085 (23%) resulted in searches. Of those searches, 542 (49.9%) were made in response to Self-Initiated Calls, and 543 (50%) were in response to Dispatched Calls for Service.



SFPD Total Searches, Self-Initiated vs Dispatched						
	2022				2023	
Perceived Race	**Q1**	**Q2***	**Q3**	**Q4**	**Q1**	**Q2***
Self-Initiated	385	603	399	382	456	542
Dispatched	668	360	621	533	514	543
Total	1053	963	1020	915	970	1085

*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

The Department utilizes the SDCS program definitions under AB953; a 'stop' is defined as **1)** any detention, as defined in regulations, by a peace officer of a person or **2)** any peace officer interaction with a person in which the officer conducts a search as defined in regulation.[7] Stops include Traffic Stops and Pedestrian Detentions. Stops may be Self-Initiated or Dispatched.

[7] https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I93C41A693CA74BA595E5E5C58A213F79&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)

Stop Data Q2 2023

Stops and Searches by Perceived Race/Ethnicity

White individuals accounted for 28% of all stops and 25% of all searches. Black/African American individuals accounted for 21% of total stops and 32% of total searches.

Total Stops by Perceived Race / Ethnicity Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
Perceived Race / Ethnicity	Apr	May	June	Q2 Total	% of Stops
Asian	176	180	122	478	10%
Black/African American	333	375	309	1,017	21%
Hispanic/Latino	434	566	312	1,312	28%
Middle Eastern or South	92	124	90	306	6%
Native American	4	2	4	10	0%
Pacific Islander	24	23	19	66	1%
White	472	543	335	1,350	28%
Other	72	82	61	215	5%
Total	1,607	1,895	1,252	4,754	100%

Total Searches by Perceived Race / Ethnicity Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
Perceived Race / Ethnicity	Apr	May	June	Q2 Total	% of Searches
Asian	20	15	14	49	5%
Black/African American	105	135	110	350	32%
Hispanic/Latino	95	129	75	299	28%
Middle Eastern or South	7	4	7	18	2%
Native American	1	0	4	5	0%
Pacific Islander	7	4	7	18	2%
White	90	96	88	274	25%
Other	28	23	21	72	7%
Total	353	406	326	1,085	100%

Stop Data Q2 2023



Stops and Searches by Perceived Race/Ethnicity, By Self-Initiated (On-View) and Dispatched Calls for Service

In Q2 2023, 3,638 out of Stops made in response to Self-Initiated Calls, White individuals accounted for (27%) stops followed by Hispanic/Latino Individuals 1,076 (30%). Black/African American Individuals accounted for 678 (19%) stops.



Stop Data Q2 2023

In Q2 2023, out of 1,152 Stops made in response to Dispatched Calls for Service, White Individuals accounted for 399 (35%) stops and Black/African American individuals accounted for 362 (31%) stops. Hispanic/Latino individuals accounted for 224 (19%) stops.



**Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Searches, by Self- Initiated vs Dispatched

In Q2 2023, out of 543 Searches made in response to Self-Initiated Stops, Black/African American individuals accounted for 179 (33%) searches followed by Hispanic/Latino individuals 181 (33%), and White individuals accounted for 97 (18%) searches.



In Q2 2023, out of 542 Searches made in response to Dispatched Calls for Service, Black/African American accounted for 171 (32%) searches followed by White individuals 177 (33%), and Hispanic/Latino individuals accounted for 118 (22%) searches.



*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

Stops and Searches by Perceived Age

Individuals within the age group of 30-39 accounted for the most stops (33%) and the most searches (36%).

Total Stops by Perceived Age Category Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
Perceived Age Category	Apr	May	June	Q2 Total	% of Stops
Under 18	41	55	43	139	3%
18 - 29	399	437	309	1,145	24%
30 - 39	540	635	400	1,575	33%
40 - 49	322	379	275	976	21%
50 - 59	200	262	141	603	13%
60 or over	103	117	80	300	6%
Unknown	2	10	4	16	0%
Total	1,607	1,895	1,252	4,754	100%

Total Searches by Perceived Age Category Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
Perceived Age Category	Apr	May	June	Q2 Total	% of Searches
Under 18	18	23	26	67	6%
18 - 29	95	106	85	286	26%
30 - 39	136	138	114	388	36%
40 - 49	61	82	65	208	19%
50 - 59	28	43	29	100	9%
60 or over	15	14	7	36	3%
Total	353	406	326	1,085	100%



Stop Data Q2 2023

Stops and Searches by Perceived Gender

Male individuals accounted for 78% of all stops and 82% of all searches.

Total Stops by Perceived Gender Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
Perceived Gender	Apr	May	June	Q2 Total	% of Stops
Female	331	427	226	984	21%
Male	1,262	1,450	1,015	3,727	78%
Transgender man/boy	2	0	1	3	0%
Transgender woman/girl	6	7	6	19	0%
Unknown	6	11	4	21	0%
Total	1,607	1,895	1,252	4,754	100%

Total Searches by Perceived Gender Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
Perceived Gender	Apr	May	June	Q2 Total	% of Searches
Female	57	81	41	179	16%
Male	292	320	282	894	82%
Transgender man/boy	1	0	1	2	0%
Transgender woman/girl	1	4	2	7	1%
Unknown	2	1	0	3	0%
Total	353	406	326	1,085	100%



Stops and Searches by District

Mission Station accounted for the most stops (14.1%) and Tenderloin Station conducted the most searches (15.9%).

Total Stops by District Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
District	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total	% Total
Central	119	117	74	310	7.6%
Southern	127	83	145	355	8.7%
Bayview	36	36	86	158	3.9%
Mission	123	195	259	577	14.1%
Northern	109	131	110	350	8.6%
Park	61	38	86	185	4.5%
Richmond	93	75	71	239	5.8%
Ingleside	76	86	79	241	5.9%
Taraval	31	43	89	163	4.0%
Tenderloin	79	131	133	343	8.4%
Airport	114	107	150	371	9.1%
Unknown	247	228	326	801	19.6%
Total	**1,215**	**1,270**	**1,608**	**4,093**	**100%**

Total Searches by District Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs					
District	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total	% Total
Central	38	47	20	105	10.8%
Southern	32	31	41	104	10.7%
Bayview	15	19	24	58	6.0%
Mission	30	35	43	108	11.1%
Northern	37	29	28	94	9.7%
Park	9	8	6	23	2.4%
Richmond	2	4	8	14	1.4%
Ingleside	16	22	25	63	6.5%
Taraval	12	9	11	32	3.3%
Tenderloin	40	53	61	154	15.9%
Airport	17	16	29	62	6.4%
Unknown	68	47	38	153	15.8%
Total	**316**	**320**	**334**	**970**	**100%**

Note: Location information in the Stop Data Collection System is in free text format. "Unknown" indicates stop records that could not be geocoded.

Basis of Searches

The two reasons that accounted for 63% of total searches were Incident to Arrest (46%) and Officer Safety/Safety of Others (17%).

Total Basis of Search	Total	% Total
Consent given	59	4%
Officer safety/safety of others	276	17%
Search warrant	52	3%
Condition of parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision	90	6%
Suspected weapons	88	6%
Visible contraband	67	4%
Odor of contraband	9	1%
Canine Detection	3	0%
Evidence of crime	163	10%
Incident to arrest	729	46%
Exigent circumstances/emergency	9	1%
Vehicle inventory	53	3%
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0%
***Distinct Count of Searches**	**1,085**	
Total Count of Basis for Search	**1,598**	

***There may be more than one basis for search**



Stop Data Q2 2023

Basis of Search by Race, Age, and Gender – Quarter 2 of 2023

Basis of Search	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
Consent given	4	21	10	1	2	1	16	4	59
Officer safety/safety of others	20	88	61	6	2	4	69	26	276
Search warrant	2	23	22	0	0	1	1	3	52
Condition of parole/probation/ PRCS/mandatory supervision	1	34	20	2	0	3	15	15	90
Suspected weapons	3	34	17	3	0	2	26	3	88
Visible contraband	0	17	18	2	1	0	24	5	67
Odor of contraband	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	9
Canine Detection	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Evidence of crime	4	55	54	1	0	1	41	7	163
Incident to arrest	31	235	216	11	2	10	188	36	729
Exigent circumstances/emergency	0	3	1	0	0	0	5	0	9
Vehicle inventory	2	22	12	1	0	1	12	3	53
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Distinct Count of Searches	**49**	**350**	**299**	**18**	**5**	**18**	**274**	**72**	**1,085**
% of Total Searches	**5%**	**32%**	**28%**	**2%**	**0%**	**2%**	**25%**	**7%**	**100%**

Basis of Search	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Total
Consent given	1	17	20	13	4	4	59
Officer safety/safety of others	25	79	85	49	26	12	276
Search warrant	5	16	12	12	5	2	52
Condition of parole/probation/ PRCS/mandatory supervision	0	22	39	20	6	3	90
Suspected weapons	5	19	32	16	13	3	88
Visible contraband	1	26	24	11	4	1	67
Odor of contraband	1	4	4	0	0	0	9
Canine Detection	0	3	0	0		0	3
Evidence of crime	12	53	56	28	9	5	163
Incident to arrest	43	195	267	130	72	22	729
Exigent circumstances/emergency	2	2	3	0	2	0	9
Vehicle inventory	2	13	16	14	7	1	53
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Distinct Count of Searches	**67**	**286**	**388**	**208**	**100**	**36**	**1,085**
% of Total Searches	**6%**	**26%**	**36%**	**19%**	**9%**	**3%**	**100%**

Stop Data Q2 2023

Basis of Search	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
Consent given	11	47	0	1	0	59
Officer safety/safety of others	45	227	2	1	1	276
Search warrant	14	38	0	0	0	52
Condition of parole/probation/ PRCS/mandatory supervision	6	84	0	0	0	90
Suspected weapons	7	80	0	1	0	88
Visible contraband	7	60	0	0	0	67
Odor of contraband	4	5	0	0	0	9
Canine Detection	1	2	0	0	0	3
Evidence of crime	25	136	0	2	0	163
Incident to arrest	125	597	1	4	2	729
Exigent circumstances/emergency	2	7	0	0	0	9
Vehicle inventory	7	46	0	0	0	53
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Distinct Count of Searches	**179**	**894**	**2**	**7**	**3**	**1,085**
% of Total Searches	**16%**	**82%**	**0%**	**1%**	**0%**	**100%**

Search Yield Rate

There were 1085 distinct searches in Quarter 2 of 2023. Total yield rate for all searches was 57%.



	Q1	Q2*	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2*
	2022				2023	
Asian	44%	36%	32%	43%	40%	36%
Black/ African American	42%	43%	47%	54%	48%	53%
Hispanic/ Latino	48%	47%	52%	51%	51%	69%
White	38%	41%	41%	48%	43%	54%
Other	50%	19%	42%	49%	55%	58%

*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

Yield rate was 58% for Other, 53% for Black/African Americans, 69% for Hispanics/Latinos, 36% for Asian and 54% for White individuals in Quarter 2 of 2023.



	2018 Q3 - Q4 Average	2019 Q1-Q4 Average	2020 Q1-Q4 Average	2021 Q1-Q4 Average	2022 Q1-Q4 Average
Asian	23%	29%	33%	36%	38%
Black/ African American	29%	32%	36%	40%	48%
Hispanic/ Latino	29%	37%	41%	45%	51%
White	27%	32%	34%	36%	42%
Other	29%	33%	36%	31%	47%

Search yield rates have increased year over year since mid-2018, suggesting an increase in the use of objective factors and decrease in the use of bias in decisions to search individuals.

Results of Searches
2023 QUARTER 2



Results of Searches	Total	% Total
None	469	31%
Firearm(s)	77	5%
Ammunition	66	4%
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	71	5%
Drugs/Narcotics	247	16%
Alcohol	26	2%
Money	119	8%
Drug Paraphernalia	152	10%
Suspected stolen property	98	6%
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	76	5%
Other Contraband or evidence	134	9%
Unknown	0	0%
Distinct Count of Search	**1,085**	**100%**

***A single search may have multiple results**

Results of Searches
2023 QUARTER 2

Results of Searches	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
None	32	166	95	15	3	11	125	22	**469**
Firearm(s)	3	34	16	2	1	1	12	8	**77**
Ammunition	2	26	13	2	1	0	11	11	**66**
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	4	17	18	1	1	2	24	4	**71**
Drugs/Narcotics	6	45	126	2	0	1	43	24	**247**
Alcohol	1	3	13	0	0	0	3	6	**26**
Money	0	15	80	2	0	0	7	15	**119**
Drug Paraphernalia	3	44	37	0	0	2	62	4	**152**
Suspected stolen property	2	50	21	0	0	0	22	3	**98**
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	2	32	30	1	0	1	8	2	**76**
Other Contraband or evidence	4	52	29	0	0	2	42	5	**134**
Unknown									**0**
Distinct Count of Search	**49**	**350**	**299**	**18**	**5**	**18**	**274**	**72**	**1,085**

Results of Searches	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	Total
None	31	110	163	107	43	15	0	**469**
Firearm(s)	7	33	27	5	4	1	0	**77**
Ammunition	6	26	20	7	5	2	0	**66**
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	5	10	27	18	10	1	0	**71**
Drugs/Narcotics	14	92	89	29	19	4	0	**247**
Alcohol	0	10	7	4	3	2	0	**26**
Money	10	67	31	10	1	0	0	**119**
Drug Paraphernalia	0	21	80	29	17	5	0	**152**
Suspected stolen property	10	28	32	17	7	4	0	**98**
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	6	33	20	11	3	3	0	**76**
Other Contraband or evidence	11	25	49	29	14	6	0	**134**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Search	**67**	**286**	**388**	**208**	**100**	**36**	**0**	**1,085**

Results of Searches	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
None	97	366	1	4	1	**469**
Firearm(s)	7	69	0	1	0	**77**
Ammunition	6	57	1	0	2	**66**
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	13	57	0	1	0	**71**
Drugs/Narcotics	33	213	0	1	0	**247**
Alcohol	2	24	0	0	0	**26**
Money	13	106	0	0	0	**119**
Drug Paraphernalia	20	132	0	0	0	**152**
Suspected stolen property	18	80	0	0	0	**98**
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	16	60	0	0	0	**76**
Other Contraband or evidence	21	112	0	1	0	**134**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Search	**179**	**894**	**2**	**7**	**3**	**1,085**

Reasons for Stops

In Quarter 2 of 2023, traffic violations and reasonable suspicion accounted for 95% of reasons for stop. Traffic violations accounted for 60% and reasonable suspicion accounted for 35%.

Reason for Stops	Total	% Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	18	0%
Investigation to determine if person is truant	22	0%
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	158	3%
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	14	0%
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	1,680	35%
Traffic violation	2,838	60%
Unknown	24	1%
Distinct Count of Stops	**4,754**	**100%**



Stop Data Q2 2023

Reasons for Stops by Race, Age, Gender

Reasons for Stops	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	2	6	2	0	0	0	8	0	18
Investigation to determine if person is truant	0	3	9	1	0	1	8	0	22
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	10	64	35	6	0	1	38	4	158
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	0	5	4	0	0	1	2	2	14
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	93	492	488	36	7	26	477	61	1,680
Traffic violation	372	447	769	263	3	37	815	132	2,838
Unknown	1	0	5	0	0	0	2	16	24
Distinct Count of Stops	**478**	**1,017**	**1,312**	**306**	**10**	**66**	**1,350**	**215**	**4,754**
% of Stops	**10%**	**21%**	**28%**	**6%**	**0%**	**1%**	**28%**	**5%**	**100%**

Reasons for Stops	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	0	9	3	3	0	3	0	18
Investigation to determine if person is truant	2	8	5	4	1	2	0	22
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	8	36	45	37	24	8	0	158
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	0	5	6	3	0	0	0	14
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	112	386	588	322	185	87	0	1,680
Traffic violation	17	700	925	603	393	200	0	2,838
Unknown	0	1	3	4	0	0	16	24
Distinct Count of Stops	**139**	**1,145**	**1,575**	**976**	**603**	**300**	**16**	**4,754**
% of Stops	**3%**	**24%**	**33%**	**21%**	**13%**	**6%**	**0%**	**100%**

Reasons for Stops	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	4	14	0	0	0	18
Investigation to determine if person is truant	6	16	0	0	0	22
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	22	134	1	1	0	158
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	1	13	0	0	0	14
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	349	1,317	0	13	1	1,680
Traffic violation	600	2,227	2	5	4	2,838
Unknown	2	6	0	0	16	24
Distinct Count of Stops	**984**	**3,727**	**3**	**19**	**21**	**4,754**
% of Stops	**21%**	**78%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**100%**

Results of Stops

Of the 4,754 stops, a citation for infraction was issued for 29% of the stops; a warning was issued for 27%, and custodial arrest without warrant occurred for 14% of the stops.

Results of Stops	Total	% Total
No action	426	9%
Warning (verbal or written)	1,341	27%
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	1,430	29%
In-field cite and release	542	11%
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	321	6%
Custodial arrest without warrant	685	14%
Field interview card completed	49	1%
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	32	1%
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	45	1%
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	121	2%
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	3	0%
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0%
Unknown	0	0%
Distinct Count of Stops	**4,754**	**100%**

***A single stop may have multiple results**



Results of Stops by Race, Age, and Gender

Results of Stops	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino(a)	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
No action	19	130	114	9	5	6	114	29	**426**
Warning (verbal or written)	147	290	338	121	2	14	362	67	**1,341**
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	213	150	391	133	0	24	461	58	**1,430**
In-field cite and release	52	121	182	35	0	6	127	19	**542**
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	13	109	68	7	0	5	110	9	**321**
Custodial arrest without warrant	29	211	230	7	2	11	160	35	**685**
Field interview card completed	2	14	15	1	0	1	15	1	**49**
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	0	11	5	2	0	0	14	0	**32**
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	2	19	10	2	1	0	6	5	**45**
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	18	29	15	3	0	2	52	2	**121**
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	**3**
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Stops	**478**	**1,017**	**1,312**	**306**	**10**	**66**	**1,350**	**215**	**4,754**

Results of Stops	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	Total
No action	15	113	133	89	47	13	16	**426**
Warning (verbal or written)	13	295	440	310	191	92	0	**1,341**
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	10	320	460	305	215	120	0	**1,430**
In-field cite and release	30	142	176	97	60	37	0	**542**
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	7	46	133	86	35	14	0	**321**
Custodial arrest without warrant	33	214	250	113	59	16	0	**685**
Field interview card completed	3	16	16	7	6	1	0	**49**
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	5	10	9	5	3	0	0	**32**
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	41	4	0	0	0	0	0	**45**
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	5	28	48	14	10	16	0	**121**
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	**3**
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Stops	**139**	**1,145**	**1,575**	**976**	**603**	**300**	**16**	**4,754**

Results of Stops	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
No action	106	303	0	1	16	**426**
Warning (verbal or written)	299	1,037	0	5	0	**1,341**
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	283	1,140	2	1	4	**1,430**
In-field cite and release	106	430	0	5	1	**542**
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	45	275	0	0	1	**321**
Custodial arrest without warrant	121	558	1	5	0	**685**
Field interview card completed	10	38	0	0	1	**49**
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	9	23	0	0	0	**32**
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	10	35	0	0	0	**45**
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	43	75	0	3	0	**121**
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	0	3	0	0	0	**3**
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Stops	**984**	**3,727**	**3**	**19**	**21**	**4,754**

**Three stops during Quarter 2 of 2023 resulted in contact with the Department of Homeland Security or its sub-divisions. One incident occurred at Central District and the other two incidents occurred at the San Francisco International Airport where Department of Homeland Security/TSA was notified and responded as follows:*

- *On 4/1/23 after completion of a traffic stop in Central Police District which resulted in a citation of the driver, SF Dispatch requested the citing Officer contact DHS. DHS Agent advised the Officer that the cited driver was*

a human trafficking suspect and it was believed that the passenger in the vehicle was a victim of human trafficking. DHS Agent requested the Officer confirm the suspect via photo shared by the agent. The Officer positively identified the suspect.

- *On 5/26/23 (case #23-14658), a USA citizen was detained for going through a secured door after he got lost coming off of a flight. The DHS/TSA was notified as is the policy.*

- *On 6/23/23 (case # 23-17454), a USA citizen was intoxicated and unruly on a domestic flight. She was detained upon arrival. The DHS/TSA was notified as is the policy.*

There was no violation of DGO 5.15, Enforcement of Immigration Laws.

Calls for Service, Q2 2023

Calls for Service

The Department responded to 146,297 total calls for service during April 1 through June 30, 2023. Call volume slightly decreased from the month of May to the month of June during the Quarter 2 2023.



Calls for Service, Q2 2023



911 Calls assigned to SFPD have declined year over year since 2019.

Data Source: San Francisco Police Department Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). Calls for Service data represent calls to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) via the 911 system and assigned to SFPD.

Suspects, Q2 2023

SUSPECTS OBSERVED AND/OR REPORTED TO SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Suspect information/description is either provided by a member of the public, reported directly to the police or through dispatch, or is observed by a department member during a self-initiated call for service in which there is reasonable suspicion or probable cause for an officer to conduct a stop. The suspect information is documented in a police incident report that is generated from the call for service.

The following table summarizes suspect descriptions gathered from incident reports through the means stated above. Data captured shows that approximately 38% of the individuals observed and/or reported are Black/African American.

Suspects by Race/Ethnicity			April 1, 2023 - June 30, 2023		
DESCRIPTION	Apr	May	June	Q2 2023 Suspects	% of Total Suspects Q2 2023
Asian/ Pacific Islander	107	115	101	323	4.2%
Black/ African American	944	979	1023	2946	37.9%
Hispanic/ Latino	444	480	409	1333	17.2%
Native American	7	6	1	14	0.2%
White	476	542	531	1549	19.9%
Others	507	468	631	1606	20.7%
Total	**2,485**	**2,590**	**2,696**	**7,771**	**100.00%**



Note: Suspect data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Suspects, Q2 2023

Black/African American individuals have been the highest demographic of Suspects observed and/or reported for the last 6 quarters (Q1 2022 – Q2 2023). However, data captured in Q2 2023 shows a decline by almost 3% of Suspects observed and/or reported as Black/African American when compared to Q2 2022.



	Q1 2022	Q2 2022	Q3 2022	Q4 2022	Q1 2023	Q2 2023
Asian/ Pacific Islander	361	326	377	301	295	323
Black/ African American	3,074	2,982	3,175	2,993	2,926	2,946
Hispanic/ Latino	1,349	1,420	1,421	1,289	1,202	1,333
Native American	19	11	11	20	16	14
White	1,811	1,740	1,710	1,563	1,482	1,549
Others	1,401	1,513	1,605	1,715	1,488	1,606
Total	8,015	7,992	8,299	7,881	7,409	7,771

Note: Suspect data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

Total Use of Force Overview
January 1, 2016, through December 7, 2022



Changes to the Use of Force Department General Order and associated data collection is discussed in the data exploration section of this report and should be kept in mind when interpreting these data.

Where possible this report provides data for December 8, 2022 through December 31, 2022 and complete Q1 2023 data to account for December 2022 UoF policy change and allow for historical context and tracking of data not provided in QADR Report for Q4 2022.

Use of Force, Q2 2023



During Quarter 2 of 2023, the department responded to 146,297 total calls for service. Department officers were assaulted 57 times and force was used in 251 incidents which represented 0.017% of all calls for service. Of those 251 incidents, force was used 600 times by 322 officers against 305 individuals.

.

Overview by Subject Race/Ethnicity

During Quarter 2 of 2023, April 1 through June 30, 2023, 16% of the total Uses of Force were against White individuals, 43% were against Black/African American individual, 27% were against Hispanic/Latino individuals, and 11% were against Asians.

	COUNT OF FORCE - December 2022 Policy		
	2022	2023	
INDIVIDUAL RACE	Dec 8-31	Q1	Q2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	14	66
Black	53	243	259
Hispanic	43	148	163
White	23	126	97
Unknown	7	20	15
Grand Total	**130**	**551**	**600**



Use of Force, Q2 2023

Under the December 2022 Use of Force policy, from April 1st through June 30th, Quarter 2 of 2023, the total count of use of force received by Black/African American individuals accounted for (43%, 259), while Hispanic individuals accounted for (27%, 163), and White individuals accounted for (16%, 97).

Total % Use of Force, Q2 2023 by Race/Ethnicity		
Subject Race	**Q2 2023**	
Asian or Pacific Islander	66	11%
Black	259	43%
Hispanic	163	27%
White	97	16%
Oth/Unk Race & Gender	15	3%
Grand Total	**600**	**100%**



Total Use of Force
Overview by Individual Age

Under the 2022 Use of Force policy, during April 1 through June 30, 2023, of Q2-2023, 39% of the total Uses of Force were against 18-29 years old individuals, and 13% were against 40-49 years old individuals, and 28% were against 30-39 years old individuals.

	COUNT OF FORCE - December 2022 Policy		
	2022	2023	
INDIVIDUAL AGE	Dec 8-31	Q1	Q2
Under 18	12	36	50
18-29	40	214	233
30-39	43	163	169
40-49	24	78	77
50-59	4	31	38
60+	1	6	12
Unknown	6	23	21
Grand Total	**130**	**551**	**600**



Total Use of Force
Overview by Individual Gender

Using the 2022 use of force policy, 85% of the total Uses of Force were against male individuals, and 14% were against female individuals during Quarter 2 of 2023.

	COUNT OF FORCE - December 2022 Policy		
	2022	2023	
INDIVIDUAL GENDER	Dec 8-31	Q1	Q2
Female	17	87	86
Male	111	460	511
Unkown/Nonbinary	2	4	3
Grand Total	**130**	**551**	**600**



Total Uses of Force-by-Force Type

Q2 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, under the December 2022 use of force policy, Physical Control and Firearm Pointing were the top two types of force used and accounted for 85% of total Uses of Force.



Use of Force by Type of Force Description December 2022 UoF Policy Standard	
Type of Force Description	**Q2 2023**
Chemical Agent	17
ERIW	5
ERIW 40mm	2
Firearm Pointing	260
Impact Weapon	4
Other	19
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	251
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	27
Vehicle Intervention	13
Firearm OIS	2
Grand Total	**600**

A review of all reported uses of force during Quarter 2 of 2023 found no instances of officers discharging firearms at a moving vehicle, nor any instances where the carotid restraint was employed.

USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

There were two Use of Force incidents resulting in death in Quarter 2 of 2023.

SAN FRANCISCO (May 19, 2023) — At approximately 2:20 p.m. SFPD officers responded to the 100 block of Bosworth St. regarding a person armed with a firearm who entered a residence. The person who discovered the suspect was able to exit the residence and contacted the police. Officers arrived on scene and made contact with the armed suspect who had refused to comply with officers for approximately 3 and a half hours. Additional SFPD resources and SFFD medics were on scene to assist with the incident. As officers were attempting to negotiate with the suspect, an officer involved shooting occurred. The suspect was transported to the hospital. Despite the life-saving efforts of the emergency responders and medical staff the suspect succumbed to his injuries and was declared deceased.

SAN FRANCISCO (JUNE 22, 2023) – On Thursday, June 22, 2023, at approximately 2:39 a.m., San Francisco police officers from Richmond Station were dispatched to a residence on the 700 block of 31st Avenue for a report of an aggravated assault in progress. An officer arrived on scene and made contact with an 84-year-old male victim in the doorway of the home. During the interaction, the 37-year-old suspect, who was armed with a knife, advanced toward the officer and the victim from inside the home and an officer involved shooting occurred. Additional officers arrived on scene and began rendering aid to the suspect and summoned medical personnel to the scene.

The victim told officers that the suspect had assaulted a 76-year-old female victim inside the home. Officers entered the home and discovered the female victim deceased. A dog was also found deceased inside the home. Medics transported the suspect to a local hospital where he was later pronounced deceased. The male victim was transported to a local hospital and treated for non-life-threatening injuries.

Officers Assaulted, Q2 2023

Officers Assaulted by Quarter

In Quarter 2 of 2023, there were a total of 57 officers assaulted.



Types of Force by

Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Subject
April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, under the new December 2022 Use of Force Policy, Uses of Force used against Hispanic Male individuals accounted for 25%, 13% against White Male individuals, and 35% against Black Male individuals.

Type of Force by Individual Race and Gender
April 1 - June 30, 2023

Individual Race and Gender	Chemical Agent	ERIW	ERIW 40mm	Firearm Pointing	Impact Weapon	Other	Physical Control Hold/Take Down	Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	Vehicle Intervention	Firearm OIS	Grand Total	% of Calls
A - Asian or Pacific Islander F	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	1%
A - Asian or Pacific Islander M	0	0	0	39	0	3	19	1	0	1	63	11%
B - Black F	0	0	0	11	0	2	30	4	0	0	47	8%
B - Black M	10	1	0	91	2	12	78	11	7	0	212	35%
H - Hispanic or Latin F	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	12	2%
H - Hispanic or Latin M	5	2	2	81	0	2	50	5	3	1	151	25%
W - White F	1	0	0	4	0	0	11	1	3	0	20	3%
W - White M	1	1	0	25	2	0	46	2	0	0	77	13%
Z - Other/Unkn M	0	1	0	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	8	1%
Z - Other/Unkn F	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	1%
Z - Other/Unkn Race and Gender	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	1%
Grand Total	**17**	**5**	**2**	**260**	**4**	**19**	**251**	**27**	**13**	**2**	**600**	**100%**

Types of Force by Age of Subject April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, per December 2022 use-of-force standard, use of force used against the individuals in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 39% of Uses of Force, the age group of 30-39 accounted for 28%, and the age group of 40-49 accounted for 13%.

Type of Force by Individual Age Category
April 1 - June 30, 2023

Individual Age Category	Chemical Agent	ERIW	ERIW 40mm	Firearm Pointing	Impact Weapon	Other	Physical Control Hold/Take Down	Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	Vehicle Intervention	Firearm OIS	Grand Total	% of Calls
Under 18	0	0	0	29	0	0	17	0	4	0	50	**8%**
18-29	6	1	0	112	1	9	90	9	5	0	233	**39%**
30-39	6	2	0	68	2	5	75	10	0	1	169	**28%**
40-49	3	1	2	29	0	1	36	4	0	1	77	**13%**
50-59	1	1	0	10	0	4	20	2	0	0	38	**6%**
60+	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	1	0	0	12	**2%**
Unknown	1	0	0	11	0	0	4	1	4	0	21	**4%**
Grand Total	**17**	**5**	**2**	**260**	**4**	**19**	**251**	**27**	**13**	**2**	**600**	**100%**

Unknown indicates information was not documented in the report for various reasons (i.e. suspect fled and demographic information was not known).

Due to rounding, percentage totals may not add up to exactly 100%

Types of Force by Call Type, 2022 Use of Force Policy
April 1 – June 30, 2023

Per December 2022 Use-of-Force Standard, Part I Violent was the top call type and accounted for 32% of total Uses of Force during Quarter 2 of 2023.

Use of Force by Types of Call and Force Type Description April 1 - June 30, 2023												
Types of Call	**Chemical Agent**	**ERIW**	**ERIW 40mm**	**Firearm OIS**	**Firearm Pointing**	**Impact Weapon**	**Other**	**Physical Control Hold/Take Down**	**Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist**	**Vehicle Intervention**	**Grand Total**	**% of Calls**
Part I Violent	10	0	0	1	90	1	3	77	7	0	189	**32%**
1030	0	0	0	0	35	0	1	12	3	1	52	**9%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/602/603/646/916/917)	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	38	2	0	49	**8%**
Part I Property	1	1	0	0	28	0	0	10	1	6	47	**8%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	1	2	1	36	0	1	3	0	0	44	**7%**
Misc	0	0	0	0	14	0	2	14	3	3	36	**6%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801/806)	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	24	3	0	30	**5%**
Vandalism (594/595/911)	1	2	0	0	2	2	0	19	3	0	29	**5%**
7A	0	0	0	0	20	0	7	1	0	0	28	**5%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	14	0	1	9	0	3	27	**5%**
All Other Types of Call	3	0	0	0	13	0	4	44	5	0	69	**12%**
Grand Total	**17**	**5**	**2**	**2**	**260**	**4**	**19**	**251**	**27**	**13**	**600**	**100%**

The table above reflects the top 10 Types of Call. “All Other Types of Call” include the sum of remaining call type categories.

Uses of Force by Reason

April 1 – June 30, 2023

Per December 2022 Use of Force Standard, "To Effect a Lawful Arrest, Detention, or Search" was the most common reason for Use of Force in Quarter 2 of 2023.

UoF Reason of Force Description April 1 - June 30, 2023		
UoF Reason of Force	**Total UoF Incidents**	**Total Count of Reason**
Reason is to effect a lawful arrest,detention or search	244	1467
Reason is to overcome resistance or to prevent escape	191	1205
Reason is to prevent a person from injuring himself/herself, when the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another person or officer	14	112
Reason is to prevent the commission of a public offense	74	444
Reason of others or in self-defense	111	641
Reason to gain compliance with a lawful order	207	1202
Grand Total	**251**	**5071**

As noted in the data exploration section, the reason for use of force has gone from a single selection to a multiple select field. This can lead to more reasons for uses of force in data collected in Quarter 2 of 2022 onward than actual uses of force, as seen above.

Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Officer Q2-2023, April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, using the December 2022 Use of Force policy, White male officers accounted for 290 (48%) of Uses of Force used, and Asian male officers accounted for 105 (18%) of Uses of Force used, and Hispanic male officers accounted for 105 (18%) as well.

Officers Using Force by Race and Gender
April 1 - June 30, 2023

Officer Race and Gender	Total Uses of Force	Officers Using Force	Department Demographic
A - Asian or Pacific Islander F	5	5	43
A - Asian or Pacific Islander M	105	64	411
B - Black F	14	6	34
B - Black M	45	22	127
H - Hispanic F	8	7	74
H - Hispanic M	105	57	289
W - White F	14	8	119
W - White M	290	146	734
Z - Other F	0	0	7
Z - Other M	14	7	31
Grand Total	**600**	**322**	**1869**

Per December 2022 Use of Force Policy, Officers in the age group of 30-39 accounted for 328 (55%) of Uses of Force applied against individuals.

Officers Using Force by Age Category
April 1 - June 30, 2023

Officer Age Category	Total Uses of Force	Officers Using Force	Department Demographic
21-29	132	74	190
30-39	328	165	646
40-49	95	60	577
50-59	40	21	418
60+	5	3	38
Grand Total	**600**	**322**	**1869**

**Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander*
***Other indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions*

Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Individual Q2-2023, April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, per December 2022 use-of-force standard, Black male individuals accounted for 212 (35%), Hispanic male individuals accounted for 151 (25%) of Uses of Force used against, and White male individuals accounted for 77 (13%) of Uses of Force used against.

Individuals by Race and Gender
April 1 - June 30, 2023

Individual Race and Gender	Total Uses of Force	Number of Individuals
A - Asian or Pacific Islander F	3	2
A - Asian or Pacific Islander M	63	21
B - Black F	47	23
B - Black M	212	100
H - Hispanic or Latin F	12	9
H - Hispanic or Latin M	151	72
W - White F	20	15
W - White M	77	51
Z - Other/Unkn F	4	3
Z - Other/Unkn M	8	7
Z - Other/Unkn Race and Gender	3	2
Grand Total	**600**	**305**

Individuals in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 233 (39%) of Total Use of Force used against, and age group of 30-39 accounted for 169 (28%) of Total Use of Force.

Individuals by Age Category
April 1 - June 30, 2023

Individual Age Category	Total Uses of Force	Number of Individuals
Under 18	50	22
18-29	233	107
30-39	169	87
40-49	77	42
50-59	38	21
60+	12	6
Unknown	21	20
Grand Total	**600**	**305**

**Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report*

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Officers Involved April 1 – June 30, 2023

Per the December 2022 Use of Force standard, of 251 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 officer (137, 54%).

Number of Officers Involved April 1 - June 30, 2023	
Number of Officers	**Number of Incidents**
1	137
2	62
3	24
4	9
5	10
6	4
7	3
8	1
11	1
Grand Total	**251**



Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Individuals Involved April 1 – June 30, 2023

Under the December 2022 Use of Force policy, of 251 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 subject (216, 86%).

Number of Individuals Involved April 1 - June 30, 2023	
Number of Individuals	**Number of Incidents**
1	216
2	23
3	8
4	2
5	1
6	1
Grand Total	**251**



Arrests, Q2 2023

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
Q2-2022 vs. Q2-2023

Overall arrests increased in Quarter 2 of 2023 (3,416) by 15% compared to Quarter 2 of 2022 (2,982).

Arrests By Race/Ethnicity and Gender Q2 2022 vs Q2 2023			
Race and Gender	**Q2 2022**	**Q2 2023**	**% change**
Asian Female	42	41	-2%
Asian Male	156	164	5%
Asian Unknown	0	0	not cal
Black Female	192	260	35%
Black Male	822	820	0%
Black Unknown	1	7	600%
Hispanic Female	97	157	62%
Hispanic Male	781	935	20%
Hispanic Unknown	3	1	-67%
White Female	157	143	-9%
White Male	615	761	24%
White Unknown	2	4	100%
Unknown Female	22	19	-14%
Unknown Male	79	88	11%
Unknown Race & Gender	13	16	23%
Total	**2,982**	**3,416**	**15%**



Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in these data.

Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type is listed as "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports in which data was not provided.

Arrests Q2, 2023

Arrests by Age

Q2-2022 vs. Q2-2023

The overall arrests of individuals under age 18 increased by 123% in Quarter 2 of 2023 (178) when compared to arrests in Quarter 2 of 2022 (80). The arrest of individuals aged 30-39 increased by 20% in Quarter 2 of 2023 (1,137) when compared to Quarter 2 of 2022 (943).

Arrests By Age Q2 2022 vs Q2 2023			
Age	**Q2 2022**	**Q2 2023**	**% change**
Under 18	80	178	123%
18-29	943	1,019	8%
30-39	948	1,137	20%
40-49	554	605	9%
50-59	285	324	14%
60+	172	153	-11%
Unknown	0	0	0%
Total	**2,982**	**3,416**	**15%**



Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Use of Force Incidents, by District
Q1 – 2023, December 2022 Reporting Standard

During Quarter 2 of 2023, per December 2022 use-of-force standard, the Mission District accounted for 46 Use of Force incidents comprising 18% of all districts use-of-force incidents.

Use of Force Incidents by District April 1 - June 30, 2023	
Districts	**Incidents**
A - Central	27
B - Southern	30
C - Bayview	25
D - Mission	46
E - Northern	26
F - Park	5
G - Richmond	12
H - Ingleside	30
I - Taraval	6
J - Tenderloin	39
L - Outside SF	5
Grand Total	**251**



By District Data

Number of Individuals on Whom Force Was Used, by District
Q1 – 2023, December 2022 Reporting Standard

Per December 2022 Use of Force Reporting Standard, during Quarter 2 of 2023, Mission and Tenderloin districts accounted for 33% of all districts by the number of individuals on whom force was used.

Number of Individuals on Whom Force was Used by District April 1 - June 30, 2023	
District	**Number of Individuals**
Bayview	35
Central	35
Ingleside	33
Mission	57
Northern	29
Out of SF	6
Park	5
Richmond	18
Southern	33
Taraval	10
Tenderloin	44
Grand Total	**305**



By District Data

Total Uses of Force, by District

Uses of Force by District April 1 - June 30, 2023	
Districts	**of Force**
A - Central	62
B - Southern	55
C - Bayview	57
D - Mission	121
E - Northern	51
F - Park	10
G - Richmond	42
H - Ingleside	76
I - Taraval	15
J - Tenderloin	91
L - Outside SF	20
Grand Total	**600**



During Quarter 2 of 2023, April 1 through June 30, 2023, Mission District (121 uses of force incidents), Tenderloin District (91 uses of force incidents) and Ingleside District (76 uses of force incidents) accounted for 48% of all districts Uses of Force incidents.

By District Data

Total Arrests by District

Q2 – 2022 vs. 2023

In Quarter 2 of 2023, there was an overall increase in arrests of 15% as compared to Quarter 2, 2022. However, Northern station arrests (372) increased by 37% when compared to Q2-2022 (272).

Arrests By District, Q2 2022 vs Q2 2023			
District	**Q2 2022**	**Q2 2023**	**% change**
Co. A - Central	363	420	16%
Co. B - Southern	431	544	26%
Co. C - Bayview	271	250	-8%
Co. D - Mission	454	536	18%
Co. E - Northern	272	372	37%
Co. F - Park	98	78	-20%
Co. G - Richmond	110	126	15%
Co. H - Ingleside	181	230	27%
Co. I - Taraval	155	146	-6%
Co. J - Tenderloin	590	685	16%
Outside SF	57	29	-49%
Total	**2,982**	**3,416**	**15%**



Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals. Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Arrests totals do not include arrests at the Airport.

Central District

(Company A)

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 62 total Uses of Force in the Central District. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (28) accounted for 45% of the type of force used. The peak time for incidents (39, 63%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	1
ERIW	1
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	18
Impact Weapon	0
Other	2
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	28
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	3
Vehicle Intervention	9
Grand Total	**62**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
A-Central	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	**2**	3%
0400-0759	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	**4**	6%
0800-1159	0	0	0	4	1	0	3	**8**	13%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	6	8	0	10	3	8	4	**39**	63%
2000-2359	2	2	2	1	0	0	2	**9**	15%
Total	**8**	**12**	**2**	**16**	**4**	**11**	**9**	**62**	**100%**
Percentage	13%	19%	3%	26%	6%	18%	15%	**100%**	

Central District
(Company A)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Black males (28%), and White males (27%) accounted for approximately 55% of arrests made by Central Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company A
Race and Gender	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	8	2%
Asian Male	22	5%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	29	7%
Black Male	118	28%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	14	3%
Hispanic Male	68	16%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	24	6%
White Male	115	27%
White Unknown	2	0%
Unknown Female	5	1%
Unknown Male	12	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	3	1%
Total	**420**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Central District
(Company A)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals aged 18-29 (26%) and 30-39 (29%) accounted for 55% of arrests made by Central Station, while individuals aged 60 and over accounted for 5%.

Arrest By Age		Company A
Age	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	47	11%
18-29	111	26%
30-39	121	29%
40-49	76	18%
50-59	46	11%
60+	19	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**420**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Southern District

(Company B)

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 55 total Uses of Force in the Southern District. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (25) accounted for 45% of Type of Force used. The peak times for incidents (19, 35%) were at 0000-0359hr and 2000-2359hr.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	0
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	24
Impact Weapon	1
Other	5
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	25
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	0
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**55**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
B-Southern	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	1	0	0	4	4	10	**19**	35%
0400-0759	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	**3**	5%
0800-1159	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	**3**	5%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	1	2	0	2	1	5	**11**	20%
2000-2359	0	9	1	1	3	4	1	**19**	35%
Total	**0**	**12**	**4**	**2**	**11**	**10**	**16**	**55**	**100%**
Percentage	0%	22%	7%	4%	20%	18%	29%	**100%**	

Southern District (Company B)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Black males (31%) and White males (27%) accounted for approximately 58% of arrests made by Southern Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company B
Race and Gender	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	8	1%
Asian Male	15	3%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	38	7%
Black Male	168	31%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	20	4%
Hispanic Male	116	21%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	18	3%
White Male	145	27%
White Unknown	1	0%
Unknown Female	1	0%
Unknown Male	9	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	5	1%
Total	**544**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Southern District (Company B)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals aged 18-29 (31%) and individuals 30-39 (33%) accounted for approximately 64% of arrests made by Southern Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company B
Age	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	14	3%
18-29	170	31%
30-39	180	33%
40-49	114	21%
50-59	44	8%
60+	22	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**544**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Bayview District
(Company C)
Use of Force
April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 57 total Uses of Force in the Bayview district. Firearm Pointing (26) accounted for 46% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (32, 56%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	1
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	26
Impact Weapon	0
Other	3
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	22
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	4
Vehicle Intervention	1
Grand Total	**57**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
C-Bayview	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	**8**	14%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	**8**	14%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	**2**	4%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	10	3	11	1	1	6	**32**	56%
2000-2359	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	**7**	12%
Total	**0**	**19**	**5**	**12**	**11**	**1**	**9**	**57**	**100%**
Percentage	0%	33%	9%	21%	19%	2%	16%	**100%**	

Bayview District (Company C)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April –June 2023

Black males (38%) and Hispanic males (22%) accounted for 60% of arrests made by Bayview Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company C
Race and Gender	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	2	1%
Asian Male	13	5%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	32	13%
Black Male	94	38%
Black Unknown	3	1%
Hispanic Female	19	8%
Hispanic Male	56	22%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	7	3%
White Male	17	7%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	7	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	**250**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Bayview District (Company C)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (27%) and individuals ages 30-39 (30%) accounted for 57% of the arrests made by Bayview station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company C
Age	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	11	4%
18-29	68	27%
30-39	74	30%
40-49	44	18%
50-59	34	14%
60+	19	8%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**250**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Mission District

(Company D)
Use of Force
April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 121 total Uses of Force in the Mission district. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (53) accounted for 44% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (40, 33%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	6
ERIW	1
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	50
Impact Weapon	1
Other	1
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	53
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	9
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**121**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
D-Mission	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	3	1	0	1	1	8	1	**15**	12%
0400-0759	0	1	0	0	3	4	2	**10**	8%
0800-1159	4	8	1	3	0	17	1	**34**	28%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	2	5	1	2	4	2	6	**22**	18%
2000-2359	0	2	5	2	10	1	20	**40**	33%
Total	**9**	**17**	**7**	**8**	**18**	**32**	**30**	**121**	**100%**
Percentage	7%	14%	6%	7%	15%	26%	25%	**100%**	

Mission District (Company D)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Hispanic males accounted for 46% of all arrests made by Mission station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	Company D	
Race and Gender	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	3	1%
Asian Male	17	3%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	32	6%
Black Male	92	17%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	30	6%
Hispanic Male	246	46%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	14	3%
White Male	87	16%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	3	1%
Unknown Male	11	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	0%
Total	**536**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Mission District (Company D)
Arrests by Age
April –June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (35%) and individuals ages 30-39 (30%) accounted for 65% of the arrest made by Mission station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company D
Age	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	20	4%
18-29	188	35%
30-39	162	30%
40-49	99	18%
50-59	45	8%
60+	22	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**536**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Northern District

(Company E)

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 51 total Uses of Force in the Northern district. Physical Control (32) accounted for 63% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (23, 45%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	3
ERIW	1
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	10
Impact Weapon	2
Other	2
Physical Control Hold/Take	32
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	1
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**51**

Time of Day/Day of Week E-Northern	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	**9**	18%
0400-0759	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	**7**	14%
0800-1159	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	**6**	12%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	3	0	9	1	4	6	**23**	45%
2000-2359	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	**6**	12%
Total	**4**	**6**	**2**	**12**	**3**	**11**	**13**	**51**	**100%**
Percentage	8%	12%	4%	24%	6%	22%	25%	**100%**	

Northern District (Company E)

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Hispanic males (23%) and White males (28%) accounted for 51% of all arrests made by Northern Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	Company E	
Race and Gender	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	3	1%
Asian Male	16	4%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	21	6%
Black Male	83	22%
Black Unknown	1	0%
Hispanic Female	23	6%
Hispanic Male	87	23%
Hispanic Unknown	1	0%
White Female	23	6%
White Male	105	28%
White Unknown	1	0%
Unknown Female	1	0%
Unknown Male	6	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	0%
Total	**372**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Northern District (Company E)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (31%) and individuals ages 30-39 (38%) accounted for 69% of arrests made by Northern station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company E
Age	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	10	3%
18-29	115	31%
30-39	142	38%
40-49	63	17%
50-59	27	7%
60+	15	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**372**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Park District

(Company F)

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 10 total Uses of Force in the Park district. Physical Control/Take Down (9) accounted for 90% of Type of Force used. The peak times for incidents (4, 40%) were at 0400-0759hrs and 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	1
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	0
Impact Weapon	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	9
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	0
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**10**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
F-Park	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0400-0759	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	**4**	40%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	**2**	20%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	**4**	40%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
Total	**1**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**10**	**100%**
Percentage	10%	0%	0%	40%	30%	20%	0%	**100%**	

Park District (Company F)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Hispanic males (18%) and White males (36%) accounted for 54% of all arrests made by Park Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company F
Race and Gender	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	1	1%
Asian Male	5	6%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	2	3%
Black Male	11	14%
Black Unknown	1	1%
Hispanic Female	3	4%
Hispanic Male	14	18%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	8	10%
White Male	28	36%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	5	6%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	**78**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Park District (Company F)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals ages 30-39 accounted for 44% of the arrests made by Park station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company F
Age	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	1	1%
18-29	18	23%
30-39	34	44%
40-49	18	23%
50-59	3	4%
60+	4	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**78**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Richmond District

(Company G)

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 42 total Uses of Force in the Richmond district. Firearm Pointing (24) accounted for 57% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (16, 38%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	2
ERIW	0
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	1
Firearm Pointing	24
Impact Weapon	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take	12
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	3
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**42**

Time of Day/Day of Week G-Richmond	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	**9**	21%
0400-0759	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	**4**	10%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	2%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	0	2	9	4	1	0	**16**	38%
2000-2359	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	**12**	29%
Total	**0**	**12**	**2**	**13**	**8**	**3**	**4**	**42**	**100%**
Percentage	0%	29%	5%	31%	19%	7%	10%	**100%**	

Richmond District (Company G)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

White males (29%) and Hispanic males (25%) accounted for 54% of all arrests made by Richmond station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	Company G	
Race and Gender	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	5	4%
Asian Male	11	9%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	5	4%
Black Male	22	17%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	2	2%
Hispanic Male	31	25%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	9	7%
White Male	37	29%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	4	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	**126**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Richmond District (Company G)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals age 18-29 (25%) and individuals age 30-39 (36%) accounted for approximately 61% of the arrests made by Richmond station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company G
Age	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	14	11%
18-29	31	25%
30-39	45	36%
40-49	18	14%
50-59	13	10%
60+	5	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**126**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Ingleside District

(Company H)

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 76 total Uses of Force in the Ingleside district. Firearm Pointing (39) accounted for 51% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents was (36, 47%) between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	4
ERIW	0
ERIW 40mm	2
Firearm OIS	1
Firearm Pointing	39
Impact Weapon	0
Other	2
Physical Control Hold/Take	25
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	3
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**76**

Time of Day/Day of Week H-Ingleside	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	**7**	9%
0400-0759	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	**4**	5%
0800-1159	2	0	0	1	3	6	2	**14**	18%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	4	3	0	6	4	14	5	**36**	47%
2000-2359	2	2	2	0	9	0	0	**15**	20%
Total	**8**	**6**	**2**	**8**	**18**	**24**	**10**	**76**	**100%**
Percentage	11%	8%	3%	11%	24%	32%	13%	**100%**	

Ingleside District (Company H)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Hispanic males (31%) and Black males (20%) accounted for approximately 51% of all arrests made by Ingleside station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	Company H	
Race and Gender	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	5	2%
Asian Male	19	8%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	28	12%
Black Male	46	20%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	10	4%
Hispanic Male	71	31%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	8	3%
White Male	31	13%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	2	1%
Unknown Male	9	4%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	0%
Total	**230**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Ingleside District (Company H)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (27%) and individuals ages 30-39 (34%) accounted for 61% of arrests made by the Ingleside station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company H
Age	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Under 18	14	6%
18-29	62	27%
30-39	79	34%
40-49	33	14%
50-59	32	14%
60+	10	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**230**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Taraval District
(Company I)
Use of Force
April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were total of 15 Uses of Force in the Taraval district. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (7) accounted for 46% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (8, 53%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	0
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	5
Impact Weapon	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take	7
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	0
Vehicle Intervention	3
Grand Total	**15**

Time of Day/Day of Week I-Taraval	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	**2**	13%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	7%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	0	2	0	3	3	0	**8**	53%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	**4**	27%
Total	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**5**	**5**	**15**	**100%**
Percentage	0%	0%	13%	0%	20%	33%	33%	**100%**	

Taraval District (Company I)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Black males (21%) and White males (22%) accounted for 43% of all arrests made by Taraval station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Company I
Race and Gender	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	5	3%
Asian Male	25	17%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	8	5%
Black Male	31	21%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	6	4%
Hispanic Male	27	18%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	7	5%
White Male	32	22%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	4	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	1%
Total	**146**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Taraval District (Company I)
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals ages 30-39 accounted for 32% of arrests made by Taraval station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company I
Age	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	9	6%
18-29	41	28%
30-39	46	32%
40-49	28	19%
50-59	15	10%
60+	7	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**146**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Tenderloin District

(Company J)

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 91 total Uses of Force in the Tenderloin district. Firearm pointing (51) accounted for 56% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (41, 45%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	1
ERIW	0
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	51
Impact Weapon	0
Other	0
Physical Control Hold/Take	35
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	4
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**91**

Time of Day/Day of Week J-Tenderloin	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	**8**	9%
0400-0759	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	**6**	7%
0800-1159	2	6	4	0	0	1	6	**19**	21%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	2	1	5	3	1	3	2	**17**	19%
2000-2359	0	32	1	2	2	0	4	**41**	45%
Total	**5**	**45**	**10**	**6**	**4**	**4**	**17**	**91**	**100%**
Percentage	5%	49%	11%	7%	4%	4%	19%	**100%**	

Tenderloin District (Company J)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Hispanic males (31%) and White males (23%) accounted for 54% of all arrests made by Tenderloin Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	Company J	
Race and Gender	**Q2 2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	1	0%
Asian Male	19	3%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	63	9%
Black Male	143	21%
Black Unknown	2	0%
Hispanic Female	30	4%
Hispanic Male	211	31%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	25	4%
White Male	159	23%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	7	1%
Unknown Male	21	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	4	1%
Total	**685**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Tenderloin District (Company J)
Arrests Age
April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (30%) and individuals ages 30-39 (35%) accounted for 65% of arrests made by Tenderloin station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Arrest By Age		Company J
Age	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	38	6%
18-29	204	30%
30-39	238	35%
40-49	112	16%
50-59	64	9%
60+	29	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**685**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Airport

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

Airport Use of Force data per December 2022 Use of Force Policy standard was unavailable at time of report.

Airport
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Black males (18%) and White males (25%) accounted for 43% of total Airport arrests in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Airport Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		
Race & Gender	**Q2-2023 Arrests**	**% of Total**
Asian Female	5	4%
Asian Male	12	10%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	6	5%
Black Male	22	18%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	5	4%
Hispanic Male	13	11%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	6	5%
White Male	30	25%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	4	3%
Unknown Male	19	16%
Total	**122**	**100%**



Note: Airport arrest data is obtained from the San Francisco Police Department's Airport Bureau. Airport data includes every individual arrest (booked or cited) that occurs within 24-hour periods in the 3-month quarterly time period. An individual arrested within different 24-hour periods are counted as separate arrests. Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Airport
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals ages 30-39 (31%) and Individuals ages 40-49 (27%) accounted for 58% of all Airport arrests in Quarter 2 of 2023.

Airport Arrests by Age		
Group	Q2-2023 Arrests	% of Total
18-29	24	20%
30-39	38	31%
40-49	33	27%
50-59	14	11%
60+	13	11%
Total	**122**	**100%**



Note: Airport arrest data is obtained from the San Francisco Police Department's Airport Bureau. Airport data includes every individual arrest (booked or cited) that occurs within 24-hour periods in the 3-month quarterly time period. An individual arrested within different 24-hour periods are counted as separate arrests. Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Outside of SF/Unknown

Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 20 total Uses of Force Outside of SF/Unknown. Firearm Pointing (13) accounted for 65% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (16, 80%) was between 1600-1959hr.

Use of Force	Total
Chemical Agent	0
ERIW	0
ERIW 40mm	0
Firearm OIS	0
Firearm Pointing	13
Impact Weapon	0
Other	4
Physical Control Hold/Take Down	3
Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist	0
Vehicle Intervention	0
Grand Total	**20**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
L-Outside SF	SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	**2**	10%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	**2**	10%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	**16**	80%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**11**	**0**	**2**	**20**	**100%**
Percentage	0%	0%	0%	35%	55%	0%	10%	**100%**	

Outside SF/Unknown
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
April – June 2023

Black males (41%) and Hispanic males (28%) accounted for 69% of all Outside SF arrests.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender		Outside SF
Race and Gender	Q2 2023 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	0	0%
Asian Male	2	7%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	2	7%
Black Male	12	41%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	0	0%
Hispanic Male	8	28%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	0	0%
White Male	5	17%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	0	0%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	**29**	**100%**



Note: Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Outside SF/Unknown
Arrests by Age
April – June 2023

Individuals age 30-99 accounted for 55% of all Outside SF arrests.

Arrests by Age		Outside SF
Age	Q2-2023 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	0	0%
18-29	11	38%
30-39	16	55%
40-49	0	0%
50-59	1	3%
60+	1	3%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**29**	**100%**



Note: Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which "Person Type" = "Booked" or "Cited." Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Outside SF/Unknown

Arrests by Location
April - June 2023

Contra Costa County, CA (4), Oakland, CA (4) and Walnut Creek (3) accounted for 11 of 29 arrests outside of the city limits.

Arrests Outside of SF by Location	
Location	**Q2 2023 Arrests**
Alameda, CA	1
Baton Rouge, LA	1
Concord, CA	1
Confidential	2
Contra Costa County	4
Hayward, CA	2
Hercules, CA	1
Jonesboro, GA	1
Mill Valley, CA	1
Oakland, CA	4
Pinole, CA	1
Redwood City, CA	1
Richmond, CA	1
San Rafael, CA	1
Santa Clara County	1
SF County (Non-SFPD Jurisdiction)	1
Stockton, CA	1
Suisun City, CA	1
Walnut Creek, CA	3
Grand Total	**29**



Note: Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

Glossary

AB 953	Assembly Bill 953, also known as the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) of 2015; requires CA law enforcement agencies to collect and report demographic data to the California Department of Justice
ACS	American Community Survey
CDW	Crime Data Warehouse
City	City and County of San Francisco
Department	San Francisco Police Department
DGO	Department General Order
DHR	San Francisco Department of Human Resources
DHS	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
DOJ	U.S. Department of Justice
DPA	Department of Police Accountability
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
PRCS	Post Release Community Supervision; used to classify probation and parole searches
RIPA Board	California's Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board; produces an annual report on the past and current status of racial identity profiling and provides recommendations to law enforcement agencies
SDCS	Stop Data Collection System, the tool used to collect stops and search data in compliance with AB953
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
TSA	Transportation Security Administration
UoF	Use of Force

Safety with Respect

Prepared by San Francisco Police Department

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit

August 2023

Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Early Intervention Systems Administrative Investigative Management Database, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau, San Francisco Police Department Human Resources; San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs; San Francisco Department of Emergency Management; San Francisco Department of Police Accountability; California Department of Justice Stop Data Collection System

Q2 2023 Use of Force data was queried on July 18, 2023
Q2 2023 Arrest Data was queried on July 26, 2023

Safety with Respect

APPENDIX A
SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report
2023 Quarter 2 Report
Crime Victim Data Reporting

WILLIAM SCOTT
Chief of Police

On April 12, 2020, Ordinance 40-20 went into effect, amending San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96 to include section 96A.5, "Quarterly Crime Victim Data Reporting." The ordinance mandated that the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provide quarterly reports regarding victim demographics across a host of data points, further specifying that the quarterly reports would be due on the first Tuesday in February, May, August and November.

As part of our commitment to the community we serve, SFPD's Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit worked diligently and in close coordination with relevant SFPD bureaus to compile the crime victim information required for this report. It bears mentioning here, however, that as noted by the Board of Supervisors' Budget and Legislative Analyst, SFPD…

> …would need to modify the current UCR [Uniform Crime Reports] system if the proposed ordinance required tracking and reporting of the additional crime data at an earlier date than the estimated NIBRS [National Incident-Based Reporting System] implementation date of March 2022. Based on a minimum of two full-time equivalent (FTE) consultants, the Department estimates the minimum cost would be approximately $960,000. The estimated cost could be higher, based on the actual scope of work needed to modify the current UCR system. (Source: Budget and Legislative Analyst Memo for the February 6, 2020 Government Audit and Oversight Committee Meeting, Feb. 3, 2020, https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8048232&GUID=24920980-EBBA-4951-95B0-79C2FB993568)

As no additional funding was allocated to allow for the extraction of this data from our primary records management system, Crime Data Warehouse (CDW), staff worked within the constraints of the current resources to aggregate the needed data from CDW as it stands. As a result, readers must be aware that SFPD data is not structured for this reporting method.

As background, all law enforcement agencies must report the most severe crime under the Uniform Crime Reporting requirements, as stated by the FBI Summary Reporting System manual:

"*In cases where more than one offense occurs in an incident, only the highest ranking Part I offense is counted.*"

This “hierarchy rule” has led to the development of a system (born many decades ago), and migrated to the current state, structured for the purpose of counting the “highest ranking” offense. As such, the number of victims of certain crimes is not mandated for reporting by UCR nor is the age, ethnicity, gender or location for any crime. Therefore, detailed demographic and location information for victims is not prepared for capture in this type of report.

For example:

1. An individual can be a victim of multiple crime types in a single reported incident – that person may be counted in each crime type.
2. In a single incident with multiple crimes *and* multiple victims, SFPD summary reporting cannot provide how many people were victim to any individual crime. All victims in the incident show up in each crime.

Prepared by: San Francisco Police Department Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit
Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse (CDW); San Francisco Police Department Homicide Unit; San Francisco Police Department Special Investigations Division

APPENDIX A – SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report - Victim Demographic Summary Findings

Aggravated Assault
The number of victims associated with Aggravated Assault incident reports is down 11.1 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 7.2 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q2 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Aggravated Assault in Q2 2023 and Q1-Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29.

Battery/Other Assault
The number of victims associated with Battery/Other Assault incident reports is down 0.6 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 9 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Battery/Other Assault in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29. White, male, ages 30-39 is the highest demographic for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Robbery
The number of victims associated with Robbery incident reports is up 2.2 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 12.1 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Robbery in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Burglary
The number of victims associated with Burglary incident reports is down 4 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 3.4 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Burglary victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Burglary in Q2 2023, excluding others and unknown, are White, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Larceny Theft
The number of victims associated with Larceny incident reports is down 4.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 1 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Larceny victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Larceny in Q2 2023 are other/unknown, followed by White, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Motor Vehicle Theft
The number of victims associated with Motor Vehicle Theft incident reports is up 19.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 2.6 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Motor Vehicle Theft victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Motor Vehicle Theft in Q2 2023 are others, followed by white, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Sexual Assault
The number of victims associated with Sexual Assault incident reports is down 17.6 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 10.2 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Sexual Assault in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, female, under 18. Hispanic, female, 18-29, are the highest demographic characteristics for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Vandalism
The number of victims associated with Vandalism incident reports is down 11.8 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 7.3 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Vandalism victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the "other" and "unknown" demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Vandalism in Q2 2023 are others, followed by White, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Domestic Violence
The number of victims associated with Domestic Violence incident reports is down 11.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 7.4 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Domestic Violence in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, female, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Elder Abuse
The number of victims associated with Elder Abuse incident reports is up 19.9 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 13.5 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Elder Abuse in Q3 2022 are White, male, ages 65 or older. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Child Abuse
The number of victims associated with Child Abuse incident reports is down 1.9 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 1.1 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Child Abuse in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, female, under 18 years old. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Homicide
The number of Homicide victims is down 6.7 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023 and up 4.2 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Homicide in Q2 2023 are Black, male, ages 18-29. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

Hate Crime
The number of victims associated with Hate Crime incident reports is up 27.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 76.2 percent from Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Hate Crime in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29. For Q1 through Q2 2023, the most common demographic characteristics are Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian and Hispanic, female, ages 18-29. The most prevalent bias motivation during Q2 2023 was anti-Transgender and Q1 through Q2 2023 was anti-Asian.

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		11.00	23.00	20.00	6.00	4.00	31.00	**95.00**
B	Southern		7.00	38.00	33.00	14.00	3.00	31.00	**126.00**
C	Bayview		10.00	48.00	48.00	12.00	1.00	11.00	**130.00**
D	Mission		4.00	19.00	97.00	13.00	7.00	39.00	**179.00**
E	Northern	2.00	18.00	21.00	27.00	21.00	9.00	36.00	**134.00**
F	Park		3.00	1.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	19.00	**34.00**
G	Richmond		4.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	10.00	**23.00**
H	Ingleside	2.00	29.00	8.00	49.00	9.00	4.00	17.00	**118.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	15.00	8.00	11.00	1.00	1.00	9.00	**46.00**
J	Tenderloin		19.00	46.00	27.00	13.00	10.00	53.00	**168.00**
X	Out of SF					1.00			**1.00**
Grand Total		**5.00**	**120.00**	**213.00**	**321.00**	**96.00**	**43.00**	**256.00**	**1054.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		1.0%	2.2%	1.9%	0.6%	0.4%	2.9%	**9.0%**
B	Southern		0.7%	3.6%	3.1%	1.3%	0.3%	2.9%	**12.0%**
C	Bayview		0.9%	4.6%	4.6%	1.1%	0.1%	1.0%	**12.3%**
D	Mission		0.4%	1.8%	9.2%	1.2%	0.7%	3.7%	**17.0%**
E	Northern	0.2%	1.7%	2.0%	2.6%	2.0%	0.9%	3.4%	**12.7%**
F	Park		0.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	1.8%	**3.2%**
G	Richmond		0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.9%	**2.2%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	2.8%	0.8%	4.6%	0.9%	0.4%	1.6%	**11.2%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	1.4%	0.8%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%	**4.4%**
J	Tenderloin		1.8%	4.4%	2.6%	1.2%	0.9%	5.0%	**15.9%**
X	Out of SF					0.1%			**0.1%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**11.4%**	**20.2%**	**30.5%**	**9.1%**	**4.1%**	**24.3%**	**100.0%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	2.00	22.00	26.00	14.00	13.00	7.00	11.00	**95.00**
B	Southern	3.00	33.00	34.00	16.00	21.00	4.00	15.00	**126.00**
C	Bayview	14.00	28.00	25.00	19.00	16.00	14.00	14.00	**130.00**
D	Mission	11.00	52.00	31.00	31.00	19.00	18.00	17.00	**179.00**
E	Northern	15.00	25.00	27.00	19.00	11.00	12.00	25.00	**134.00**
F	Park	4.00	8.00	6.00	5.00	2.00	6.00	3.00	**34.00**
G	Richmond	5.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	2.00	**23.00**
H	Ingleside	17.00	24.00	21.00	22.00	8.00	21.00	5.00	**118.00**
I	Taraval	7.00	14.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	4.00	2.00	**46.00**
J	Tenderloin	6.00	23.00	32.00	25.00	41.00	18.00	23.00	**168.00**
X	Out of SF							1.00	**1.00**
Grand Total		**84.00**	**233.00**	**211.00**	**159.00**	**140.00**	**109.00**	**118.00**	**1054.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.2%	2.1%	2.5%	1.3%	1.2%	0.7%	1.0%	**9.0%**
B	Southern	0.3%	3.1%	3.2%	1.5%	2.0%	0.4%	1.4%	**12.0%**
C	Bayview	1.3%	2.7%	2.4%	1.8%	1.5%	1.3%	1.3%	**12.3%**
D	Mission	1.0%	4.9%	2.9%	2.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.6%	**17.0%**
E	Northern	1.4%	2.4%	2.6%	1.8%	1.0%	1.1%	2.4%	**12.7%**
F	Park	0.4%	0.8%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	0.6%	0.3%	**3.2%**
G	Richmond	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	**2.2%**
H	Ingleside	1.6%	2.3%	2.0%	2.1%	0.8%	2.0%	0.5%	**11.2%**
I	Taraval	0.7%	1.3%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	**4.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.6%	2.2%	3.0%	2.4%	3.9%	1.7%	2.2%	**15.9%**
X	Out of SF							0.1%	**0.1%**
Grand Total		**8.0%**	**22.1%**	**20.0%**	**15.1%**	**13.3%**	**10.3%**	**11.2%**	**100.0%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	27.00	62.00		6.00		**95.00**
B	Southern	35.00	77.00	1.00	13.00		**126.00**
C	Bayview	54.00	66.00		9.00	1.00	**130.00**
D	Mission	52.00	114.00		12.00	1.00	**179.00**
E	Northern	52.00	65.00		17.00		**134.00**
F	Park	13.00	20.00		1.00		**34.00**
G	Richmond	9.00	12.00		2.00		**23.00**
H	Ingleside	46.00	62.00	1.00	9.00		**118.00**
I	Taraval	14.00	31.00		1.00		**46.00**
J	Tenderloin	46.00	102.00		13.00	7.00	**168.00**
X	Out of SF		1.00				**1.00**
Grand Total		**348.00**	**612.00**	**2.00**	**83.00**	**9.00**	**1054.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	2.6%	5.9%		0.6%		**9.0%**
B	Southern	3.3%	7.3%	0.1%	1.2%		**12.0%**
C	Bayview	5.1%	6.3%		0.9%	0.1%	**12.3%**
D	Mission	4.9%	10.8%		1.1%	0.1%	**17.0%**
E	Northern	4.9%	6.2%		1.6%		**12.7%**
F	Park	1.2%	1.9%		0.1%		**3.2%**
G	Richmond	0.9%	1.1%		0.2%		**2.2%**
H	Ingleside	4.4%	5.9%	0.1%	0.9%		**11.2%**
I	Taraval	1.3%	2.9%		0.1%		**4.4%**
J	Tenderloin	4.4%	9.7%		1.2%	0.7%	**15.9%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%				**0.1%**
Grand Total		**33.0%**	**58.1%**	**0.2%**	**7.9%**	**0.9%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	4	128	280	354	107	41	272	**1,186**
Q2 2023	5	120	213	321	96	43	256	**1,054**
Difference	1	-8	-67	-33	-11	2	-16	**-132**
% Change	**25.0%**	**-6.3%**	**-23.9%**	**-9.3%**	**-10.3%**	**4.9%**	**-5.9%**	**-11.1%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	81	257	270	200	124	117	137	**1,186**
Q2 2023	84	233	211	159	140	109	118	**1,054**
Difference	3	-24	-59	-41	16	-8	-19	**-132**
% Change	**3.7%**	**-9.3%**	**-21.9%**	**-20.5%**	**12.9%**	**-6.8%**	**-13.9%**	**-11.1%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	383	699	2	99	3	**1,186**
Q2 2023	348	612	2	83	9	**1,054**
Difference	-35	-87	0	-16	6	**-132**
% Change	**-9.1%**	**-12.4%**	**0.0%**	**-16.2%**	**200.0%**	**-11.1%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		26.00	28.00	47.00	23.00	12.00	68.00	**204.00**
B	Southern	5.00	24.00	47.00	61.00	9.00	10.00	56.00	**212.00**
C	Bayview		21.00	45.00	43.00	3.00	4.00	18.00	**134.00**
D	Mission		26.00	38.00	134.00	15.00	16.00	79.00	**308.00**
E	Northern	2.00	21.00	31.00	43.00	9.00	9.00	55.00	**170.00**
F	Park		8.00	7.00	7.00	3.00	1.00	22.00	**48.00**
G	Richmond		13.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	12.00	24.00	**61.00**
H	Ingleside		17.00	19.00	56.00	6.00	3.00	26.00	**127.00**
I	Taraval		26.00	15.00	23.00	4.00	3.00	34.00	**105.00**
J	Tenderloin	2.00	32.00	51.00	45.00	14.00	14.00	83.00	**241.00**
X	Out of SF		1.00	6.00	3.00		1.00		**11.00**
Grand Total		**9.00**	**215.00**	**290.00**	**468.00**	**89.00**	**85.00**	**465.00**	**1621.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		1.6%	1.7%	2.9%	1.4%	0.7%	4.2%	**12.6%**
B	Southern	0.3%	1.5%	2.9%	3.8%	0.6%	0.6%	3.5%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview		1.3%	2.8%	2.7%	0.2%	0.2%	1.1%	**8.3%**
D	Mission		1.6%	2.3%	8.3%	0.9%	1.0%	4.9%	**19.0%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.3%	1.9%	2.7%	0.6%	0.6%	3.4%	**10.5%**
F	Park		0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.4%	**3.0%**
G	Richmond		0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	1.5%	**3.8%**
H	Ingleside		1.0%	1.2%	3.5%	0.4%	0.2%	1.6%	**7.8%**
I	Taraval		1.6%	0.9%	1.4%	0.2%	0.2%	2.1%	**6.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	2.0%	3.1%	2.8%	0.9%	0.9%	5.1%	**14.9%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.4%	0.2%		0.1%		**0.7%**
Grand Total		**0.6%**	**13.3%**	**17.9%**	**28.9%**	**5.5%**	**5.2%**	**28.7%**	**100.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	6.00	46.00	49.00	35.00	26.00	18.00	24.00	**204.00**
B	Southern	13.00	56.00	51.00	32.00	26.00	21.00	13.00	**212.00**
C	Bayview	19.00	27.00	32.00	12.00	19.00	21.00	4.00	**134.00**
D	Mission	29.00	89.00	59.00	53.00	29.00	25.00	24.00	**308.00**
E	Northern	17.00	34.00	47.00	24.00	26.00	11.00	11.00	**170.00**
F	Park	5.00	13.00	10.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	1.00	**48.00**
G	Richmond	8.00	5.00	11.00	10.00	9.00	12.00	6.00	**61.00**
H	Ingleside	15.00	25.00	21.00	17.00	22.00	21.00	6.00	**127.00**
I	Taraval	16.00	18.00	14.00	21.00	13.00	18.00	5.00	**105.00**
J	Tenderloin	5.00	42.00	60.00	49.00	30.00	36.00	19.00	**241.00**
X	Out of SF	4.00	3.00	2.00		1.00	1.00		**11.00**
Grand Total		**137.00**	**358.00**	**356.00**	**259.00**	**208.00**	**190.00**	**113.00**	**1621.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.4%	2.8%	3.0%	2.2%	1.6%	1.1%	1.5%	**12.6%**
B	Southern	0.8%	3.5%	3.1%	2.0%	1.6%	1.3%	0.8%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview	1.2%	1.7%	2.0%	0.7%	1.2%	1.3%	0.2%	**8.3%**
D	Mission	1.8%	5.5%	3.6%	3.3%	1.8%	1.5%	1.5%	**19.0%**
E	Northern	1.0%	2.1%	2.9%	1.5%	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	**10.5%**
F	Park	0.3%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	**3.0%**
G	Richmond	0.5%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	**3.8%**
H	Ingleside	0.9%	1.5%	1.3%	1.0%	1.4%	1.3%	0.4%	**7.8%**
I	Taraval	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%	1.3%	0.8%	1.1%	0.3%	**6.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.3%	2.6%	3.7%	3.0%	1.9%	2.2%	1.2%	**14.9%**
X	Out of SF	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%		0.1%	0.1%		**0.7%**
Grand Total		**8.5%**	**22.1%**	**22.0%**	**16.0%**	**12.8%**	**11.7%**	**7.0%**	**100.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	76.00	106.00		20.00	2.00	**204.00**
B	Southern	93.00	108.00	1.00	9.00	1.00	**212.00**
C	Bayview	72.00	59.00		3.00		**134.00**
D	Mission	120.00	176.00	1.00	11.00		**308.00**
E	Northern	71.00	88.00		8.00	3.00	**170.00**
F	Park	15.00	30.00	1.00	2.00		**48.00**
G	Richmond	25.00	31.00		3.00	2.00	**61.00**
H	Ingleside	61.00	59.00	1.00	6.00		**127.00**
I	Taraval	47.00	53.00	1.00	4.00		**105.00**
J	Tenderloin	85.00	140.00	1.00	15.00		**241.00**
X	Out of SF	7.00	4.00				**11.00**
Grand Total		**672.00**	**854.00**	**6.00**	**81.00**	**8.00**	**1621.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	4.7%	6.5%		1.2%	0.1%	**12.6%**
B	Southern	5.7%	6.7%	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview	4.4%	3.6%		0.2%		**8.3%**
D	Mission	7.4%	10.9%	0.1%	0.7%		**19.0%**
E	Northern	4.4%	5.4%		0.5%	0.2%	**10.5%**
F	Park	0.9%	1.9%	0.1%	0.1%		**3.0%**
G	Richmond	1.5%	1.9%		0.2%	0.1%	**3.8%**
H	Ingleside	3.8%	3.6%	0.1%	0.4%		**7.8%**
I	Taraval	2.9%	3.3%	0.1%	0.2%		**6.5%**
J	Tenderloin	5.2%	8.6%	0.1%	0.9%		**14.9%**
X	Out of SF	0.4%	0.2%				**0.7%**
Grand Total		**41.5%**	**52.7%**	**0.4%**	**5.0%**	**0.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	7	237	306	398	104	95	484	**1,631**
Q2 2023	9	215	290	468	89	85	465	**1,621**
Difference	2	-22	-16	70	-15	-10	-19	**-10**
% Change	**28.6%**	**-9.3%**	**-5.2%**	**17.6%**	**-14.4%**	**-10.5%**	**-3.9%**	**-0.6%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	104	348	359	314	177	195	134	**1,631**
Q2 2023	137	358	356	259	208	190	113	**1,621**
Difference	33	10	-3	-55	31	-5	-21	**-10**
% Change	**31.7%**	**2.9%**	**-0.8%**	**-17.5%**	**17.5%**	**-2.6%**	**-15.7%**	**-0.6%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	718	803	2	98	10	**1,631**
Q2 2023	672	854	6	81	8	**1,621**
Difference	-46	51	4	-17	-2	**-10**
% Change	**-6.4%**	**6.4%**	**200.0%**	**-17.3%**	**-20.0%**	**-0.6%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		18.00	18.00	20.00	34.00	7.00	30.00	**127.00**
B	Southern		18.00	13.00	46.00	16.00	7.00	27.00	**127.00**
C	Bayview		10.00	13.00	52.00	21.00	1.00	5.00	**102.00**
D	Mission		7.00	4.00	62.00	2.00	3.00	25.00	**103.00**
E	Northern		14.00	3.00	24.00	16.00	2.00	39.00	**98.00**
F	Park		9.00		1.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	**25.00**
G	Richmond		13.00	2.00	7.00	17.00	4.00	18.00	**61.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	23.00	13.00	51.00	14.00	1.00	14.00	**117.00**
I	Taraval		27.00	1.00	10.00	12.00	1.00	8.00	**59.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	19.00	29.00	30.00	28.00	5.00	40.00	**152.00**
Grand Total		**2.00**	**158.00**	**96.00**	**303.00**	**166.00**	**32.00**	**214.00**	**971.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		1.9%	1.9%	2.1%	3.5%	0.7%	3.1%	**13.1%**
B	Southern		1.9%	1.3%	4.7%	1.6%	0.7%	2.8%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview		1.0%	1.3%	5.4%	2.2%	0.1%	0.5%	**10.5%**
D	Mission		0.7%	0.4%	6.4%	0.2%	0.3%	2.6%	**10.6%**
E	Northern		1.4%	0.3%	2.5%	1.6%	0.2%	4.0%	**10.1%**
F	Park		0.9%		0.1%	0.6%	0.1%	0.8%	**2.6%**
G	Richmond		1.3%	0.2%	0.7%	1.8%	0.4%	1.9%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	2.4%	1.3%	5.3%	1.4%	0.1%	1.4%	**12.0%**
I	Taraval		2.8%	0.1%	1.0%	1.2%	0.1%	0.8%	**6.1%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	2.0%	3.0%	3.1%	2.9%	0.5%	4.1%	**15.7%**
Grand Total		**0.2%**	**16.3%**	**9.9%**	**31.2%**	**17.1%**	**3.3%**	**22.0%**	**100.0%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	1.00	33.00	14.00	15.00	9.00	18.00	37.00	**127.00**
B	Southern	2.00	44.00	28.00	11.00	17.00	10.00	15.00	**127.00**
C	Bayview	8.00	27.00	9.00	23.00	13.00	4.00	18.00	**102.00**
D	Mission	12.00	30.00	30.00	13.00	7.00	7.00	4.00	**103.00**
E	Northern	16.00	20.00	25.00	6.00	11.00	4.00	16.00	**98.00**
F	Park	4.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	7.00	**25.00**
G	Richmond	11.00	11.00	7.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	16.00	**61.00**
H	Ingleside	26.00	26.00	18.00	18.00	9.00	8.00	12.00	**117.00**
I	Taraval	11.00	10.00	8.00	4.00	7.00	5.00	14.00	**59.00**
J	Tenderloin	4.00	36.00	30.00	23.00	23.00	7.00	29.00	**152.00**
Grand Total		**95.00**	**240.00**	**173.00**	**119.00**	**104.00**	**72.00**	**168.00**	**971.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	3.4%	1.4%	1.5%	0.9%	1.9%	3.8%	**13.1%**
B	Southern	0.2%	4.5%	2.9%	1.1%	1.8%	1.0%	1.5%	**13.1%**
C	Bayview	0.8%	2.8%	0.9%	2.4%	1.3%	0.4%	1.9%	**10.5%**
D	Mission	1.2%	3.1%	3.1%	1.3%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%	**10.6%**
E	Northern	1.6%	2.1%	2.6%	0.6%	1.1%	0.4%	1.6%	**10.1%**
F	Park	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	**2.6%**
G	Richmond	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	1.6%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	2.7%	2.7%	1.9%	1.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.2%	**12.0%**
I	Taraval	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%	1.4%	**6.1%**
J	Tenderloin	0.4%	3.7%	3.1%	2.4%	2.4%	0.7%	3.0%	**15.7%**
Grand Total		**9.8%**	**24.7%**	**17.8%**	**12.3%**	**10.7%**	**7.4%**	**17.3%**	**100.0%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	33.00	60.00		34.00		**127.00**
B	Southern	36.00	76.00		15.00		**127.00**
C	Bayview	27.00	55.00		20.00		**102.00**
D	Mission	43.00	57.00	1.00	2.00		**103.00**
E	Northern	31.00	49.00	2.00	16.00		**98.00**
F	Park	8.00	11.00		6.00		**25.00**
G	Richmond	18.00	26.00		17.00		**61.00**
H	Ingleside	44.00	59.00		14.00		**117.00**
I	Taraval	16.00	31.00		12.00		**59.00**
J	Tenderloin	40.00	83.00	1.00	27.00	1.00	**152.00**
Grand Total		**296.00**	**507.00**	**4.00**	**163.00**	**1.00**	**971.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	3.4%	6.2%		3.5%		**13.1%**
B	Southern	3.7%	7.8%		1.5%		**13.1%**
C	Bayview	2.8%	5.7%		2.1%		**10.5%**
D	Mission	4.4%	5.9%	0.1%	0.2%		**10.6%**
E	Northern	3.2%	5.0%	0.2%	1.6%		**10.1%**
F	Park	0.8%	1.1%		0.6%		**2.6%**
G	Richmond	1.9%	2.7%		1.8%		**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	4.5%	6.1%		1.4%		**12.0%**
I	Taraval	1.6%	3.2%		1.2%		**6.1%**
J	Tenderloin	4.1%	8.5%	0.1%	2.8%	0.1%	**15.7%**
Grand Total		**30.5%**	**52.2%**	**0.4%**	**16.8%**	**0.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

ROBBERY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	6	154	94	240	181	46	229	**950**
Q2 2023	2	158	96	303	166	32	214	**971**
Difference	-4	4	2	63	-15	-14	-15	**21**
% Change	**-66.7%**	**2.6%**	**2.1%**	**26.3%**	**-8.3%**	**-30.4%**	**-6.6%**	**2.2%**

ROBBERY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	40	253	174	128	93	103	159	**950**
Q2 2023	95	240	173	119	104	72	168	**971**
Difference	55	-13	-1	-9	11	-31	9	**21**
% Change	**137.5%**	**-5.1%**	**-0.6%**	**-7.0%**	**11.8%**	**-30.1%**	**5.7%**	**2.2%**

ROBBERY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	273	491	1	180	5	**950**
Q2 2023	296	507	4	163	1	**971**
Difference	23	16	3	-17	-4	**21**
% Change	**8.4%**	**3.3%**	**300.0%**	**-9.4%**	**-80.0%**	**2.2%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1.00	42.00	11.00	10.00	120.00	36.00	63.00	**283.00**
B	Southern	5.00	22.00	12.00	16.00	122.00	23.00	46.00	**246.00**
C	Bayview		18.00	14.00	26.00	61.00	4.00	29.00	**152.00**
D	Mission	4.00	27.00	9.00	24.00	90.00	15.00	71.00	**240.00**
E	Northern	1.00	35.00	11.00	12.00	154.00	30.00	111.00	**354.00**
F	Park	1.00	22.00	3.00	6.00	30.00	15.00	73.00	**150.00**
G	Richmond		18.00	11.00	6.00	47.00	7.00	57.00	**146.00**
H	Ingleside	4.00	44.00	7.00	16.00	36.00	13.00	93.00	**213.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	72.00	8.00	11.00	57.00	8.00	68.00	**226.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	6.00	10.00	7.00	44.00	7.00	14.00	**89.00**
X	Out of SF							1.00	**1.00**
Grand Total		**19.00**	**306.00**	**96.00**	**134.00**	**761.00**	**158.00**	**626.00**	**2100.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.0%	2.0%	0.5%	0.5%	5.7%	1.7%	3.0%	**13.5%**
B	Southern	0.2%	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%	5.8%	1.1%	2.2%	**11.7%**
C	Bayview		0.9%	0.7%	1.2%	2.9%	0.2%	1.4%	**7.2%**
D	Mission	0.2%	1.3%	0.4%	1.1%	4.3%	0.7%	3.4%	**11.4%**
E	Northern	0.0%	1.7%	0.5%	0.6%	7.3%	1.4%	5.3%	**16.9%**
F	Park	0.0%	1.0%	0.1%	0.3%	1.4%	0.7%	3.5%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond		0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.2%	0.3%	2.7%	**7.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	2.1%	0.3%	0.8%	1.7%	0.6%	4.4%	**10.1%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	3.4%	0.4%	0.5%	2.7%	0.4%	3.2%	**10.8%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	2.1%	0.3%	0.7%	**4.2%**
X	Out of SF							0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.9%**	**14.6%**	**4.6%**	**6.4%**	**36.2%**	**7.5%**	**29.8%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2.00	43.00	24.00	20.00	23.00	34.00	137.00	**283.00**
B	Southern		20.00	35.00	27.00	19.00	10.00	135.00	**246.00**
C	Bayview	3.00	10.00	23.00	17.00	16.00	23.00	60.00	**152.00**
D	Mission		16.00	47.00	39.00	20.00	29.00	89.00	**240.00**
E	Northern	5.00	38.00	56.00	40.00	21.00	42.00	152.00	**354.00**
F	Park	2.00	23.00	42.00	25.00	14.00	18.00	26.00	**150.00**
G	Richmond		14.00	29.00	20.00	16.00	25.00	42.00	**146.00**
H	Ingleside	6.00	19.00	48.00	39.00	26.00	47.00	28.00	**213.00**
I	Taraval	4.00	19.00	40.00	37.00	30.00	40.00	56.00	**226.00**
J	Tenderloin		6.00	11.00	9.00	13.00	6.00	44.00	**89.00**
X	Out of SF			1.00					**1.00**
Grand Total		**22.00**	**208.00**	**356.00**	**273.00**	**198.00**	**274.00**	**769.00**	**2100.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	2.0%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	1.6%	6.5%	**13.5%**
B	Southern		1.0%	1.7%	1.3%	0.9%	0.5%	6.4%	**11.7%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.5%	1.1%	0.8%	0.8%	1.1%	2.9%	**7.2%**
D	Mission		0.8%	2.2%	1.9%	1.0%	1.4%	4.2%	**11.4%**
E	Northern	0.2%	1.8%	2.7%	1.9%	1.0%	2.0%	7.2%	**16.9%**
F	Park	0.1%	1.1%	2.0%	1.2%	0.7%	0.9%	1.2%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond		0.7%	1.4%	1.0%	0.8%	1.2%	2.0%	**7.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	0.9%	2.3%	1.9%	1.2%	2.2%	1.3%	**10.1%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	0.9%	1.9%	1.8%	1.4%	1.9%	2.7%	**10.8%**
J	Tenderloin		0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	2.1%	**4.2%**
X	Out of SF			0.0%					**0.0%**
Grand Total		**1.0%**	**9.9%**	**17.0%**	**13.0%**	**9.4%**	**13.0%**	**36.6%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	53.00	89.00		118.00	23.00	**283.00**
B	Southern	31.00	80.00		121.00	14.00	**246.00**
C	Bayview	30.00	61.00		59.00	2.00	**152.00**
D	Mission	50.00	104.00		84.00	2.00	**240.00**
E	Northern	79.00	120.00		150.00	5.00	**354.00**
F	Park	43.00	81.00		26.00		**150.00**
G	Richmond	40.00	65.00		41.00		**146.00**
H	Ingleside	72.00	108.00	1.00	29.00	3.00	**213.00**
I	Taraval	73.00	98.00		54.00	1.00	**226.00**
J	Tenderloin	15.00	27.00	2.00	44.00	1.00	**89.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00					**1.00**
Grand Total		**487.00**	**833.00**	**3.00**	**726.00**	**51.00**	**2100.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2.5%	4.2%		5.6%	1.1%	**13.5%**
B	Southern	1.5%	3.8%		5.8%	0.7%	**11.7%**
C	Bayview	1.4%	2.9%		2.8%	0.1%	**7.2%**
D	Mission	2.4%	5.0%		4.0%	0.1%	**11.4%**
E	Northern	3.8%	5.7%		7.1%	0.2%	**16.9%**
F	Park	2.0%	3.9%		1.2%		**7.1%**
G	Richmond	1.9%	3.1%		2.0%		**7.0%**
H	Ingleside	3.4%	5.1%	0.0%	1.4%	0.1%	**10.1%**
I	Taraval	3.5%	4.7%		2.6%	0.0%	**10.8%**
J	Tenderloin	0.7%	1.3%	0.1%	2.1%	0.0%	**4.2%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%					**0.0%**
Grand Total		**23.2%**	**39.7%**	**0.1%**	**34.6%**	**2.4%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

BURGLARY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	11	325	94	158	663	170	766	**2,187**
Q2 2023	19	306	96	134	761	158	626	**2,100**
Difference	8	-19	2	-24	98	-12	-140	**-87**
% Change	**72.7%**	**-5.8%**	**2.1%**	**-15.2%**	**14.8%**	**-7.1%**	**-18.3%**	**-4.0%**

BURGLARY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	16	210	363	335	261	320	682	**2,187**
Q2 2023	22	208	356	273	198	274	769	**2,100**
Difference	6	-2	-7	-62	-63	-46	87	**-87**
% Change	**37.5%**	**-1.0%**	**-1.9%**	**-18.5%**	**-24.1%**	**-14.4%**	**12.8%**	**-4.0%**

BURGLARY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	553	978	2	610	44	**2,187**
Q2 2023	487	833	3	726	51	**2,100**
Difference	-66	-145	1	116	7	**-87**
% Change	**-11.9%**	**-14.8%**	**50.0%**	**19.0%**	**15.9%**	**-4.0%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	12.00	441.00	75.00	210.00	1179.00	116.00	887.00	**2920.00**
B	Southern	12.00	163.00	52.00	82.00	317.00	48.00	224.00	**898.00**
C	Bayview	3.00	101.00	54.00	86.00	155.00	30.00	83.00	**512.00**
D	Mission	4.00	91.00	38.00	127.00	273.00	44.00	225.00	**802.00**
E	Northern	7.00	333.00	69.00	139.00	776.00	79.00	656.00	**2059.00**
F	Park	1.00	89.00	10.00	36.00	249.00	48.00	242.00	**675.00**
G	Richmond	4.00	207.00	19.00	74.00	584.00	42.00	424.00	**1354.00**
H	Ingleside	5.00	123.00	32.00	99.00	223.00	25.00	142.00	**649.00**
I	Taraval	4.00	200.00	32.00	54.00	313.00	34.00	190.00	**827.00**
J	Tenderloin		60.00	39.00	36.00	175.00	16.00	121.00	**447.00**
X	Out of SF		29.00	9.00	7.00	55.00	6.00	63.00	**169.00**
Grand Total		**52.00**	**1837.00**	**429.00**	**950.00**	**4299.00**	**488.00**	**3257.00**	**11312.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	3.9%	0.7%	1.9%	10.4%	1.0%	7.8%	**25.8%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.4%	0.5%	0.7%	2.8%	0.4%	2.0%	**7.9%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.8%	1.4%	0.3%	0.7%	**4.5%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%	1.1%	2.4%	0.4%	2.0%	**7.1%**
E	Northern	0.1%	2.9%	0.6%	1.2%	6.9%	0.7%	5.8%	**18.2%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.8%	0.1%	0.3%	2.2%	0.4%	2.1%	**6.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	1.8%	0.2%	0.7%	5.2%	0.4%	3.7%	**12.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	1.1%	0.3%	0.9%	2.0%	0.2%	1.3%	**5.7%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.8%	0.3%	0.5%	2.8%	0.3%	1.7%	**7.3%**
J	Tenderloin		0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	1.5%	0.1%	1.1%	**4.0%**
X	Out of SF		0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	0.1%	0.6%	**1.5%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**16.2%**	**3.8%**	**8.4%**	**38.0%**	**4.3%**	**28.8%**	**100.0%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	95.00	476.00	534.00	453.00	337.00	232.00	793.00	**2920.00**
B	Southern	12.00	232.00	222.00	149.00	98.00	63.00	122.00	**898.00**
C	Bayview	12.00	99.00	116.00	77.00	73.00	70.00	65.00	**512.00**
D	Mission	7.00	186.00	235.00	119.00	87.00	64.00	104.00	**802.00**
E	Northern	34.00	470.00	418.00	296.00	225.00	152.00	464.00	**2059.00**
F	Park	20.00	154.00	145.00	102.00	63.00	67.00	124.00	**675.00**
G	Richmond	38.00	227.00	229.00	187.00	163.00	137.00	373.00	**1354.00**
H	Ingleside	6.00	104.00	149.00	112.00	87.00	95.00	96.00	**649.00**
I	Taraval	5.00	132.00	166.00	142.00	91.00	141.00	150.00	**827.00**
J	Tenderloin	5.00	101.00	89.00	51.00	39.00	47.00	115.00	**447.00**
X	Out of SF	2.00	35.00	46.00	28.00	22.00	23.00	13.00	**169.00**
Grand Total		**236.00**	**2216.00**	**2349.00**	**1716.00**	**1285.00**	**1091.00**	**2419.00**	**11312.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.8%	4.2%	4.7%	4.0%	3.0%	2.1%	7.0%	**25.8%**
B	Southern	0.1%	2.1%	2.0%	1.3%	0.9%	0.6%	1.1%	**7.9%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.9%	1.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	**4.5%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.6%	2.1%	1.1%	0.8%	0.6%	0.9%	**7.1%**
E	Northern	0.3%	4.2%	3.7%	2.6%	2.0%	1.3%	4.1%	**18.2%**
F	Park	0.2%	1.4%	1.3%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%	**6.0%**
G	Richmond	0.3%	2.0%	2.0%	1.7%	1.4%	1.2%	3.3%	**12.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	0.9%	1.3%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	**5.7%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.2%	1.5%	1.3%	0.8%	1.2%	1.3%	**7.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	1.0%	**4.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	**1.5%**
Grand Total		**2.1%**	**19.6%**	**20.8%**	**15.2%**	**11.4%**	**9.6%**	**21.4%**	**100.0%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	879.00	1247.00	1.00	779.00	14.00	**2920.00**
B	Southern	304.00	469.00	1.00	120.00	4.00	**898.00**
C	Bayview	202.00	250.00		58.00	2.00	**512.00**
D	Mission	257.00	435.00		96.00	14.00	**802.00**
E	Northern	714.00	881.00		453.00	11.00	**2059.00**
F	Park	223.00	327.00		121.00	4.00	**675.00**
G	Richmond	391.00	584.00		376.00	3.00	**1354.00**
H	Ingleside	230.00	317.00		96.00	6.00	**649.00**
I	Taraval	279.00	393.00	1.00	148.00	6.00	**827.00**
J	Tenderloin	135.00	182.00		129.00	1.00	**447.00**
X	Out of SF	84.00	72.00		13.00		**169.00**
Grand Total		**3698.00**	**5157.00**	**3.00**	**2389.00**	**65.00**	**11312.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	7.8%	11.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.1%	**25.8%**
B	Southern	2.7%	4.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	**7.9%**
C	Bayview	1.8%	2.2%		0.5%	0.0%	**4.5%**
D	Mission	2.3%	3.8%		0.8%	0.1%	**7.1%**
E	Northern	6.3%	7.8%		4.0%	0.1%	**18.2%**
F	Park	2.0%	2.9%		1.1%	0.0%	**6.0%**
G	Richmond	3.5%	5.2%		3.3%	0.0%	**12.0%**
H	Ingleside	2.0%	2.8%		0.8%	0.1%	**5.7%**
I	Taraval	2.5%	3.5%	0.0%	1.3%	0.1%	**7.3%**
J	Tenderloin	1.2%	1.6%		1.1%	0.0%	**4.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.7%	0.6%		0.1%		**1.5%**
Grand Total		**32.7%**	**45.6%**	**0.0%**	**21.1%**	**0.6%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

LARCENY THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	36	1,626	496	930	4,670	588	3,474	**11,820**
Q2 2023	52	1,837	429	950	4,299	488	3,257	**11,312**
Difference	16	211	-67	20	-371	-100	-217	**-508**
% Change	**44.4%**	**13.0%**	**-13.5%**	**2.2%**	**-7.9%**	**-17.0%**	**-6.2%**	**-4.3%**

LARCENY THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	241	2,528	2,406	1,608	1,347	1,030	2,660	**11,820**
Q2 2023	236	2,216	2,349	1,716	1,285	1,091	2,419	**11,312**
Difference	-5	-312	-57	108	-62	61	-241	**-508**
% Change	**-2.1%**	**-12.3%**	**-2.4%**	**6.7%**	**-4.6%**	**5.9%**	**-9.1%**	**-4.3%**

LARCENY THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	3,933	5,250	2	2,606	29	**11,820**
Q2 2023	3,698	5,157	3	2,389	65	**11,312**
Difference	-235	-93	1	-217	36	**-508**
% Change	**-6.0%**	**-1.8%**	**50.0%**	**-8.3%**	**124.1%**	**-4.3%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			1.00	126.00	2.00	3.00	**132.00**
B	Southern	2.00	1.00	6.00	168.00	1.00	6.00	**184.00**
C	Bayview	2.00	5.00	4.00	289.00	1.00	11.00	**312.00**
D	Mission	2.00		3.00	240.00	1.00	3.00	**249.00**
E	Northern	2.00	1.00	4.00	200.00	1.00	3.00	**211.00**
F	Park	2.00	1.00		101.00		3.00	**107.00**
G	Richmond		1.00		86.00		1.00	**88.00**
H	Ingleside	7.00		6.00	301.00	1.00		**315.00**
I	Taraval		3.00		191.00		3.00	**197.00**
J	Tenderloin		3.00	1.00	71.00	1.00	1.00	**77.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00		11.00		1.00	**14.00**
Grand Total		**17.00**	**17.00**	**25.00**	**1784.00**	**8.00**	**35.00**	**1886.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			0.1%	6.7%	0.1%	0.2%	**7.0%**
B	Southern	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	8.9%	0.1%	0.3%	**9.8%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	15.3%	0.1%	0.6%	**16.5%**
D	Mission	0.1%		0.2%	12.7%	0.1%	0.2%	**13.2%**
E	Northern	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	10.6%	0.1%	0.2%	**11.2%**
F	Park	0.1%	0.1%		5.4%		0.2%	**5.7%**
G	Richmond		0.1%		4.6%		0.1%	**4.7%**
H	Ingleside	0.4%		0.3%	16.0%	0.1%		**16.7%**
I	Taraval		0.2%		10.1%		0.2%	**10.4%**
J	Tenderloin		0.2%	0.1%	3.8%	0.1%	0.1%	**4.1%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%		0.6%		0.1%	**0.7%**
Grand Total		**0.9%**	**0.9%**	**1.3%**	**94.6%**	**0.4%**	**1.9%**	**100.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		38.00	36.00	22.00	13.00	17.00	6.00	**132.00**
B	Southern		43.00	58.00	18.00	30.00	27.00	8.00	**184.00**
C	Bayview	1.00	65.00	58.00	65.00	51.00	59.00	13.00	**312.00**
D	Mission		48.00	58.00	46.00	38.00	53.00	6.00	**249.00**
E	Northern		65.00	63.00	30.00	19.00	29.00	5.00	**211.00**
F	Park		32.00	23.00	25.00	12.00	13.00	2.00	**107.00**
G	Richmond		18.00	27.00	13.00	17.00	12.00	1.00	**88.00**
H	Ingleside		44.00	89.00	68.00	46.00	63.00	5.00	**315.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	44.00	32.00	34.00	29.00	53.00	4.00	**197.00**
J	Tenderloin		21.00	18.00	13.00	9.00	12.00	4.00	**77.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	**14.00**
Grand Total		**2.00**	**420.00**	**465.00**	**337.00**	**267.00**	**340.00**	**55.00**	**1886.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		2.0%	1.9%	1.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.3%	**7.0%**
B	Southern		2.3%	3.1%	1.0%	1.6%	1.4%	0.4%	**9.8%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	3.4%	3.1%	3.4%	2.7%	3.1%	0.7%	**16.5%**
D	Mission		2.5%	3.1%	2.4%	2.0%	2.8%	0.3%	**13.2%**
E	Northern		3.4%	3.3%	1.6%	1.0%	1.5%	0.3%	**11.2%**
F	Park		1.7%	1.2%	1.3%	0.6%	0.7%	0.1%	**5.7%**
G	Richmond		1.0%	1.4%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.1%	**4.7%**
H	Ingleside		2.3%	4.7%	3.6%	2.4%	3.3%	0.3%	**16.7%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	2.3%	1.7%	1.8%	1.5%	2.8%	0.2%	**10.4%**
J	Tenderloin		1.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	0.2%	**4.1%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	**0.7%**
Grand Total		**0.1%**	**22.3%**	**24.7%**	**17.9%**	**14.2%**	**18.0%**	**2.9%**	**100.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		6.00	126.00		**132.00**
B	Southern	8.00	9.00	167.00		**184.00**
C	Bayview	9.00	14.00	289.00		**312.00**
D	Mission	1.00	8.00	240.00		**249.00**
E	Northern	6.00	6.00	198.00	1.00	**211.00**
F	Park	3.00	3.00	101.00		**107.00**
G	Richmond		2.00	86.00		**88.00**
H	Ingleside	6.00	9.00	300.00		**315.00**
I	Taraval	3.00	3.00	191.00		**197.00**
J	Tenderloin	4.00	2.00	71.00		**77.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00	2.00	11.00		**14.00**
Grand Total		**41.00**	**64.00**	**1780.00**	**1.00**	**1886.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		0.3%	6.7%		**7.0%**
B	Southern	0.4%	0.5%	8.9%		**9.8%**
C	Bayview	0.5%	0.7%	15.3%		**16.5%**
D	Mission	0.1%	0.4%	12.7%		**13.2%**
E	Northern	0.3%	0.3%	10.5%	0.1%	**11.2%**
F	Park	0.2%	0.2%	5.4%		**5.7%**
G	Richmond		0.1%	4.6%		**4.7%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	0.5%	15.9%		**16.7%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	0.2%	10.1%		**10.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.2%	0.1%	3.8%		**4.1%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%		**0.7%**
Grand Total		**2.2%**	**3.4%**	**94.4%**	**0.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	1	19	18	22	1,468	14	39	**1,581**
Q2 2023	0	17	17	25	1,784	8	35	**1,886**
Difference	-1	-2	-1	3	316	-6	-4	**305**
% Change	**-100.0%**	**-10.5%**	**-5.6%**	**13.6%**	**21.5%**	**-42.9%**	**-10.3%**	**19.3%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	6	265	414	288	277	268	63	**1,581**
Q2 2023	2	420	465	337	267	340	55	**1,886**
Difference	-4	155	51	49	-10	72	-8	**305**
% Change	**-66.7%**	**58.5%**	**12.3%**	**17.0%**	**-3.6%**	**26.9%**	**-12.7%**	**19.3%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	37	76	1,467	1	**1,581**
Q2 2023	41	64	1,780	1	**1,886**
Difference	4	-12	313	0	**305**
% Change	**10.8%**	**-15.8%**	**21.3%**	**0.0%**	**19.3%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		4.00	8.00	2.00		1.00	6.00	**21.00**
B	Southern		2.00	3.00	4.00	1.00		7.00	**17.00**
C	Bayview		2.00	5.00	5.00			1.00	**13.00**
D	Mission	1.00	7.00	6.00	27.00	4.00	3.00	19.00	**67.00**
E	Northern		5.00		4.00	3.00	1.00	11.00	**24.00**
F	Park		2.00	1.00				5.00	**8.00**
G	Richmond		2.00					1.00	**3.00**
H	Ingleside		1.00	1.00	14.00		3.00	2.00	**21.00**
I	Taraval		2.00		1.00	1.00		2.00	**6.00**
J	Tenderloin			4.00	3.00		1.00	4.00	**12.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00		1.00	**9.00**
Grand Total		**1.00**	**29.00**	**29.00**	**64.00**	**10.00**	**9.00**	**59.00**	**201.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		2.0%	4.0%	1.0%		0.5%	3.0%	**10.4%**
B	Southern		1.0%	1.5%	2.0%	0.5%		3.5%	**8.5%**
C	Bayview		1.0%	2.5%	2.5%			0.5%	**6.5%**
D	Mission	0.5%	3.5%	3.0%	13.4%	2.0%	1.5%	9.5%	**33.3%**
E	Northern		2.5%		2.0%	1.5%	0.5%	5.5%	**11.9%**
F	Park		1.0%	0.5%				2.5%	**4.0%**
G	Richmond		1.0%					0.5%	**1.5%**
H	Ingleside		0.5%	0.5%	7.0%		1.5%	1.0%	**10.4%**
I	Taraval		1.0%		0.5%	0.5%		1.0%	**3.0%**
J	Tenderloin			2.0%	1.5%		0.5%	2.0%	**6.0%**
X	Out of SF		1.0%	0.5%	2.0%	0.5%		0.5%	**4.5%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**14.4%**	**14.4%**	**31.8%**	**5.0%**	**4.5%**	**29.4%**	**100.0%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	7.00	2.00	6.00	5.00	1.00			**21.00**
B	Southern	5.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00		**17.00**
C	Bayview	6.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00			**13.00**
D	Mission	18.00	15.00	16.00	12.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	**67.00**
E	Northern	2.00	10.00	2.00	5.00	1.00		4.00	**24.00**
F	Park	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.00		1.00		**8.00**
G	Richmond	2.00		1.00					**3.00**
H	Ingleside	5.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	1.00			**21.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	3.00	2.00					**6.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	**12.00**
X	Out of SF	4.00	2.00	3.00					**9.00**
Grand Total		**52.00**	**51.00**	**42.00**	**34.00**	**11.00**	**4.00**	**7.00**	**201.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	3.5%	1.0%	3.0%	2.5%	0.5%			**10.4%**
B	Southern	2.5%	2.5%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%		**8.5%**
C	Bayview	3.0%	1.5%	0.5%	0.5%	1.0%			**6.5%**
D	Mission	9.0%	7.5%	8.0%	6.0%	1.5%	0.5%	1.0%	**33.3%**
E	Northern	1.0%	5.0%	1.0%	2.5%	0.5%		2.0%	**11.9%**
F	Park	0.5%	1.0%	1.5%	0.5%		0.5%		**4.0%**
G	Richmond	1.0%		0.5%					**1.5%**
H	Ingleside	2.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%	0.5%			**10.4%**
I	Taraval	0.5%	1.5%	1.0%					**3.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.5%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	**6.0%**
X	Out of SF	2.0%	1.0%	1.5%					**4.5%**
Grand Total		**25.9%**	**25.4%**	**20.9%**	**16.9%**	**5.5%**	**2.0%**	**3.5%**	**100.0%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	17.00	3.00			1.00	**21.00**
B	Southern	14.00	3.00				**17.00**
C	Bayview	10.00	3.00				**13.00**
D	Mission	50.00	14.00	1.00	2.00		**67.00**
E	Northern	19.00	2.00		3.00		**24.00**
F	Park	6.00	2.00				**8.00**
G	Richmond	3.00					**3.00**
H	Ingleside	19.00	2.00				**21.00**
I	Taraval	5.00			1.00		**6.00**
J	Tenderloin	11.00	1.00				**12.00**
X	Out of SF	8.00	1.00				**9.00**
Grand Total		**162.00**	**31.00**	**1.00**	**6.00**	**1.00**	**201.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	8.5%	1.5%			0.5%	**10.4%**
B	Southern	7.0%	1.5%				**8.5%**
C	Bayview	5.0%	1.5%				**6.5%**
D	Mission	24.9%	7.0%	0.5%	1.0%		**33.3%**
E	Northern	9.5%	1.0%		1.5%		**11.9%**
F	Park	3.0%	1.0%				**4.0%**
G	Richmond	1.5%					**1.5%**
H	Ingleside	9.5%	1.0%				**10.4%**
I	Taraval	2.5%			0.5%		**3.0%**
J	Tenderloin	5.5%	0.5%				**6.0%**
X	Out of SF	4.0%	0.5%				**4.5%**
Grand Total		**80.6%**	**15.4%**	**0.5%**	**3.0%**	**0.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	1	47	29	68	28	8	63	**244**
Q2 2023	1	29	29	64	10	9	59	**201**
Difference	0	-18	0	-4	-18	1	-4	**-43**
% Change	**0.0%**	**-38.3%**	**0.0%**	**-5.9%**	**-64.3%**	**12.5%**	**-6.3%**	**-17.6%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	70	75	41	35	8	10	5	**244**
Q2 2023	52	51	42	34	11	4	7	**201**
Difference	-18	-24	1	-1	3	-6	2	**-43**
% Change	**-25.7%**	**-32.0%**	**2.4%**	**-2.9%**	**37.5%**	**-60.0%**	**40.0%**	**-17.6%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	195	42		6	1	244
Q2 2023	162	31	1	6	1	201
Difference	-33	-11	1	0	0	-43
% Change	**-16.9%**	**-26.2%**	**not calc**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**-17.6%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	1.00	29.00	14.00	22.00	191.00	7.00	73.00	**337.00**
B	Southern		30.00	22.00	23.00	128.00	8.00	45.00	**256.00**
C	Bayview	2.00	39.00	58.00	45.00	65.00	10.00	43.00	**262.00**
D	Mission	1.00	18.00	9.00	55.00	98.00	12.00	48.00	**241.00**
E	Northern	3.00	34.00	30.00	27.00	155.00	13.00	83.00	**345.00**
F	Park		8.00	6.00	3.00	30.00	6.00	36.00	**89.00**
G	Richmond		23.00	7.00	5.00	59.00	5.00	24.00	**123.00**
H	Ingleside	3.00	48.00	22.00	52.00	62.00	10.00	47.00	**244.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	44.00	12.00	17.00	67.00	10.00	52.00	**203.00**
J	Tenderloin		15.00	22.00	12.00	71.00	8.00	21.00	**149.00**
X	Out of SF			1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	**9.00**
Grand Total		**11.00**	**288.00**	**203.00**	**262.00**	**929.00**	**92.00**	**473.00**	**2258.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.0%	1.3%	0.6%	1.0%	8.5%	0.3%	3.2%	**14.9%**
B	Southern		1.3%	1.0%	1.0%	5.7%	0.4%	2.0%	**11.3%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	1.7%	2.6%	2.0%	2.9%	0.4%	1.9%	**11.6%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	2.4%	4.3%	0.5%	2.1%	**10.7%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.5%	1.3%	1.2%	6.9%	0.6%	3.7%	**15.3%**
F	Park		0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.3%	0.3%	1.6%	**3.9%**
G	Richmond		1.0%	0.3%	0.2%	2.6%	0.2%	1.1%	**5.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	2.1%	1.0%	2.3%	2.7%	0.4%	2.1%	**10.8%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.9%	0.5%	0.8%	3.0%	0.4%	2.3%	**9.0%**
J	Tenderloin		0.7%	1.0%	0.5%	3.1%	0.4%	0.9%	**6.6%**
X	Out of SF			0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	**0.4%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**12.8%**	**9.0%**	**11.6%**	**41.1%**	**4.1%**	**20.9%**	**100.0%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	3.00	51.00	41.00	40.00	35.00	23.00	144.00	**337.00**
B	Southern		36.00	37.00	35.00	21.00	18.00	109.00	**256.00**
C	Bayview	1.00	34.00	49.00	43.00	43.00	43.00	49.00	**262.00**
D	Mission	3.00	28.00	34.00	39.00	29.00	35.00	73.00	**241.00**
E	Northern	9.00	53.00	63.00	37.00	32.00	36.00	115.00	**345.00**
F	Park		15.00	15.00	14.00	12.00	12.00	21.00	**89.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	13.00	14.00	11.00	16.00	26.00	42.00	**123.00**
H	Ingleside	6.00	28.00	52.00	45.00	36.00	36.00	41.00	**244.00**
I	Taraval		30.00	39.00	25.00	28.00	44.00	37.00	**203.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	14.00	16.00	18.00	15.00	15.00	70.00	**149.00**
X	Out of SF		3.00		1.00	2.00		3.00	**9.00**
Grand Total		**24.00**	**305.00**	**360.00**	**308.00**	**269.00**	**288.00**	**704.00**	**2258.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.1%	2.3%	1.8%	1.8%	1.6%	1.0%	6.4%	**14.9%**
B	Southern		1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	0.9%	0.8%	4.8%	**11.3%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	1.5%	2.2%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	2.2%	**11.6%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.2%	1.5%	1.7%	1.3%	1.6%	3.2%	**10.7%**
E	Northern	0.4%	2.3%	2.8%	1.6%	1.4%	1.6%	5.1%	**15.3%**
F	Park		0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	**3.9%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	1.2%	1.9%	**5.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	1.2%	2.3%	2.0%	1.6%	1.6%	1.8%	**10.8%**
I	Taraval		1.3%	1.7%	1.1%	1.2%	1.9%	1.6%	**9.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	3.1%	**6.6%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%		0.0%	0.1%		0.1%	**0.4%**
Grand Total		**1.1%**	**13.5%**	**15.9%**	**13.6%**	**11.9%**	**12.8%**	**31.2%**	**100.0%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	74.00	115.00		148.00		**337.00**
B	Southern	53.00	95.00		107.00	1.00	**256.00**
C	Bayview	103.00	114.00		45.00		**262.00**
D	Mission	60.00	107.00		72.00	2.00	**241.00**
E	Northern	85.00	142.00		113.00	5.00	**345.00**
F	Park	27.00	43.00		19.00		**89.00**
G	Richmond	34.00	47.00		40.00	2.00	**123.00**
H	Ingleside	79.00	128.00		36.00	1.00	**244.00**
I	Taraval	71.00	94.00		37.00	1.00	**203.00**
J	Tenderloin	30.00	47.00	2.00	66.00	4.00	**149.00**
X	Out of SF	3.00	2.00		3.00	1.00	**9.00**
Grand Total		**619.00**	**934.00**	**2.00**	**686.00**	**17.00**	**2258.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	3.3%	5.1%		6.6%		**14.9%**
B	Southern	2.3%	4.2%		4.7%	0.0%	**11.3%**
C	Bayview	4.6%	5.0%		2.0%		**11.6%**
D	Mission	2.7%	4.7%		3.2%	0.1%	**10.7%**
E	Northern	3.8%	6.3%		5.0%	0.2%	**15.3%**
F	Park	1.2%	1.9%		0.8%		**3.9%**
G	Richmond	1.5%	2.1%		1.8%	0.1%	**5.4%**
H	Ingleside	3.5%	5.7%		1.6%	0.0%	**10.8%**
I	Taraval	3.1%	4.2%		1.6%	0.0%	**9.0%**
J	Tenderloin	1.3%	2.1%	0.1%	2.9%	0.2%	**6.6%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.1%		0.1%	0.0%	**0.4%**
Grand Total		**27.4%**	**41.4%**	**0.1%**	**30.4%**	**0.8%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

VANDALISM - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	3	301	192	296	1,112	121	534	**2,559**
Q2 2023	11	288	203	262	929	92	473	**2,258**
Difference	8	-13	11	-34	-183	-29	-61	**-301**
% Change	**266.7%**	**-4.3%**	**5.7%**	**-11.5%**	**-16.5%**	**-24.0%**	**-11.4%**	**-11.8%**

VANDALISM - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	37	322	421	370	314	285	810	**2,559**
Q2 2023	24	305	360	308	269	288	704	**2,258**
Difference	-13	-17	-61	-62	-45	3	-106	**-301**
% Change	**-35.1%**	**-5.3%**	**-14.5%**	**-16.8%**	**-14.3%**	**1.1%**	**-13.1%**	**-11.8%**

VANDALISM - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	733	1,015	1	789	21	**2,559**
Q2 2023	619	934	2	686	17	**2,258**
Difference	-114	-81	1	-103	-4	**-301**
% Change	**-15.6%**	**-8.0%**	**100.0%**	**-13.1%**	**-19.0%**	**-11.8%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		3.00	17.00	27.00	1.00	4.00	37.00	**89.00**
B	Southern	1.00	10.00	43.00	24.00	1.00	3.00	24.00	**106.00**
C	Bayview		7.00	81.00	38.00	2.00		20.00	**148.00**
D	Mission		6.00	25.00	62.00	2.00	2.00	29.00	**126.00**
E	Northern		15.00	22.00	31.00	1.00	1.00	17.00	**87.00**
F	Park		1.00	2.00	3.00		1.00	7.00	**14.00**
G	Richmond		5.00	2.00	4.00		10.00	12.00	**33.00**
H	Ingleside		8.00	26.00	53.00	3.00	2.00	23.00	**115.00**
I	Taraval		22.00	22.00	31.00		1.00	28.00	**104.00**
J	Tenderloin	2.00	10.00	40.00	30.00	1.00	2.00	33.00	**118.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00	10.00	6.00				**18.00**
Grand Total		**3.00**	**89.00**	**290.00**	**309.00**	**11.00**	**26.00**	**230.00**	**958.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		0.3%	1.8%	2.8%	0.1%	0.4%	3.9%	**9.3%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.0%	4.5%	2.5%	0.1%	0.3%	2.5%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview		0.7%	8.5%	4.0%	0.2%		2.1%	**15.4%**
D	Mission		0.6%	2.6%	6.5%	0.2%	0.2%	3.0%	**13.2%**
E	Northern		1.6%	2.3%	3.2%	0.1%	0.1%	1.8%	**9.1%**
F	Park		0.1%	0.2%	0.3%		0.1%	0.7%	**1.5%**
G	Richmond		0.5%	0.2%	0.4%		1.0%	1.3%	**3.4%**
H	Ingleside		0.8%	2.7%	5.5%	0.3%	0.2%	2.4%	**12.0%**
I	Taraval		2.3%	2.3%	3.2%		0.1%	2.9%	**10.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.2%	1.0%	4.2%	3.1%	0.1%	0.2%	3.4%	**12.3%**
X	Out of SF		0.2%	1.0%	0.6%				**1.9%**
Grand Total		**0.3%**	**9.3%**	**30.3%**	**32.3%**	**1.1%**	**2.7%**	**24.0%**	**100.0%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	4.00	19.00	33.00	17.00	8.00	8.00		**89.00**
B	Southern	6.00	28.00	35.00	23.00	9.00	3.00	2.00	**106.00**
C	Bayview	22.00	30.00	45.00	24.00	16.00	9.00	2.00	**148.00**
D	Mission	11.00	37.00	36.00	26.00	8.00	7.00	1.00	**126.00**
E	Northern	14.00	16.00	28.00	13.00	10.00	6.00		**87.00**
F	Park		9.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		**14.00**
G	Richmond	7.00	4.00	9.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	**33.00**
H	Ingleside	24.00	27.00	27.00	16.00	11.00	6.00	4.00	**115.00**
I	Taraval	24.00	20.00	26.00	22.00	6.00	5.00	1.00	**104.00**
J	Tenderloin	5.00	30.00	36.00	21.00	18.00	7.00	1.00	**118.00**
X	Out of SF	7.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		**18.00**
Grand Total		**124.00**	**224.00**	**281.00**	**169.00**	**92.00**	**55.00**	**13.00**	**958.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.4%	2.0%	3.4%	1.8%	0.8%	0.8%		**9.3%**
B	Southern	0.6%	2.9%	3.7%	2.4%	0.9%	0.3%	0.2%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview	2.3%	3.1%	4.7%	2.5%	1.7%	0.9%	0.2%	**15.4%**
D	Mission	1.1%	3.9%	3.8%	2.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.1%	**13.2%**
E	Northern	1.5%	1.7%	2.9%	1.4%	1.0%	0.6%		**9.1%**
F	Park		0.9%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%		**1.5%**
G	Richmond	0.7%	0.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	**3.4%**
H	Ingleside	2.5%	2.8%	2.8%	1.7%	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	**12.0%**
I	Taraval	2.5%	2.1%	2.7%	2.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.1%	**10.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.5%	3.1%	3.8%	2.2%	1.9%	0.7%	0.1%	**12.3%**
X	Out of SF	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%		**1.9%**
Grand Total		**12.9%**	**23.4%**	**29.3%**	**17.6%**	**9.6%**	**5.7%**	**1.4%**	**100.0%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	58.00	31.00				**89.00**
B	Southern	84.00	21.00		1.00		**106.00**
C	Bayview	110.00	38.00				**148.00**
D	Mission	80.00	43.00	1.00	2.00		**126.00**
E	Northern	61.00	25.00	1.00			**87.00**
F	Park	8.00	6.00				**14.00**
G	Richmond	19.00	12.00			2.00	**33.00**
H	Ingleside	87.00	25.00		3.00		**115.00**
I	Taraval	74.00	30.00				**104.00**
J	Tenderloin	78.00	40.00				**118.00**
X	Out of SF	10.00	8.00				**18.00**
Grand Total		**669.00**	**279.00**	**2.00**	**6.00**	**2.00**	**958.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	6.1%	3.2%				**9.3%**
B	Southern	8.8%	2.2%		0.1%		**11.1%**
C	Bayview	11.5%	4.0%				**15.4%**
D	Mission	8.4%	4.5%	0.1%	0.2%		**13.2%**
E	Northern	6.4%	2.6%	0.1%			**9.1%**
F	Park	0.8%	0.6%				**1.5%**
G	Richmond	2.0%	1.3%			0.2%	**3.4%**
H	Ingleside	9.1%	2.6%		0.3%		**12.0%**
I	Taraval	7.7%	3.1%				**10.9%**
J	Tenderloin	8.1%	4.2%				**12.3%**
X	Out of SF	1.0%	0.8%				**1.9%**
Grand Total		**69.8%**	**29.1%**	**0.2%**	**0.6%**	**0.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	4	104	314	331	18	34	275	**1,080**
Q2 2023	3	89	290	309	11	26	230	**958**
Difference	-1	-15	-24	-22	-7	-8	-45	**-122**
% Change	**-25.0%**	**-14.4%**	**-7.6%**	**-6.6%**	**-38.9%**	**-23.5%**	**-16.4%**	**-11.3%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	143	264	293	216	78	61	25	**1,080**
Q2 2023	124	224	281	169	92	55	13	**958**
Difference	-19	-40	-12	-47	14	-6	-12	**-122**
% Change	**-13.3%**	**-15.2%**	**-4.1%**	**-21.8%**	**17.9%**	**-9.8%**	**-48.0%**	**-11.3%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	768	291	1	14	6	**1,080**
Q2 2023	669	279	2	6	2	**958**
Difference	-99	-12	1	-8	-4	**-122**
% Change	**-12.9%**	**-4.1%**	**100.0%**	**-57.1%**	**-66.7%**	**-11.3%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	9.00	1.00	1.00			13.00	**24.00**
B	Southern	3.00	1.00				7.00	**11.00**
C	Bayview	2.00	5.00	3.00			3.00	**13.00**
D	Mission	4.00	5.00	8.00			7.00	**24.00**
E	Northern	7.00	2.00			1.00	7.00	**17.00**
F	Park	3.00					5.00	**8.00**
G	Richmond	3.00					6.00	**9.00**
H	Ingleside	6.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	13.00	**28.00**
I	Taraval	4.00	1.00	1.00			6.00	**12.00**
J	Tenderloin	11.00	2.00	3.00		1.00	6.00	**23.00**
Grand Total		**52.00**	**20.00**	**20.00**	**1.00**	**3.00**	**73.00**	**169.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	5.3%	0.6%	0.6%			7.7%	**14.2%**
B	Southern	1.8%	0.6%				4.1%	**6.5%**
C	Bayview	1.2%	3.0%	1.8%			1.8%	**7.7%**
D	Mission	2.4%	3.0%	4.7%			4.1%	**14.2%**
E	Northern	4.1%	1.2%			0.6%	4.1%	**10.1%**
F	Park	1.8%					3.0%	**4.7%**
G	Richmond	1.8%					3.6%	**5.3%**
H	Ingleside	3.6%	1.8%	2.4%	0.6%	0.6%	7.7%	**16.6%**
I	Taraval	2.4%	0.6%	0.6%			3.6%	**7.1%**
J	Tenderloin	6.5%	1.2%	1.8%		0.6%	3.6%	**13.6%**
Grand Total		**30.8%**	**11.8%**	**11.8%**	**0.6%**	**1.8%**	**43.2%**	**100.0%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	24.00	**24.00**
B	Southern	11.00	**11.00**
C	Bayview	13.00	**13.00**
D	Mission	24.00	**24.00**
E	Northern	17.00	**17.00**
F	Park	8.00	**8.00**
G	Richmond	9.00	**9.00**
H	Ingleside	28.00	**28.00**
I	Taraval	12.00	**12.00**
J	Tenderloin	23.00	**23.00**
Grand Total		**169.00**	**169.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	14.2%	**14.2%**
B	Southern	6.5%	**6.5%**
C	Bayview	7.7%	**7.7%**
D	Mission	14.2%	**14.2%**
E	Northern	10.1%	**10.1%**
F	Park	4.7%	**4.7%**
G	Richmond	5.3%	**5.3%**
H	Ingleside	16.6%	**16.6%**
I	Taraval	7.1%	**7.1%**
J	Tenderloin	13.6%	**13.6%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	10.00	14.00		**24.00**
B	Southern	6.00	5.00		**11.00**
C	Bayview	5.00	8.00		**13.00**
D	Mission	10.00	14.00		**24.00**
E	Northern	11.00	6.00		**17.00**
F	Park	4.00	4.00		**8.00**
G	Richmond	3.00	6.00		**9.00**
H	Ingleside	12.00	15.00	1.00	**28.00**
I	Taraval	6.00	6.00		**12.00**
J	Tenderloin	8.00	15.00		**23.00**
Grand Total		**75.00**	**93.00**	**1.00**	**169.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	5.9%	8.3%		**14.2%**
B	Southern	3.6%	3.0%		**6.5%**
C	Bayview	3.0%	4.7%		**7.7%**
D	Mission	5.9%	8.3%		**14.2%**
E	Northern	6.5%	3.6%		**10.1%**
F	Park	2.4%	2.4%		**4.7%**
G	Richmond	1.8%	3.6%		**5.3%**
H	Ingleside	7.1%	8.9%	0.6%	**16.6%**
I	Taraval	3.6%	3.6%		**7.1%**
J	Tenderloin	4.7%	8.9%		**13.6%**
Grand Total		**44.4%**	**55.0%**	**0.6%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

ELDER ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	0	34	20	11	2	0	74	**141**
Q2 2023	0	52	20	20	1	3	73	**169**
Difference	0	18	0	9	-1	3	-1	**28**
% Change	**not calc**	**52.9%**	**0.0%**	**81.8%**	**-50.0%**	**not calc**	**-1.4%**	**19.9%**

ELDER ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	65+	
Q2 2022	141	**141**
Q2 2023	169	**169**
Difference	28	**28**
% Change	**19.9%**	**19.9%**

ELDER ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	73	66	0	2	0	**141**
Q2 2023	75	93	0	1	0	**169**
Difference	2	27	0	-1	0	**28**
% Change	**2.7%**	**40.9%**	**not calc**	**-50.0%**	**not calc**	**19.9%**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			2.00	4.00		4.00	3.00	**13.00**
B	Southern		1.00	2.00		3.00			**6.00**
C	Bayview		1.00	11.00	8.00		3.00	1.00	**24.00**
D	Mission		3.00	3.00	20.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	**30.00**
E	Northern		2.00	1.00	5.00	1.00			**9.00**
F	Park				1.00			4.00	**5.00**
G	Richmond		2.00						**2.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	1.00	5.00	18.00		1.00	1.00	**27.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	4.00	3.00	6.00		1.00	6.00	**22.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	2.00	1.00	7.00			1.00	**12.00**
X	Out of SF			3.00	2.00	1.00		1.00	**7.00**
Grand Total		**4.00**	**16.00**	**31.00**	**71.00**	**6.00**	**10.00**	**19.00**	**157.00**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			1.3%	2.5%		2.5%	1.9%	**8.3%**
B	Southern		0.6%	1.3%		1.9%			**3.8%**
C	Bayview		0.6%	7.0%	5.1%		1.9%	0.6%	**15.3%**
D	Mission		1.9%	1.9%	12.7%	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	**19.1%**
E	Northern		1.3%	0.6%	3.2%	0.6%			**5.7%**
F	Park				0.6%			2.5%	**3.2%**
G	Richmond		1.3%						**1.3%**
H	Ingleside	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	11.5%		0.6%	0.6%	**17.2%**
I	Taraval	1.3%	2.5%	1.9%	3.8%		0.6%	3.8%	**14.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.6%	1.3%	0.6%	4.5%			0.6%	**7.6%**
X	Out of SF			1.9%	1.3%	0.6%		0.6%	**4.5%**
Grand Total		**2.5%**	**10.2%**	**19.7%**	**45.2%**	**3.8%**	**6.4%**	**12.1%**	**100.0%**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	
A	Central	13.00	**13.00**
B	Southern	6.00	**6.00**
C	Bayview	24.00	**24.00**
D	Mission	30.00	**30.00**
E	Northern	9.00	**9.00**
F	Park	5.00	**5.00**
G	Richmond	2.00	**2.00**
H	Ingleside	27.00	**27.00**
I	Taraval	22.00	**22.00**
J	Tenderloin	12.00	**12.00**
X	Out of SF	7.00	**7.00**
Grand Total		**157.00**	**157.00**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	
A	Central	8.3%	**8.3%**
B	Southern	3.8%	**3.8%**
C	Bayview	15.3%	**15.3%**
D	Mission	19.1%	**19.1%**
E	Northern	5.7%	**5.7%**
F	Park	3.2%	**3.2%**
G	Richmond	1.3%	**1.3%**
H	Ingleside	17.2%	**17.2%**
I	Taraval	14.0%	**14.0%**
J	Tenderloin	7.6%	**7.6%**
X	Out of SF	4.5%	**4.5%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	7.00	6.00		**13.00**
B	Southern	4.00	1.00	1.00	**6.00**
C	Bayview	14.00	10.00		**24.00**
D	Mission	17.00	13.00		**30.00**
E	Northern	4.00	5.00		**9.00**
F	Park	4.00	1.00		**5.00**
G	Richmond	2.00			**2.00**
H	Ingleside	15.00	12.00		**27.00**
I	Taraval	15.00	7.00		**22.00**
J	Tenderloin	6.00	6.00		**12.00**
X	Out of SF	3.00	4.00		**7.00**
Grand Total		**91.00**	**65.00**	**1.00**	**157.00**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	4.5%	3.8%		**8.3%**
B	Southern	2.5%	0.6%	0.6%	**3.8%**
C	Bayview	8.9%	6.4%		**15.3%**
D	Mission	10.8%	8.3%		**19.1%**
E	Northern	2.5%	3.2%		**5.7%**
F	Park	2.5%	0.6%		**3.2%**
G	Richmond	1.3%			**1.3%**
H	Ingleside	9.6%	7.6%		**17.2%**
I	Taraval	9.6%	4.5%		**14.0%**
J	Tenderloin	3.8%	3.8%		**7.6%**
X	Out of SF	1.9%	2.5%		**4.5%**
Grand Total		**58.0%**	**41.4%**	**0.6%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

CHILD ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	0	22	35	71	10	8	14	**160**
Q2 2023	4	16	31	71	6	10	19	**157**
Difference	4	-6	-4	0	-4	2	5	**-3**
% Change	**not calc**	**-27.3%**	**-11.4%**	**0.0%**	**-40.0%**	**25.0%**	**35.7%**	**-1.9%**

CHILD ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	0-17	
Q2 2022	160	**160**
Q2 2023	157	**157**
Difference	-3	**-3**
% Change	**-1.9%**	**-1.9%**

CHILD ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	86	72	0	2	0	**160**
Q2 2023	91	65	0	1	0	**157**
Difference	5	-7	0	-1	0	**-3**
% Change	**5.8%**	**-9.7%**	**not calc**	**-50.0%**	**not calc**	**-1.9%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central			1					**1**
B	Southern		1	1	1			1	**4**
C	Bayview			1					**1**
D	Mission								**0**
E	Northern			2					**2**
F	Park		1						**1**
G	Richmond		1						**1**
H	Ingleside								**0**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin			4					**4**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**3**	**9**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**14**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
B	Southern	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	**28.6%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**14.3%**
F	Park	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**21.4%**	**64.3%**	**7.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**7.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central				1				**1**
B	Southern		2		1	1			**4**
C	Bayview					1			**1**
D	Mission								**0**
E	Northern	1	1						**2**
F	Park						1		**1**
G	Richmond						1		**1**
H	Ingleside								**0**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin		1	1	1	1			**4**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**1**	**4**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**14**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
B	Southern	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
E	Northern	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**14.3%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	**7.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**7.1%**	**28.6%**	**7.1%**	**21.4%**	**21.4%**	**14.3%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central		1			**1**
B	Southern	1	3			**4**
C	Bayview		1			**1**
D	Mission					**0**
E	Northern		2			**2**
F	Park	1				**1**
G	Richmond	1				**1**
H	Ingleside					**0**
I	Taraval					**0**
J	Tenderloin		4			**4**
X	Out of SF					**0**
Grand Total		**3**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**14**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
B	Southern	7.1%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	**14.3%**
F	Park	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
G	Richmond	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
Grand Total		**21.4%**	**78.6%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HOMICIDE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q2 2022	0	2	8	4	0	0	1	**15**
Q2 2023	0	3	9	1	0	0	1	**14**
Difference	0	1	1	-3	0	0	0	**-1**
% Change	**not calc**	**50.0%**	**12.5%**	**-75.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**0.0%**	**-6.7%**

HOMICIDE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	0	8	5	2	0	0	0	**15**
Q2 2023	1	4	1	3	3	2	0	**14**
Difference	1	-4	-4	1	3	2	0	**-1**
% Change	**not calc**	**-50.0%**	**-80.0%**	**50.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**-6.7%**

HOMICIDE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	0	15	0	0	0	**15**
Q2 2023	3	11	0	0	0	**14**
Difference	3	-4	0	0	0	**-1**
% Change	**not calc**	**-26.7%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**-6.7%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Others	White	Unknown	
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern				1		3		**4**
C	Bayview								**0**
D	Mission				4		1		**5**
E	Northern								**0**
F	Park				1	1			**2**
G	Richmond								**0**
H	Ingleside								**0**
I	Taraval			1				1	**2**
J	Tenderloin			1					**1**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**0**	**2**	**6**	**1**	**4**	**1**	**14**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Others	White	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	**28.6%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	**35.7%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**14.3%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	**14.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**14.3%**	**42.9%**	**7.1%**	**28.6%**	**7.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern		1	1	1	1			**4**
C	Bayview								**0**
D	Mission		4	1					**5**
E	Northern								**0**
F	Park			1	1				**2**
G	Richmond								**0**
H	Ingleside								**0**
I	Taraval						1	1	**2**
J	Tenderloin						1		**1**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**14**

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY PERCENTAGE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	28.6%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**35.7%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**14.3%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	**14.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	**7.1%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**35.7%**	**21.4%**	**14.3%**	**7.1%**	**14.3%**	**7.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central						**0**
B	Southern	1	3				**4**
C	Bayview						**0**
D	Mission	3	2				**5**
E	Northern						**0**
F	Park	1	1				**2**
G	Richmond						**0**
H	Ingleside						**0**
I	Taraval		1			1	**2**
J	Tenderloin		1				**1**
X	Out of SF						**0**
Grand Total		**5**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**14**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	7.1%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	21.4%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**35.7%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
F	Park	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**14.3%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	**14.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
Grand Total		**35.7%**	**57.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**7.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION										PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	Anti-Christian	Anti-Arab	
A	Central											**0**
B	Southern	3			1							**4**
C	Bayview											**0**
D	Mission	3			1				1			**5**
E	Northern											**0**
F	Park	1							1			**2**
G	Richmond											**0**
H	Ingleside											**0**
I	Taraval			1						1		**2**
J	Tenderloin			1								**1**
X	Out of SF											**0**
Grand Total		**7**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**14**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION										PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	Anti-Christian	Anti-Arab	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**28.6%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**35.7%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
F	Park	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**14.3%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	**14.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**7.1%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**50.0%**	**0.0%**	**14.3%**	**14.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**14.3%**	**7.1%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q2 2023

HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	White	Other	Unknown	
Q2 2022	0	0	2	2	7	0	0	**11**
Q2 2023	0	0	2	6	1	4	1	**14**
Difference	0	0	0	4	-6	4	1	**3**
% Change	**not calc**	**not calc**	**0.0%**	**200.0%**	**-85.7%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**27.3%**

HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q2 2022	1	0	4	1	3	1	1	**11**
Q2 2023	0	5	3	2	1	2	1	**14**
Difference	-1	5	-1	1	-2	1	0	**3**
% Change	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**-25.0%**	**100.0%**	**-66.7%**	**100.0%**	**0.0%**	**27.3%**

HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q2 2022	2	9	0	0	0	**11**
Q2 2023	5	8	0	0	1	**14**
Difference	3	-1	0	0	1	**3**
% Change	**150.0%**	**-11.1%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**27.3%**

HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION												PERSON COUNT
	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	Anti-Christian	Anti-Muslim	Anti-Other	Anti-Arab	
Q2 2022	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	**11**
Q2 2023	7	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	**14**
Difference	6	0	1	1	-2	0	-1	-2	0	0	0	0	**3**
% Change	**600.0%**	**not calc**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**-100.0%**	**-50.0%**	**0.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**27.3%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	1.00	25.00	35.00	39.00	15.00	9.00	58.00	**182.00**
B	Southern	2.00	18.00	65.00	71.00	21.00	4.00	69.00	**250.00**
C	Bayview		25.00	107.00	90.00	26.00	3.00	25.00	**276.00**
D	Mission		15.00	34.00	172.00	18.00	13.00	66.00	**318.00**
E	Northern	2.00	32.00	37.00	49.00	32.00	20.00	74.00	**246.00**
F	Park		3.00	4.00	15.00	5.00	9.00	24.00	**60.00**
G	Richmond		16.00	4.00	8.00	14.00	3.00	19.00	**64.00**
H	Ingleside	3.00	46.00	26.00	85.00	17.00	6.00	31.00	**214.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	22.00	13.00	24.00	1.00	2.00	22.00	**85.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	31.00	89.00	43.00	20.00	28.00	97.00	**309.00**
X	Out of SF			2.00		1.00		1.00	**4.00**
Grand Total		**10.00**	**233.00**	**416.00**	**596.00**	**170.00**	**97.00**	**486.00**	**2008.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.0%	1.2%	1.7%	1.9%	0.7%	0.4%	2.9%	**9.1%**
B	Southern	0.1%	0.9%	3.2%	3.5%	1.0%	0.2%	3.4%	**12.5%**
C	Bayview		1.2%	5.3%	4.5%	1.3%	0.1%	1.2%	**13.7%**
D	Mission		0.7%	1.7%	8.6%	0.9%	0.6%	3.3%	**15.8%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.6%	1.8%	2.4%	1.6%	1.0%	3.7%	**12.3%**
F	Park		0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	1.2%	**3.0%**
G	Richmond		0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.9%	**3.2%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	2.3%	1.3%	4.2%	0.8%	0.3%	1.5%	**10.7%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.1%	0.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.1%	1.1%	**4.2%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	1.5%	4.4%	2.1%	1.0%	1.4%	4.8%	**15.4%**
X	Out of SF			0.1%		0.0%		0.0%	**0.2%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**11.6%**	**20.7%**	**29.7%**	**8.5%**	**4.8%**	**24.2%**	**100.0%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	6.00	43.00	46.00	24.00	25.00	18.00	20.00	**182.00**
B	Southern	8.00	60.00	61.00	41.00	36.00	20.00	24.00	**250.00**
C	Bayview	35.00	52.00	58.00	37.00	30.00	35.00	29.00	**276.00**
D	Mission	15.00	85.00	66.00	58.00	37.00	31.00	26.00	**318.00**
E	Northern	20.00	57.00	50.00	33.00	23.00	27.00	36.00	**246.00**
F	Park	11.00	12.00	8.00	11.00	5.00	8.00	5.00	**60.00**
G	Richmond	6.00	7.00	11.00	8.00	6.00	13.00	13.00	**64.00**
H	Ingleside	30.00	43.00	46.00	33.00	18.00	31.00	13.00	**214.00**
I	Taraval	11.00	21.00	17.00	11.00	8.00	13.00	4.00	**85.00**
J	Tenderloin	8.00	48.00	61.00	49.00	65.00	37.00	41.00	**309.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00	1.00				1.00	**4.00**
Grand Total		**150.00**	**430.00**	**425.00**	**305.00**	**253.00**	**233.00**	**212.00**	**2008.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.3%	2.1%	2.3%	1.2%	1.2%	0.9%	1.0%	**9.1%**
B	Southern	0.4%	3.0%	3.0%	2.0%	1.8%	1.0%	1.2%	**12.5%**
C	Bayview	1.7%	2.6%	2.9%	1.8%	1.5%	1.7%	1.4%	**13.7%**
D	Mission	0.7%	4.2%	3.3%	2.9%	1.8%	1.5%	1.3%	**15.8%**
E	Northern	1.0%	2.8%	2.5%	1.6%	1.1%	1.3%	1.8%	**12.3%**
F	Park	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	**3.0%**
G	Richmond	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	**3.2%**
H	Ingleside	1.5%	2.1%	2.3%	1.6%	0.9%	1.5%	0.6%	**10.7%**
I	Taraval	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	**4.2%**
J	Tenderloin	0.4%	2.4%	3.0%	2.4%	3.2%	1.8%	2.0%	**15.4%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.0%				0.0%	**0.2%**
Grand Total		**7.5%**	**21.4%**	**21.2%**	**15.2%**	**12.6%**	**11.6%**	**10.6%**	**100.0%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	42.00	125.00		15.00		**182.00**
B	Southern	63.00	166.00	1.00	20.00		**250.00**
C	Bayview	103.00	149.00		22.00	2.00	**276.00**
D	Mission	94.00	206.00		17.00	1.00	**318.00**
E	Northern	79.00	139.00	1.00	26.00	1.00	**246.00**
F	Park	27.00	30.00		3.00		**60.00**
G	Richmond	18.00	33.00		13.00		**64.00**
H	Ingleside	76.00	122.00	1.00	15.00		**214.00**
I	Taraval	27.00	57.00		1.00		**85.00**
J	Tenderloin	79.00	194.00	2.00	21.00	13.00	**309.00**
X	Out of SF	3.00	1.00				**4.00**
Grand Total		**611.00**	**1222.00**	**5.00**	**153.00**	**17.00**	**2008.00**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	2.1%	6.2%		0.7%		**9.1%**
B	Southern	3.1%	8.3%	0.0%	1.0%		**12.5%**
C	Bayview	5.1%	7.4%		1.1%	0.1%	**13.7%**
D	Mission	4.7%	10.3%		0.8%	0.0%	**15.8%**
E	Northern	3.9%	6.9%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	**12.3%**
F	Park	1.3%	1.5%		0.1%		**3.0%**
G	Richmond	0.9%	1.6%		0.6%		**3.2%**
H	Ingleside	3.8%	6.1%	0.0%	0.7%		**10.7%**
I	Taraval	1.3%	2.8%		0.0%		**4.2%**
J	Tenderloin	3.9%	9.7%	0.1%	1.0%	0.6%	**15.4%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.0%				**0.2%**
Grand Total		**30.4%**	**60.9%**	**0.2%**	**7.6%**	**0.8%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	12	229	515	626	190	93	499	**2,164**
Q1-Q2 2023	10	233	416	596	170	97	486	**2,008**
Difference	-2	4	-99	-30	-20	4	-13	**-156**
% Change	**-16.7%**	**1.7%**	**-19.2%**	**-4.8%**	**-10.5%**	**4.3%**	**-2.6%**	**-7.2%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	147	436	499	371	258	217	236	**2,164**
Q1-Q2 2023	150	430	425	305	253	233	212	**2,008**
Difference	3	-6	-74	-66	-5	16	-24	**-156**
% Change	**2.0%**	**-1.4%**	**-14.8%**	**-17.8%**	**-1.9%**	**7.4%**	**-10.2%**	**-7.2%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	689	1,292	3	172	8	**2,164**
Q1-Q2 2023	611	1,222	5	153	17	**2,008**
Difference	-78	-70	2	-19	9	**-156**
% Change	**-11.3%**	**-5.4%**	**66.7%**	**-11.0%**	**112.5%**	**-7.2%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		47.00	57.00	87.00	44.00	25.00	137.00	**397.00**
B	Southern	6.00	59.00	88.00	115.00	25.00	20.00	113.00	**426.00**
C	Bayview		37.00	95.00	82.00	5.00	10.00	33.00	**262.00**
D	Mission		42.00	70.00	271.00	33.00	29.00	142.00	**587.00**
E	Northern	3.00	49.00	78.00	85.00	27.00	16.00	126.00	**384.00**
F	Park		13.00	12.00	12.00	5.00	3.00	52.00	**97.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	29.00	15.00	18.00	5.00	19.00	46.00	**133.00**
H	Ingleside		40.00	36.00	104.00	11.00	8.00	56.00	**255.00**
I	Taraval	4.00	48.00	39.00	36.00	8.00	8.00	70.00	**213.00**
J	Tenderloin	6.00	74.00	130.00	100.00	39.00	34.00	157.00	**540.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00	7.00	8.00		2.00	1.00	**20.00**
Grand Total		**20.00**	**440.00**	**627.00**	**918.00**	**202.00**	**174.00**	**933.00**	**3314.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		1.4%	1.7%	2.6%	1.3%	0.8%	4.1%	**12.0%**
B	Southern	0.2%	1.8%	2.7%	3.5%	0.8%	0.6%	3.4%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview		1.1%	2.9%	2.5%	0.2%	0.3%	1.0%	**7.9%**
D	Mission		1.3%	2.1%	8.2%	1.0%	0.9%	4.3%	**17.7%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.5%	2.4%	2.6%	0.8%	0.5%	3.8%	**11.6%**
F	Park		0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.6%	**2.9%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.6%	1.4%	**4.0%**
H	Ingleside		1.2%	1.1%	3.1%	0.3%	0.2%	1.7%	**7.7%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	1.4%	1.2%	1.1%	0.2%	0.2%	2.1%	**6.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.2%	2.2%	3.9%	3.0%	1.2%	1.0%	4.7%	**16.3%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.2%	0.2%		0.1%	0.0%	**0.6%**
Grand Total		**0.6%**	**13.3%**	**18.9%**	**27.7%**	**6.1%**	**5.3%**	**28.2%**	**100.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	12.00	95.00	101.00	56.00	55.00	34.00	44.00	**397.00**
B	Southern	22.00	106.00	108.00	68.00	51.00	39.00	32.00	**426.00**
C	Bayview	32.00	53.00	58.00	37.00	43.00	31.00	8.00	**262.00**
D	Mission	54.00	153.00	126.00	97.00	66.00	44.00	47.00	**587.00**
E	Northern	35.00	91.00	83.00	48.00	54.00	39.00	34.00	**384.00**
F	Park	8.00	24.00	21.00	16.00	13.00	10.00	5.00	**97.00**
G	Richmond	14.00	24.00	29.00	21.00	16.00	20.00	9.00	**133.00**
H	Ingleside	37.00	37.00	51.00	38.00	40.00	38.00	14.00	**255.00**
I	Taraval	41.00	34.00	31.00	39.00	21.00	37.00	10.00	**213.00**
J	Tenderloin	16.00	100.00	121.00	100.00	81.00	73.00	49.00	**540.00**
X	Out of SF	5.00	6.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	3.00		**20.00**
Grand Total		**276.00**	**723.00**	**733.00**	**521.00**	**441.00**	**368.00**	**252.00**	**3314.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.4%	2.9%	3.0%	1.7%	1.7%	1.0%	1.3%	**12.0%**
B	Southern	0.7%	3.2%	3.3%	2.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.0%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview	1.0%	1.6%	1.8%	1.1%	1.3%	0.9%	0.2%	**7.9%**
D	Mission	1.6%	4.6%	3.8%	2.9%	2.0%	1.3%	1.4%	**17.7%**
E	Northern	1.1%	2.7%	2.5%	1.4%	1.6%	1.2%	1.0%	**11.6%**
F	Park	0.2%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	**2.9%**
G	Richmond	0.4%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%	**4.0%**
H	Ingleside	1.1%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	0.4%	**7.7%**
I	Taraval	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	1.2%	0.6%	1.1%	0.3%	**6.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.5%	3.0%	3.7%	3.0%	2.4%	2.2%	1.5%	**16.3%**
X	Out of SF	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%		**0.6%**
Grand Total		**8.3%**	**21.8%**	**22.1%**	**15.7%**	**13.3%**	**11.1%**	**7.6%**	**100.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	138.00	216.00		41.00	2.00	**397.00**
B	Southern	183.00	217.00	1.00	23.00	2.00	**426.00**
C	Bayview	143.00	114.00		5.00		**262.00**
D	Mission	232.00	324.00	1.00	29.00	1.00	**587.00**
E	Northern	162.00	194.00		25.00	3.00	**384.00**
F	Park	41.00	52.00	1.00	3.00		**97.00**
G	Richmond	58.00	68.00		5.00	2.00	**133.00**
H	Ingleside	133.00	108.00	1.00	11.00	2.00	**255.00**
I	Taraval	109.00	97.00	1.00	6.00		**213.00**
J	Tenderloin	212.00	288.00	2.00	37.00	1.00	**540.00**
X	Out of SF	16.00	4.00				**20.00**
Grand Total		**1427.00**	**1682.00**	**7.00**	**185.00**	**13.00**	**3314.00**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	4.2%	6.5%		1.2%	0.1%	**12.0%**
B	Southern	5.5%	6.5%	0.0%	0.7%	0.1%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview	4.3%	3.4%		0.2%		**7.9%**
D	Mission	7.0%	9.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	**17.7%**
E	Northern	4.9%	5.9%		0.8%	0.1%	**11.6%**
F	Park	1.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.1%		**2.9%**
G	Richmond	1.8%	2.1%		0.2%	0.1%	**4.0%**
H	Ingleside	4.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	**7.7%**
I	Taraval	3.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.2%		**6.4%**
J	Tenderloin	6.4%	8.7%	0.1%	1.1%	0.0%	**16.3%**
X	Out of SF	0.5%	0.1%				**0.6%**
Grand Total		**43.1%**	**50.8%**	**0.2%**	**5.6%**	**0.4%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	15	453	578	752	170	170	902	**3,040**
Q1-Q2 2023	20	440	627	918	202	174	933	**3,314**
Difference	5	-13	49	166	32	4	31	**274**
% Change	**33.3%**	**-2.9%**	**8.5%**	**22.1%**	**18.8%**	**2.4%**	**3.4%**	**9.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	198	641	692	577	358	342	232	**3,040**
Q1-Q2 2023	276	723	733	521	441	368	252	**3,314**
Difference	78	82	41	-56	83	26	20	**274**
% Change	**39.4%**	**12.8%**	**5.9%**	**-9.7%**	**23.2%**	**7.6%**	**8.6%**	**9.0%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	1,335	1,524	3	157	21	**3,040**
Q1-Q2 2023	1,427	1,682	7	185	13	**3,314**
Difference	92	158	4	28	-8	**274**
% Change	**6.9%**	**10.4%**	**133.3%**	**17.8%**	**-38.1%**	**9.0%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	2.00	51.00	26.00	51.00	69.00	13.00	50.00	**262.00**
B	Southern	2.00	30.00	27.00	77.00	29.00	14.00	48.00	**227.00**
C	Bayview		43.00	23.00	109.00	40.00	2.00	20.00	**237.00**
D	Mission	3.00	19.00	15.00	137.00	32.00	8.00	43.00	**257.00**
E	Northern	3.00	41.00	12.00	53.00	32.00	10.00	77.00	**228.00**
F	Park		17.00	3.00	4.00	15.00	2.00	26.00	**67.00**
G	Richmond		29.00	3.00	17.00	35.00	8.00	39.00	**131.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	53.00	21.00	96.00	32.00	4.00	22.00	**229.00**
I	Taraval		45.00	5.00	28.00	21.00	1.00	20.00	**120.00**
J	Tenderloin	2.00	34.00	50.00	55.00	55.00	24.00	69.00	**289.00**
X	Out of SF		1.00					1.00	**2.00**
Grand Total		**13.00**	**363.00**	**185.00**	**627.00**	**360.00**	**86.00**	**415.00**	**2049.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	2.5%	1.3%	2.5%	3.4%	0.6%	2.4%	**12.8%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.5%	1.3%	3.8%	1.4%	0.7%	2.3%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview		2.1%	1.1%	5.3%	2.0%	0.1%	1.0%	**11.6%**
D	Mission	0.1%	0.9%	0.7%	6.7%	1.6%	0.4%	2.1%	**12.5%**
E	Northern	0.1%	2.0%	0.6%	2.6%	1.6%	0.5%	3.8%	**11.1%**
F	Park		0.8%	0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	0.1%	1.3%	**3.3%**
G	Richmond		1.4%	0.1%	0.8%	1.7%	0.4%	1.9%	**6.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	2.6%	1.0%	4.7%	1.6%	0.2%	1.1%	**11.2%**
I	Taraval		2.2%	0.2%	1.4%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	**5.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	1.7%	2.4%	2.7%	2.7%	1.2%	3.4%	**14.1%**
X	Out of SF		0.0%					0.0%	**0.1%**
Grand Total		**0.6%**	**17.7%**	**9.0%**	**30.6%**	**17.6%**	**4.2%**	**20.3%**	**100.0%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	7.00	66.00	33.00	31.00	30.00	25.00	70.00	**262.00**
B	Southern	7.00	73.00	49.00	25.00	28.00	21.00	24.00	**227.00**
C	Bayview	23.00	49.00	37.00	46.00	30.00	16.00	36.00	**237.00**
D	Mission	16.00	68.00	64.00	37.00	23.00	17.00	32.00	**257.00**
E	Northern	21.00	59.00	42.00	27.00	29.00	23.00	27.00	**228.00**
F	Park	5.00	11.00	9.00	11.00	9.00	8.00	14.00	**67.00**
G	Richmond	16.00	26.00	17.00	13.00	11.00	12.00	36.00	**131.00**
H	Ingleside	31.00	43.00	39.00	34.00	30.00	21.00	31.00	**229.00**
I	Taraval	21.00	25.00	17.00	17.00	11.00	7.00	22.00	**120.00**
J	Tenderloin	5.00	68.00	54.00	34.00	39.00	20.00	69.00	**289.00**
X	Out of SF			2.00					**2.00**
Grand Total		**152.00**	**488.00**	**363.00**	**275.00**	**240.00**	**170.00**	**361.00**	**2049.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.3%	3.2%	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	3.4%	**12.8%**
B	Southern	0.3%	3.6%	2.4%	1.2%	1.4%	1.0%	1.2%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview	1.1%	2.4%	1.8%	2.2%	1.5%	0.8%	1.8%	**11.6%**
D	Mission	0.8%	3.3%	3.1%	1.8%	1.1%	0.8%	1.6%	**12.5%**
E	Northern	1.0%	2.9%	2.0%	1.3%	1.4%	1.1%	1.3%	**11.1%**
F	Park	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	**3.3%**
G	Richmond	0.8%	1.3%	0.8%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	1.8%	**6.4%**
H	Ingleside	1.5%	2.1%	1.9%	1.7%	1.5%	1.0%	1.5%	**11.2%**
I	Taraval	1.0%	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	1.1%	**5.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.2%	3.3%	2.6%	1.7%	1.9%	1.0%	3.4%	**14.1%**
X	Out of SF			0.1%					**0.1%**
Grand Total		**7.4%**	**23.8%**	**17.7%**	**13.4%**	**11.7%**	**8.3%**	**17.6%**	**100.0%**

ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	67.00	129.00		66.00		**262.00**
B	Southern	66.00	132.00		28.00	1.00	**227.00**
C	Bayview	76.00	121.00		40.00		**237.00**
D	Mission	71.00	153.00	1.00	32.00		**257.00**
E	Northern	76.00	119.00	2.00	31.00		**228.00**
F	Park	21.00	31.00		15.00		**67.00**
G	Richmond	42.00	54.00		33.00	2.00	**131.00**
H	Ingleside	77.00	120.00		32.00		**229.00**
I	Taraval	43.00	56.00		21.00		**120.00**
J	Tenderloin	68.00	152.00	2.00	53.00	14.00	**289.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00				**2.00**
Grand Total		**607.00**	**1069.00**	**5.00**	**351.00**	**17.00**	**2049.00**

ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	3.3%	6.3%		3.2%		**12.8%**
B	Southern	3.2%	6.4%		1.4%	0.0%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview	3.7%	5.9%		2.0%		**11.6%**
D	Mission	3.5%	7.5%	0.0%	1.6%		**12.5%**
E	Northern	3.7%	5.8%	0.1%	1.5%		**11.1%**
F	Park	1.0%	1.5%		0.7%		**3.3%**
G	Richmond	2.0%	2.6%		1.6%	0.1%	**6.4%**
H	Ingleside	3.8%	5.9%		1.6%		**11.2%**
I	Taraval	2.1%	2.7%		1.0%		**5.9%**
J	Tenderloin	3.3%	7.4%	0.1%	2.6%	0.7%	**14.1%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%				**0.1%**
Grand Total		**29.6%**	**52.2%**	**0.2%**	**17.1%**	**0.8%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

ROBBERY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	15	289	186	470	343	102	423	**1,828**
Q1-Q2 2023	13	363	185	627	360	86	415	**2,049**
Difference	-2	74	-1	157	17	-16	-8	**221**
% Change	**-13.3%**	**25.6%**	**-0.5%**	**33.4%**	**5.0%**	**-15.7%**	**-1.9%**	**12.1%**

ROBBERY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	65	464	345	273	176	187	318	**1,828**
Q1-Q2 2023	152	488	363	275	240	170	361	**2,049**
Difference	87	24	18	2	64	-17	43	**221**
% Change	**133.8%**	**5.2%**	**5.2%**	**0.7%**	**36.4%**	**-9.1%**	**13.5%**	**12.1%**

ROBBERY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	502	969	2	340	15	**1,828**
Q1-Q2 2023	607	1,069	5	351	17	**2,049**
Difference	105	100	3	11	2	**221**
% Change	**20.9%**	**10.3%**	**150.0%**	**3.2%**	**13.3%**	**12.1%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	3.00	76.00	20.00	30.00	298.00	46.00	117.00	**590.00**
B	Southern	7.00	53.00	28.00	38.00	297.00	37.00	109.00	**569.00**
C	Bayview	1.00	41.00	31.00	45.00	126.00	13.00	67.00	**324.00**
D	Mission	6.00	44.00	17.00	51.00	162.00	30.00	164.00	**474.00**
E	Northern	6.00	97.00	22.00	40.00	281.00	78.00	254.00	**778.00**
F	Park	2.00	32.00	9.00	10.00	56.00	22.00	124.00	**255.00**
G	Richmond		42.00	17.00	15.00	90.00	19.00	119.00	**302.00**
H	Ingleside	7.00	98.00	14.00	39.00	82.00	16.00	174.00	**430.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	112.00	13.00	23.00	105.00	16.00	133.00	**404.00**
J	Tenderloin	2.00	11.00	23.00	8.00	93.00	18.00	34.00	**189.00**
X	Out of SF				1.00			1.00	**2.00**
Grand Total		**36.00**	**606.00**	**194.00**	**300.00**	**1590.00**	**295.00**	**1296.00**	**4317.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.1%	1.8%	0.5%	0.7%	6.9%	1.1%	2.7%	**13.7%**
B	Southern	0.2%	1.2%	0.6%	0.9%	6.9%	0.9%	2.5%	**13.2%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.9%	0.7%	1.0%	2.9%	0.3%	1.6%	**7.5%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.0%	0.4%	1.2%	3.8%	0.7%	3.8%	**11.0%**
E	Northern	0.1%	2.2%	0.5%	0.9%	6.5%	1.8%	5.9%	**18.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	1.3%	0.5%	2.9%	**5.9%**
G	Richmond		1.0%	0.4%	0.3%	2.1%	0.4%	2.8%	**7.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	2.3%	0.3%	0.9%	1.9%	0.4%	4.0%	**10.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	2.6%	0.3%	0.5%	2.4%	0.4%	3.1%	**9.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	2.2%	0.4%	0.8%	**4.4%**
X	Out of SF				0.0%			0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.8%**	**14.0%**	**4.5%**	**6.9%**	**36.8%**	**6.8%**	**30.0%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	5.00	64.00	54.00	41.00	60.00	54.00	312.00	**590.00**
B	Southern	7.00	41.00	78.00	70.00	42.00	27.00	304.00	**569.00**
C	Bayview	8.00	24.00	50.00	43.00	33.00	41.00	125.00	**324.00**
D	Mission	2.00	33.00	99.00	74.00	54.00	59.00	153.00	**474.00**
E	Northern	9.00	115.00	135.00	89.00	53.00	88.00	289.00	**778.00**
F	Park	2.00	34.00	63.00	47.00	26.00	33.00	50.00	**255.00**
G	Richmond		26.00	60.00	50.00	37.00	47.00	82.00	**302.00**
H	Ingleside	13.00	30.00	89.00	73.00	54.00	98.00	73.00	**430.00**
I	Taraval	8.00	29.00	73.00	62.00	61.00	69.00	102.00	**404.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	8.00	21.00	18.00	28.00	14.00	99.00	**189.00**
X	Out of SF		1.00	1.00					**2.00**
Grand Total		**55.00**	**405.00**	**723.00**	**567.00**	**448.00**	**530.00**	**1589.00**	**4317.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	1.5%	1.3%	0.9%	1.4%	1.3%	7.2%	**13.7%**
B	Southern	0.2%	0.9%	1.8%	1.6%	1.0%	0.6%	7.0%	**13.2%**
C	Bayview	0.2%	0.6%	1.2%	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%	2.9%	**7.5%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.8%	2.3%	1.7%	1.3%	1.4%	3.5%	**11.0%**
E	Northern	0.2%	2.7%	3.1%	2.1%	1.2%	2.0%	6.7%	**18.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	1.1%	0.6%	0.8%	1.2%	**5.9%**
G	Richmond		0.6%	1.4%	1.2%	0.9%	1.1%	1.9%	**7.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	0.7%	2.1%	1.7%	1.3%	2.3%	1.7%	**10.0%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	0.7%	1.7%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%	2.4%	**9.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	2.3%	**4.4%**
X	Out of SF		0.0%	0.0%					**0.0%**
Grand Total		**1.3%**	**9.4%**	**16.7%**	**13.1%**	**10.4%**	**12.3%**	**36.8%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	101.00	177.00		289.00	23.00	**590.00**
B	Southern	93.00	170.00		290.00	16.00	**569.00**
C	Bayview	78.00	121.00		121.00	4.00	**324.00**
D	Mission	103.00	221.00		148.00	2.00	**474.00**
E	Northern	210.00	284.00	2.00	265.00	17.00	**778.00**
F	Park	72.00	134.00		48.00	1.00	**255.00**
G	Richmond	86.00	136.00		80.00		**302.00**
H	Ingleside	132.00	221.00	1.00	73.00	3.00	**430.00**
I	Taraval	134.00	171.00		97.00	2.00	**404.00**
J	Tenderloin	34.00	53.00	2.00	93.00	7.00	**189.00**
X	Out of SF	2.00					**2.00**
Grand Total		**1045.00**	**1688.00**	**5.00**	**1504.00**	**75.00**	**4317.00**

BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2.3%	4.1%		6.7%	0.5%	**13.7%**
B	Southern	2.2%	3.9%		6.7%	0.4%	**13.2%**
C	Bayview	1.8%	2.8%		2.8%	0.1%	**7.5%**
D	Mission	2.4%	5.1%		3.4%	0.0%	**11.0%**
E	Northern	4.9%	6.6%	0.0%	6.1%	0.4%	**18.0%**
F	Park	1.7%	3.1%		1.1%	0.0%	**5.9%**
G	Richmond	2.0%	3.2%		1.9%		**7.0%**
H	Ingleside	3.1%	5.1%	0.0%	1.7%	0.1%	**10.0%**
I	Taraval	3.1%	4.0%		2.2%	0.0%	**9.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	2.2%	0.2%	**4.4%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%					**0.0%**
Grand Total		**24.2%**	**39.1%**	**0.1%**	**34.8%**	**1.7%**	**100.0%**

BURGLARY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	24	648	189	318	1,407	323	1,561	**4,470**
Q1-Q2 2023	36	606	194	300	1,590	295	1,296	**4,317**
Difference	12	-42	5	-18	183	-28	-265	**-153**
% Change	**50.0%**	**-6.5%**	**2.6%**	**-5.7%**	**13.0%**	**-8.7%**	**-17.0%**	**-3.4%**

BURGLARY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	55	391	775	655	528	656	1,410	**4,470**
Q1-Q2 2023	55	405	723	567	448	530	1,589	**4,317**
Difference	0	14	-52	-88	-80	-126	179	**-153**
% Change	**0.0%**	**3.6%**	**-6.7%**	**-13.4%**	**-15.2%**	**-19.2%**	**12.7%**	**-3.4%**

BURGLARY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	1,136	1,975	3	1,267	89	**4,470**
Q1-Q2 2023	1,045	1,688	5	1,504	75	**4,317**
Difference	-91	-287	2	237	-14	**-153**
% Change	**-8.0%**	**-14.5%**	**66.7%**	**18.7%**	**-15.7%**	**-3.4%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	21.00	977.00	172.00	537.00	2723.00	256.00	1977.00	**6663.00**
B	Southern	16.00	335.00	110.00	149.00	650.00	98.00	498.00	**1856.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	173.00	107.00	154.00	291.00	57.00	176.00	**962.00**
D	Mission	8.00	187.00	72.00	257.00	595.00	87.00	474.00	**1680.00**
E	Northern	15.00	635.00	138.00	306.00	1565.00	181.00	1332.00	**4172.00**
F	Park	2.00	142.00	28.00	58.00	401.00	71.00	418.00	**1120.00**
G	Richmond	10.00	424.00	53.00	148.00	1147.00	87.00	770.00	**2639.00**
H	Ingleside	7.00	222.00	54.00	210.00	458.00	44.00	252.00	**1247.00**
I	Taraval	8.00	377.00	53.00	120.00	559.00	66.00	407.00	**1590.00**
J	Tenderloin	3.00	114.00	80.00	76.00	400.00	45.00	213.00	**931.00**
X	Out of SF		44.00	14.00	24.00	81.00	10.00	102.00	**275.00**
Grand Total		**94.00**	**3630.00**	**881.00**	**2039.00**	**8870.00**	**1002.00**	**6619.00**	**23135.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	4.2%	0.7%	2.3%	11.8%	1.1%	8.5%	**28.8%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.4%	0.5%	0.6%	2.8%	0.4%	2.2%	**8.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	1.3%	0.2%	0.8%	**4.2%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%	1.1%	2.6%	0.4%	2.0%	**7.3%**
E	Northern	0.1%	2.7%	0.6%	1.3%	6.8%	0.8%	5.8%	**18.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	1.7%	0.3%	1.8%	**4.8%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	1.8%	0.2%	0.6%	5.0%	0.4%	3.3%	**11.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	1.0%	0.2%	0.9%	2.0%	0.2%	1.1%	**5.4%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.6%	0.2%	0.5%	2.4%	0.3%	1.8%	**6.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	1.7%	0.2%	0.9%	**4.0%**
X	Out of SF		0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	**1.2%**
Grand Total		**0.4%**	**15.7%**	**3.8%**	**8.8%**	**38.3%**	**4.3%**	**28.6%**	**100.0%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	195.00	1159.00	1214.00	1048.00	755.00	478.00	1814.00	**6663.00**
B	Southern	19.00	458.00	489.00	306.00	217.00	116.00	251.00	**1856.00**
C	Bayview	18.00	200.00	229.00	155.00	129.00	113.00	118.00	**962.00**
D	Mission	23.00	412.00	457.00	243.00	178.00	129.00	238.00	**1680.00**
E	Northern	91.00	1016.00	820.00	610.00	443.00	290.00	902.00	**4172.00**
F	Park	27.00	234.00	258.00	184.00	114.00	115.00	188.00	**1120.00**
G	Richmond	64.00	431.00	444.00	388.00	326.00	289.00	697.00	**2639.00**
H	Ingleside	9.00	188.00	269.00	219.00	168.00	179.00	215.00	**1247.00**
I	Taraval	18.00	247.00	307.00	253.00	218.00	272.00	275.00	**1590.00**
J	Tenderloin	9.00	180.00	181.00	108.00	81.00	76.00	296.00	**931.00**
X	Out of SF	6.00	60.00	73.00	45.00	34.00	38.00	19.00	**275.00**
Grand Total		**479.00**	**4585.00**	**4741.00**	**3559.00**	**2663.00**	**2095.00**	**5013.00**	**23135.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.8%	5.0%	5.2%	4.5%	3.3%	2.1%	7.8%	**28.8%**
B	Southern	0.1%	2.0%	2.1%	1.3%	0.9%	0.5%	1.1%	**8.0%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.9%	1.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	**4.2%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.8%	2.0%	1.1%	0.8%	0.6%	1.0%	**7.3%**
E	Northern	0.4%	4.4%	3.5%	2.6%	1.9%	1.3%	3.9%	**18.0%**
F	Park	0.1%	1.0%	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.8%	**4.8%**
G	Richmond	0.3%	1.9%	1.9%	1.7%	1.4%	1.2%	3.0%	**11.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.8%	1.2%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	**5.4%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.1%	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%	**6.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	1.3%	**4.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	**1.2%**
Grand Total		**2.1%**	**19.8%**	**20.5%**	**15.4%**	**11.5%**	**9.1%**	**21.7%**	**100.0%**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	1990.00	2856.00	1.00	1792.00	24.00	**6663.00**
B	Southern	655.00	940.00	1.00	248.00	12.00	**1856.00**
C	Bayview	384.00	468.00		105.00	5.00	**962.00**
D	Mission	572.00	865.00		222.00	21.00	**1680.00**
E	Northern	1486.00	1801.00		857.00	28.00	**4172.00**
F	Park	377.00	553.00		184.00	6.00	**1120.00**
G	Richmond	802.00	1133.00		698.00	6.00	**2639.00**
H	Ingleside	403.00	623.00		210.00	11.00	**1247.00**
I	Taraval	554.00	759.00	1.00	264.00	12.00	**1590.00**
J	Tenderloin	248.00	368.00	1.00	313.00	1.00	**931.00**
X	Out of SF	138.00	118.00		19.00		**275.00**
Grand Total		**7609.00**	**10484.00**	**4.00**	**4912.00**	**126.00**	**23135.00**

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	8.6%	12.3%	0.0%	7.7%	0.1%	**28.8%**
B	Southern	2.8%	4.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.1%	**8.0%**
C	Bayview	1.7%	2.0%		0.5%	0.0%	**4.2%**
D	Mission	2.5%	3.7%		1.0%	0.1%	**7.3%**
E	Northern	6.4%	7.8%		3.7%	0.1%	**18.0%**
F	Park	1.6%	2.4%		0.8%	0.0%	**4.8%**
G	Richmond	3.5%	4.9%		3.0%	0.0%	**11.4%**
H	Ingleside	1.7%	2.7%		0.9%	0.0%	**5.4%**
I	Taraval	2.4%	3.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.1%	**6.9%**
J	Tenderloin	1.1%	1.6%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	**4.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.6%	0.5%		0.1%		**1.2%**
Grand Total		**32.9%**	**45.3%**	**0.0%**	**21.2%**	**0.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

LARCENY THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	75	3,151	918	1,890	9,918	1,011	6,409	**23,372**
Q1-Q2 2023	94	3,630	881	2,039	8,870	1,002	6,619	**23,135**
Difference	19	479	-37	149	-1,048	-9	210	**-237**
% Change	**25.3%**	**15.2%**	**-4.0%**	**7.9%**	**-10.6%**	**-0.9%**	**3.3%**	**-1.0%**

LARCENY THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	411	4,985	4,828	3,233	2,517	2,011	5,387	**23,372**
Q1-Q2 2023	479	4,585	4,741	3,559	2,663	2,095	5,013	**23,135**
Difference	68	-400	-87	326	146	84	-374	**-237**
% Change	**16.5%**	**-8.0%**	**-1.8%**	**10.1%**	**5.8%**	**4.2%**	**-6.9%**	**-1.0%**

LARCENY THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	7,629	10,400	6	5,259	78	**23,372**
Q1-Q2 2023	7,609	10,484	4	4,912	126	**23,135**
Difference	-20	84	-2	-347	48	**-237**
% Change	**-0.3%**	**0.8%**	**-33.3%**	**-6.6%**	**61.5%**	**-1.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	2.00	1.00	1.00	207.00	2.00	8.00	**221.00**
B	Southern	3.00	2.00	6.00	301.00	4.00	10.00	**326.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	12.00	10.00	569.00	2.00	14.00	**611.00**
D	Mission	2.00		9.00	432.00	1.00	4.00	**448.00**
E	Northern	3.00	1.00	7.00	358.00	2.00	6.00	**377.00**
F	Park	2.00	1.00		176.00	4.00	9.00	**192.00**
G	Richmond	4.00	1.00		163.00	2.00	2.00	**172.00**
H	Ingleside	8.00	1.00	10.00	557.00	1.00	3.00	**580.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	3.00	6.00	378.00		5.00	**393.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	5.00	3.00	123.00	1.00	1.00	**134.00**
X	Out of SF		2.00	1.00	16.00		1.00	**20.00**
Grand Total		**30.00**	**29.00**	**53.00**	**3280.00**	**19.00**	**63.00**	**3474.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT						PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	0.1%	0.2%	**6.4%**
B	Southern	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	8.7%	0.1%	0.3%	**9.4%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	16.4%	0.1%	0.4%	**17.6%**
D	Mission	0.1%		0.3%	12.4%	0.0%	0.1%	**12.9%**
E	Northern	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	10.3%	0.1%	0.2%	**10.9%**
F	Park	0.1%	0.0%		5.1%	0.1%	0.3%	**5.5%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	0.0%		4.7%	0.1%	0.1%	**5.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	16.0%	0.0%	0.1%	**16.7%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	10.9%		0.1%	**11.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	**3.9%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.0%	0.5%		0.0%	**0.6%**
Grand Total		**0.9%**	**0.8%**	**1.5%**	**94.4%**	**0.5%**	**1.8%**	**100.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		64.00	57.00	34.00	24.00	28.00	14.00	**221.00**
B	Southern		68.00	95.00	51.00	53.00	38.00	21.00	**326.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	125.00	129.00	128.00	97.00	103.00	25.00	**611.00**
D	Mission		89.00	110.00	83.00	74.00	80.00	12.00	**448.00**
E	Northern	2.00	113.00	97.00	58.00	41.00	54.00	12.00	**377.00**
F	Park		52.00	45.00	42.00	28.00	22.00	3.00	**192.00**
G	Richmond		42.00	40.00	29.00	32.00	25.00	4.00	**172.00**
H	Ingleside		107.00	140.00	114.00	94.00	119.00	6.00	**580.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	78.00	68.00	64.00	67.00	102.00	13.00	**393.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	33.00	35.00	23.00	14.00	18.00	10.00	**134.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	**20.00**
Grand Total		**9.00**	**774.00**	**821.00**	**629.00**	**527.00**	**591.00**	**123.00**	**3474.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		1.8%	1.6%	1.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%	**6.4%**
B	Southern		2.0%	2.7%	1.5%	1.5%	1.1%	0.6%	**9.4%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%	2.8%	3.0%	0.7%	**17.6%**
D	Mission		2.6%	3.2%	2.4%	2.1%	2.3%	0.3%	**12.9%**
E	Northern	0.1%	3.3%	2.8%	1.7%	1.2%	1.6%	0.3%	**10.9%**
F	Park		1.5%	1.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.6%	0.1%	**5.5%**
G	Richmond		1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.1%	**5.0%**
H	Ingleside		3.1%	4.0%	3.3%	2.7%	3.4%	0.2%	**16.7%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	2.2%	2.0%	1.8%	1.9%	2.9%	0.4%	**11.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.9%	1.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	**3.9%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	**0.6%**
Grand Total		**0.3%**	**22.3%**	**23.6%**	**18.1%**	**15.2%**	**17.0%**	**3.5%**	**100.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	4.00	10.00	207.00		**221.00**
B	Southern	10.00	16.00	300.00		**326.00**
C	Bayview	19.00	22.00	569.00	1.00	**611.00**
D	Mission	5.00	11.00	432.00		**448.00**
E	Northern	10.00	10.00	356.00	1.00	**377.00**
F	Park	8.00	8.00	176.00		**192.00**
G	Richmond	2.00	7.00	163.00		**172.00**
H	Ingleside	8.00	16.00	556.00		**580.00**
I	Taraval	7.00	8.00	378.00		**393.00**
J	Tenderloin	4.00	7.00	123.00		**134.00**
X	Out of SF	1.00	3.00	16.00		**20.00**
Grand Total		**78.00**	**118.00**	**3276.00**	**2.00**	**3474.00**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	0.3%	6.0%		**6.4%**
B	Southern	0.3%	0.5%	8.6%		**9.4%**
C	Bayview	0.5%	0.6%	16.4%	0.0%	**17.6%**
D	Mission	0.1%	0.3%	12.4%		**12.9%**
E	Northern	0.3%	0.3%	10.2%	0.0%	**10.9%**
F	Park	0.2%	0.2%	5.1%		**5.5%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	0.2%	4.7%		**5.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	0.5%	16.0%		**16.7%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	0.2%	10.9%		**11.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.2%	3.5%		**3.9%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%		**0.6%**
Grand Total		**2.2%**	**3.4%**	**94.3%**	**0.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	2	34	35	40	3,148	35	93	**3,387**
Q1-Q2 2023	0	30	29	53	3,280	19	63	**3,474**
Difference	-2	-4	-6	13	132	-16	-30	**87**
% Change	**-100.0%**	**-11.8%**	**-17.1%**	**32.5%**	**4.2%**	**-45.7%**	**-32.3%**	**2.6%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	9	604	823	635	595	586	135	**3,387**
Q1-Q2 2023	9	774	821	629	527	591	123	**3,474**
Difference	0	170	-2	-6	-68	5	-12	**87**
% Change	**0.0%**	**28.1%**	**-0.2%**	**-0.9%**	**-11.4%**	**0.9%**	**-8.9%**	**2.6%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	75	155	0	3,145	12	**3,387**
Q1-Q2 2023	78	118	0	3,276	2	**3,474**
Difference	3	-37	0	131	-10	**87**
% Change	**4.0%**	**-23.9%**	**not calc**	**4.2%**	**-83.3%**	**2.6%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		10.00	8.00	5.00		2.00	12.00	**37.00**
B	Southern		8.00	8.00	9.00	1.00	3.00	20.00	**49.00**
C	Bayview		4.00	7.00	11.00			1.00	**23.00**
D	Mission	1.00	8.00	21.00	47.00	19.00	6.00	33.00	**135.00**
E	Northern		5.00		10.00	4.00	1.00	20.00	**40.00**
F	Park		2.00	3.00	1.00			7.00	**13.00**
G	Richmond		2.00		1.00		1.00	3.00	**7.00**
H	Ingleside		2.00	3.00	30.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	**43.00**
I	Taraval		5.00	2.00	10.00	2.00		7.00	**26.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	4.00	9.00	9.00		2.00	12.00	**37.00**
X	Out of SF		6.00	3.00	6.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	**23.00**
Grand Total		**2.00**	**56.00**	**64.00**	**139.00**	**29.00**	**22.00**	**121.00**	**433.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		2.3%	1.8%	1.2%		0.5%	2.8%	**8.5%**
B	Southern		1.8%	1.8%	2.1%	0.2%	0.7%	4.6%	**11.3%**
C	Bayview		0.9%	1.6%	2.5%			0.2%	**5.3%**
D	Mission	0.2%	1.8%	4.8%	10.9%	4.4%	1.4%	7.6%	**31.2%**
E	Northern		1.2%		2.3%	0.9%	0.2%	4.6%	**9.2%**
F	Park		0.5%	0.7%	0.2%			1.6%	**3.0%**
G	Richmond		0.5%		0.2%		0.2%	0.7%	**1.6%**
H	Ingleside		0.5%	0.7%	6.9%	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%	**9.9%**
I	Taraval		1.2%	0.5%	2.3%	0.5%		1.6%	**6.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.2%	0.9%	2.1%	2.1%		0.5%	2.8%	**8.5%**
X	Out of SF		1.4%	0.7%	1.4%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	**5.3%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**12.9%**	**14.8%**	**32.1%**	**6.7%**	**5.1%**	**27.9%**	**100.0%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	10.00	8.00	11.00	7.00	1.00			**37.00**
B	Southern	10.00	18.00	11.00	6.00	3.00	1.00		**49.00**
C	Bayview	12.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	2.00			**23.00**
D	Mission	35.00	39.00	34.00	14.00	7.00	1.00	5.00	**135.00**
E	Northern	7.00	16.00	5.00	5.00	2.00		5.00	**40.00**
F	Park	2.00	4.00	4.00	2.00		1.00		**13.00**
G	Richmond	4.00		2.00	1.00				**7.00**
H	Ingleside	13.00	12.00	7.00	6.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	**43.00**
I	Taraval	8.00	8.00	5.00	2.00	2.00		1.00	**26.00**
J	Tenderloin	5.00	6.00	12.00	7.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	**37.00**
X	Out of SF	11.00	5.00	6.00				1.00	**23.00**
Grand Total		**117.00**	**123.00**	**98.00**	**51.00**	**23.00**	**6.00**	**15.00**	**433.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2.3%	1.8%	2.5%	1.6%	0.2%			**8.5%**
B	Southern	2.3%	4.2%	2.5%	1.4%	0.7%	0.2%		**11.3%**
C	Bayview	2.8%	1.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%			**5.3%**
D	Mission	8.1%	9.0%	7.9%	3.2%	1.6%	0.2%	1.2%	**31.2%**
E	Northern	1.6%	3.7%	1.2%	1.2%	0.5%		1.2%	**9.2%**
F	Park	0.5%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%		0.2%		**3.0%**
G	Richmond	0.9%		0.5%	0.2%				**1.6%**
H	Ingleside	3.0%	2.8%	1.6%	1.4%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	**9.9%**
I	Taraval	1.8%	1.8%	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%		0.2%	**6.0%**
J	Tenderloin	1.2%	1.4%	2.8%	1.6%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	**8.5%**
X	Out of SF	2.5%	1.2%	1.4%				0.2%	**5.3%**
Grand Total		**27.0%**	**28.4%**	**22.6%**	**11.8%**	**5.3%**	**1.4%**	**3.5%**	**100.0%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	33.00	3.00			1.00	**37.00**
B	Southern	39.00	9.00			1.00	**49.00**
C	Bayview	20.00	3.00				**23.00**
D	Mission	107.00	25.00	1.00	2.00		**135.00**
E	Northern	34.00	2.00		4.00		**40.00**
F	Park	9.00	4.00				**13.00**
G	Richmond	5.00	2.00				**7.00**
H	Ingleside	38.00	4.00			1.00	**43.00**
I	Taraval	19.00	5.00		2.00		**26.00**
J	Tenderloin	32.00	5.00				**37.00**
X	Out of SF	21.00	2.00				**23.00**
Grand Total		**357.00**	**64.00**	**1.00**	**8.00**	**3.00**	**433.00**

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	7.6%	0.7%			0.2%	**8.5%**
B	Southern	9.0%	2.1%			0.2%	**11.3%**
C	Bayview	4.6%	0.7%				**5.3%**
D	Mission	24.7%	5.8%	0.2%	0.5%		**31.2%**
E	Northern	7.9%	0.5%		0.9%		**9.2%**
F	Park	2.1%	0.9%				**3.0%**
G	Richmond	1.2%	0.5%				**1.6%**
H	Ingleside	8.8%	0.9%			0.2%	**9.9%**
I	Taraval	4.4%	1.2%		0.5%		**6.0%**
J	Tenderloin	7.4%	1.2%				**8.5%**
X	Out of SF	4.8%	0.5%				**5.3%**
Grand Total		**82.4%**	**14.8%**	**0.2%**	**1.8%**	**0.7%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	3	70	62	140	42	18	147	**482**
Q1-Q2 2023	2	56	64	139	29	22	121	**433**
Difference	-1	-14	2	-1	-13	4	-26	**-49**
% Change	**-33.3%**	**-20.0%**	**3.2%**	**-0.7%**	**-31.0%**	**22.2%**	**-17.7%**	**-10.2%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	137	146	93	55	18	24	9	**482**
Q1-Q2 2023	117	123	98	51	23	6	15	**433**
Difference	-20	-23	5	-4	5	-18	6	**-49**
% Change	**-14.6%**	**-15.8%**	**5.4%**	**-7.3%**	**27.8%**	**-75.0%**	**66.7%**	**-10.2%**

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	397	72	0	11	2	**482**
Q1-Q2 2023	357	64	1	8	3	**433**
Difference	-40	-8	1	-3	1	**-49**
% Change	**-10.1%**	**-11.1%**	**not calc**	**-27.3%**	**50.0%**	**-10.2%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	3.00	83.00	30.00	52.00	486.00	25.00	153.00	**832.00**
B	Southern		57.00	42.00	39.00	244.00	19.00	81.00	**482.00**
C	Bayview	5.00	67.00	103.00	91.00	128.00	23.00	79.00	**496.00**
D	Mission	2.00	34.00	27.00	125.00	217.00	30.00	111.00	**546.00**
E	Northern	6.00	68.00	61.00	46.00	311.00	39.00	163.00	**694.00**
F	Park		21.00	11.00	10.00	69.00	7.00	67.00	**185.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	54.00	9.00	15.00	132.00	19.00	68.00	**298.00**
H	Ingleside	4.00	94.00	38.00	90.00	123.00	18.00	83.00	**450.00**
I	Taraval	1.00	85.00	28.00	32.00	156.00	19.00	89.00	**410.00**
J	Tenderloin	3.00	33.00	36.00	38.00	132.00	16.00	39.00	**297.00**
X	Out of SF			1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	**11.00**
Grand Total		**25.00**	**596.00**	**386.00**	**540.00**	**2001.00**	**218.00**	**935.00**	**4701.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.1%	1.8%	0.6%	1.1%	10.3%	0.5%	3.3%	**17.7%**
B	Southern		1.2%	0.9%	0.8%	5.2%	0.4%	1.7%	**10.3%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	1.4%	2.2%	1.9%	2.7%	0.5%	1.7%	**10.6%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.7%	0.6%	2.7%	4.6%	0.6%	2.4%	**11.6%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.4%	1.3%	1.0%	6.6%	0.8%	3.5%	**14.8%**
F	Park		0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	1.5%	0.1%	1.4%	**3.9%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	1.1%	0.2%	0.3%	2.8%	0.4%	1.4%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	2.0%	0.8%	1.9%	2.6%	0.4%	1.8%	**9.6%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.8%	0.6%	0.7%	3.3%	0.4%	1.9%	**8.7%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	2.8%	0.3%	0.8%	**6.3%**
X	Out of SF			0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	**0.2%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**12.7%**	**8.2%**	**11.5%**	**42.6%**	**4.6%**	**19.9%**	**100.0%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	7.00	126.00	128.00	95.00	79.00	45.00	352.00	**832.00**
B	Southern	2.00	62.00	76.00	56.00	46.00	31.00	209.00	**482.00**
C	Bayview	4.00	65.00	83.00	92.00	85.00	68.00	99.00	**496.00**
D	Mission	5.00	69.00	76.00	76.00	74.00	66.00	180.00	**546.00**
E	Northern	15.00	109.00	139.00	72.00	63.00	63.00	233.00	**694.00**
F	Park		36.00	29.00	30.00	24.00	24.00	42.00	**185.00**
G	Richmond	3.00	21.00	42.00	33.00	43.00	53.00	103.00	**298.00**
H	Ingleside	10.00	45.00	82.00	84.00	69.00	69.00	91.00	**450.00**
I	Taraval	2.00	53.00	73.00	53.00	62.00	73.00	94.00	**410.00**
J	Tenderloin	2.00	28.00	37.00	35.00	34.00	29.00	132.00	**297.00**
X	Out of SF		4.00		1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	**11.00**
Grand Total		**50.00**	**618.00**	**765.00**	**627.00**	**581.00**	**522.00**	**1538.00**	**4701.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.1%	2.7%	2.7%	2.0%	1.7%	1.0%	7.5%	**17.7%**
B	Southern	0.0%	1.3%	1.6%	1.2%	1.0%	0.7%	4.4%	**10.3%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	1.8%	1.4%	2.1%	**10.6%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.4%	3.8%	**11.6%**
E	Northern	0.3%	2.3%	3.0%	1.5%	1.3%	1.3%	5.0%	**14.8%**
F	Park		0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	**3.9%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	0.4%	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	1.1%	2.2%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	1.0%	1.7%	1.8%	1.5%	1.5%	1.9%	**9.6%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.1%	1.6%	1.1%	1.3%	1.6%	2.0%	**8.7%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	2.8%	**6.3%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	**0.2%**
Grand Total		**1.1%**	**13.1%**	**16.3%**	**13.3%**	**12.4%**	**11.1%**	**32.7%**	**100.0%**

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	172.00	303.00		356.00	1.00	**832.00**
B	Southern	109.00	169.00		201.00	3.00	**482.00**
C	Bayview	189.00	212.00		92.00	3.00	**496.00**
D	Mission	125.00	249.00		164.00	8.00	**546.00**
E	Northern	180.00	278.00		228.00	8.00	**694.00**
F	Park	58.00	85.00		42.00		**185.00**
G	Richmond	84.00	114.00		95.00	5.00	**298.00**
H	Ingleside	130.00	233.00		82.00	5.00	**450.00**
I	Taraval	144.00	169.00		93.00	4.00	**410.00**
J	Tenderloin	56.00	112.00	2.00	123.00	4.00	**297.00**
X	Out of SF	5.00	2.00		3.00	1.00	**11.00**
Grand Total		**1252.00**	**1926.00**	**2.00**	**1479.00**	**42.00**	**4701.00**

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	3.7%	6.4%		7.6%	0.0%	**17.7%**
B	Southern	2.3%	3.6%		4.3%	0.1%	**10.3%**
C	Bayview	4.0%	4.5%		2.0%	0.1%	**10.6%**
D	Mission	2.7%	5.3%		3.5%	0.2%	**11.6%**
E	Northern	3.8%	5.9%		4.9%	0.2%	**14.8%**
F	Park	1.2%	1.8%		0.9%		**3.9%**
G	Richmond	1.8%	2.4%		2.0%	0.1%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	2.8%	5.0%		1.7%	0.1%	**9.6%**
I	Taraval	3.1%	3.6%		2.0%	0.1%	**8.7%**
J	Tenderloin	1.2%	2.4%	0.0%	2.6%	0.1%	**6.3%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.0%		0.1%	0.0%	**0.2%**
Grand Total		**26.6%**	**41.0%**	**0.0%**	**31.5%**	**0.9%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

VANDALISM - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	23	604	390	556	2,241	232	1,024	**5,070**
Q1-Q2 2023	25	596	386	540	2,001	218	935	**4,701**
Difference	2	-8	-4	-16	-240	-14	-89	**-369**
% Change	**8.7%**	**-1.3%**	**-1.0%**	**-2.9%**	**-10.7%**	**-6.0%**	**-8.7%**	**-7.3%**

VANDALISM - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	60	666	855	720	626	573	1,570	**5,070**
Q1-Q2 2023	50	618	765	627	581	522	1,538	**4,701**
Difference	-10	-48	-90	-93	-45	-51	-32	**-369**
% Change	**-16.7%**	**-7.2%**	**-10.5%**	**-12.9%**	**-7.2%**	**-8.9%**	**-2.0%**	**-7.3%**

VANDALISM - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	1,407	2,064	2	1,554	43	**5,070**
Q1-Q2 2023	1,252	1,926	2	1,479	42	**4,701**
Difference	-155	-138	0	-75	-1	**-369**
% Change	**-11.0%**	**-6.7%**	**0.0%**	**-4.8%**	**-2.3%**	**-7.3%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	1.00	10.00	34.00	44.00	3.00	8.00	60.00	**160.00**
B	Southern	1.00	20.00	88.00	60.00	4.00	8.00	52.00	**233.00**
C	Bayview		14.00	171.00	81.00	4.00	2.00	32.00	**304.00**
D	Mission	2.00	14.00	45.00	145.00	2.00	5.00	55.00	**268.00**
E	Northern		26.00	44.00	52.00	4.00	2.00	39.00	**167.00**
F	Park		3.00	10.00	14.00	1.00	4.00	19.00	**51.00**
G	Richmond		9.00	4.00	16.00	1.00	15.00	27.00	**72.00**
H	Ingleside		24.00	37.00	108.00	6.00	7.00	44.00	**226.00**
I	Taraval		36.00	46.00	63.00		3.00	60.00	**208.00**
J	Tenderloin	3.00	16.00	94.00	53.00	3.00	8.00	75.00	**252.00**
X	Out of SF		5.00	16.00	13.00		1.00	2.00	**37.00**
Grand Total		**7.00**	**177.00**	**589.00**	**649.00**	**28.00**	**63.00**	**465.00**	**1978.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.1%	0.5%	1.7%	2.2%	0.2%	0.4%	3.0%	**8.1%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.0%	4.4%	3.0%	0.2%	0.4%	2.6%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview		0.7%	8.6%	4.1%	0.2%	0.1%	1.6%	**15.4%**
D	Mission	0.1%	0.7%	2.3%	7.3%	0.1%	0.3%	2.8%	**13.5%**
E	Northern		1.3%	2.2%	2.6%	0.2%	0.1%	2.0%	**8.4%**
F	Park		0.2%	0.5%	0.7%	0.1%	0.2%	1.0%	**2.6%**
G	Richmond		0.5%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	1.4%	**3.6%**
H	Ingleside		1.2%	1.9%	5.5%	0.3%	0.4%	2.2%	**11.4%**
I	Taraval		1.8%	2.3%	3.2%		0.2%	3.0%	**10.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.2%	0.8%	4.8%	2.7%	0.2%	0.4%	3.8%	**12.7%**
X	Out of SF		0.3%	0.8%	0.7%		0.1%	0.1%	**1.9%**
Grand Total		**0.4%**	**8.9%**	**29.8%**	**32.8%**	**1.4%**	**3.2%**	**23.5%**	**100.0%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	8.00	44.00	53.00	29.00	14.00	11.00	1.00	**160.00**
B	Southern	20.00	61.00	74.00	39.00	17.00	15.00	7.00	**233.00**
C	Bayview	44.00	72.00	86.00	52.00	31.00	16.00	3.00	**304.00**
D	Mission	28.00	82.00	70.00	52.00	22.00	12.00	2.00	**268.00**
E	Northern	25.00	39.00	45.00	25.00	19.00	11.00	3.00	**167.00**
F	Park	10.00	20.00	11.00	6.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	**51.00**
G	Richmond	11.00	16.00	20.00	12.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	**72.00**
H	Ingleside	47.00	48.00	56.00	33.00	24.00	12.00	6.00	**226.00**
I	Taraval	45.00	45.00	51.00	41.00	12.00	12.00	2.00	**208.00**
J	Tenderloin	17.00	65.00	82.00	41.00	30.00	13.00	4.00	**252.00**
X	Out of SF	9.00	10.00	9.00	4.00	3.00	2.00		**37.00**
Grand Total		**264.00**	**502.00**	**557.00**	**334.00**	**179.00**	**109.00**	**33.00**	**1978.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.4%	2.2%	2.7%	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	0.1%	**8.1%**
B	Southern	1.0%	3.1%	3.7%	2.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview	2.2%	3.6%	4.3%	2.6%	1.6%	0.8%	0.2%	**15.4%**
D	Mission	1.4%	4.1%	3.5%	2.6%	1.1%	0.6%	0.1%	**13.5%**
E	Northern	1.3%	2.0%	2.3%	1.3%	1.0%	0.6%	0.2%	**8.4%**
F	Park	0.5%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	**2.6%**
G	Richmond	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	**3.6%**
H	Ingleside	2.4%	2.4%	2.8%	1.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.3%	**11.4%**
I	Taraval	2.3%	2.3%	2.6%	2.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.1%	**10.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.9%	3.3%	4.1%	2.1%	1.5%	0.7%	0.2%	**12.7%**
X	Out of SF	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%		**1.9%**
Grand Total		**13.3%**	**25.4%**	**28.2%**	**16.9%**	**9.0%**	**5.5%**	**1.7%**	**100.0%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	103.00	56.00			1.00	**160.00**
B	Southern	176.00	51.00		4.00	2.00	**233.00**
C	Bayview	223.00	80.00		1.00		**304.00**
D	Mission	180.00	85.00	1.00	2.00		**268.00**
E	Northern	126.00	37.00	1.00	3.00		**167.00**
F	Park	36.00	14.00		1.00		**51.00**
G	Richmond	48.00	21.00		1.00	2.00	**72.00**
H	Ingleside	160.00	60.00		6.00		**226.00**
I	Taraval	149.00	59.00				**208.00**
J	Tenderloin	176.00	73.00	1.00	2.00		**252.00**
X	Out of SF	28.00	9.00				**37.00**
Grand Total		**1405.00**	**545.00**	**3.00**	**20.00**	**5.00**	**1978.00**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	5.2%	2.8%			0.1%	**8.1%**
B	Southern	8.9%	2.6%		0.2%	0.1%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview	11.3%	4.0%		0.1%		**15.4%**
D	Mission	9.1%	4.3%	0.1%	0.1%		**13.5%**
E	Northern	6.4%	1.9%	0.1%	0.2%		**8.4%**
F	Park	1.8%	0.7%		0.1%		**2.6%**
G	Richmond	2.4%	1.1%		0.1%	0.1%	**3.6%**
H	Ingleside	8.1%	3.0%		0.3%		**11.4%**
I	Taraval	7.5%	3.0%				**10.5%**
J	Tenderloin	8.9%	3.7%	0.1%	0.1%		**12.7%**
X	Out of SF	1.4%	0.5%				**1.9%**
Grand Total		**71.0%**	**27.6%**	**0.2%**	**1.0%**	**0.3%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	8	222	631	618	41	66	550	**2,136**
Q1-Q2 2023	7	177	589	649	28	63	465	**1,978**
Difference	-1	-45	-42	31	-13	-3	-85	**-158**
% Change	**-12.5%**	**-20.3%**	**-6.7%**	**5.0%**	**-31.7%**	**-4.5%**	**-15.5%**	**-7.4%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	275	531	574	415	178	109	54	**2,136**
Q1-Q2 2023	264	502	557	334	179	109	33	**1,978**
Difference	-11	-29	-17	-81	1	0	-21	**-158**
% Change	**-4.0%**	**-5.5%**	**-3.0%**	**-19.5%**	**0.6%**	**0.0%**	**-38.9%**	**-7.4%**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	1,523	574	2	31	6	**2,136**
Q1-Q2 2023	1,405	545	3	20	5	**1,978**
Difference	-118	-29	1	-11	-1	**-158**
% Change	**-7.7%**	**-5.1%**	**50.0%**	**-35.5%**	**-16.7%**	**-7.4%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		11.00	1.00	2.00			17.00	**31.00**
B	Southern		4.00	5.00				12.00	**21.00**
C	Bayview		7.00	6.00	4.00			4.00	**21.00**
D	Mission		8.00	6.00	19.00			10.00	**43.00**
E	Northern		9.00	7.00			1.00	14.00	**31.00**
F	Park		3.00	3.00	1.00			9.00	**16.00**
G	Richmond	1.00	11.00			1.00	1.00	13.00	**27.00**
H	Ingleside		11.00	5.00	6.00	1.00	1.00	21.00	**45.00**
I	Taraval		7.00	2.00	1.00	1.00		11.00	**22.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	15.00	10.00	5.00		3.00	12.00	**46.00**
Grand Total		**2.00**	**86.00**	**45.00**	**38.00**	**3.00**	**6.00**	**123.00**	**303.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		3.6%	0.3%	0.7%			5.6%	**10.2%**
B	Southern		1.3%	1.7%				4.0%	**6.9%**
C	Bayview		2.3%	2.0%	1.3%			1.3%	**6.9%**
D	Mission		2.6%	2.0%	6.3%			3.3%	**14.2%**
E	Northern		3.0%	2.3%			0.3%	4.6%	**10.2%**
F	Park		1.0%	1.0%	0.3%			3.0%	**5.3%**
G	Richmond	0.3%	3.6%			0.3%	0.3%	4.3%	**8.9%**
H	Ingleside		3.6%	1.7%	2.0%	0.3%	0.3%	6.9%	**14.9%**
I	Taraval		2.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%		3.6%	**7.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.3%	5.0%	3.3%	1.7%		1.0%	4.0%	**15.2%**
Grand Total		**0.7%**	**28.4%**	**14.9%**	**12.5%**	**1.0%**	**2.0%**	**40.6%**	**100.0%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	31.00	**31.00**
B	Southern	21.00	**21.00**
C	Bayview	21.00	**21.00**
D	Mission	43.00	**43.00**
E	Northern	31.00	**31.00**
F	Park	16.00	**16.00**
G	Richmond	27.00	**27.00**
H	Ingleside	45.00	**45.00**
I	Taraval	22.00	**22.00**
J	Tenderloin	46.00	**46.00**
Grand Total		**303.00**	**303.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	10.2%	**10.2%**
B	Southern	6.9%	**6.9%**
C	Bayview	6.9%	**6.9%**
D	Mission	14.2%	**14.2%**
E	Northern	10.2%	**10.2%**
F	Park	5.3%	**5.3%**
G	Richmond	8.9%	**8.9%**
H	Ingleside	14.9%	**14.9%**
I	Taraval	7.3%	**7.3%**
J	Tenderloin	15.2%	**15.2%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	14.00	17.00		**31.00**
B	Southern	10.00	11.00		**21.00**
C	Bayview	11.00	10.00		**21.00**
D	Mission	20.00	23.00		**43.00**
E	Northern	19.00	12.00		**31.00**
F	Park	8.00	8.00		**16.00**
G	Richmond	12.00	15.00		**27.00**
H	Ingleside	21.00	23.00	1.00	**45.00**
I	Taraval	10.00	12.00		**22.00**
J	Tenderloin	20.00	26.00		**46.00**
Grand Total		**145.00**	**157.00**	**1.00**	**303.00**

ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	4.6%	5.6%		**10.2%**
B	Southern	3.3%	3.6%		**6.9%**
C	Bayview	3.6%	3.3%		**6.9%**
D	Mission	6.6%	7.6%		**14.2%**
E	Northern	6.3%	4.0%		**10.2%**
F	Park	2.6%	2.6%		**5.3%**
G	Richmond	4.0%	5.0%		**8.9%**
H	Ingleside	6.9%	7.6%	0.3%	**14.9%**
I	Taraval	3.3%	4.0%		**7.3%**
J	Tenderloin	6.6%	8.6%		**15.2%**
Grand Total		**47.9%**	**51.8%**	**0.3%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

ELDER ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	2	75	41	27	5	5	112	**267**
Q1-Q2 2023	2	86	45	38	3	6	123	**303**
Difference	0	11	4	11	-2	1	11	**36**
% Change	**0.0%**	**14.7%**	**9.8%**	**40.7%**	**-40.0%**	**20.0%**	**9.8%**	**13.5%**

ELDER ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	65+	
Q1-Q2 2022	267	**267**
Q1-Q2 2023	303	**303**
Difference	36	**36**
% Change	**13.5%**	**13.5%**

ELDER ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	140	122	0	5	0	**267**
Q1-Q2 2023	145	157	0	1	0	**303**
Difference	5	35	0	-4	0	**36**
% Change	**3.6%**	**28.7%**	**not calc**	**-80.0%**	**not calc**	**13.5%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		1.00	5.00	7.00	1.00	6.00	3.00	**23.00**
B	Southern		3.00	6.00	7.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	**24.00**
C	Bayview	1.00	4.00	24.00	18.00		3.00	3.00	**53.00**
D	Mission		3.00	10.00	41.00	6.00	4.00	4.00	**68.00**
E	Northern		3.00	8.00	13.00	2.00			**26.00**
F	Park			1.00	2.00			6.00	**9.00**
G	Richmond		3.00	1.00	1.00			7.00	**12.00**
H	Ingleside	1.00	2.00	9.00	33.00		3.00	5.00	**53.00**
I	Taraval	3.00	9.00	15.00	9.00		2.00	12.00	**50.00**
J	Tenderloin	1.00	4.00	5.00	11.00			3.00	**24.00**
X	Out of SF			6.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	**16.00**
Grand Total		**6.00**	**32.00**	**90.00**	**147.00**	**13.00**	**23.00**	**47.00**	**358.00**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central		0.3%	1.4%	2.0%	0.3%	1.7%	0.8%	**6.4%**
B	Southern		0.8%	1.7%	2.0%	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	**6.7%**
C	Bayview	0.3%	1.1%	6.7%	5.0%		0.8%	0.8%	**14.8%**
D	Mission		0.8%	2.8%	11.5%	1.7%	1.1%	1.1%	**19.0%**
E	Northern		0.8%	2.2%	3.6%	0.6%			**7.3%**
F	Park			0.3%	0.6%			1.7%	**2.5%**
G	Richmond		0.8%	0.3%	0.3%			2.0%	**3.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	0.6%	2.5%	9.2%		0.8%	1.4%	**14.8%**
I	Taraval	0.8%	2.5%	4.2%	2.5%		0.6%	3.4%	**14.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.3%	1.1%	1.4%	3.1%			0.8%	**6.7%**
X	Out of SF			1.7%	1.4%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	**4.5%**
Grand Total		**1.7%**	**8.9%**	**25.1%**	**41.1%**	**3.6%**	**6.4%**	**13.1%**	**100.0%**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	
A	Central	23.00	**23.00**
B	Southern	24.00	**24.00**
C	Bayview	53.00	**53.00**
D	Mission	68.00	**68.00**
E	Northern	26.00	**26.00**
F	Park	9.00	**9.00**
G	Richmond	12.00	**12.00**
H	Ingleside	53.00	**53.00**
I	Taraval	50.00	**50.00**
J	Tenderloin	24.00	**24.00**
X	Out of SF	16.00	**16.00**
Grand Total		**358.00**	**358.00**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	
A	Central	6.4%	**6.4%**
B	Southern	6.7%	**6.7%**
C	Bayview	14.8%	**14.8%**
D	Mission	19.0%	**19.0%**
E	Northern	7.3%	**7.3%**
F	Park	2.5%	**2.5%**
G	Richmond	3.4%	**3.4%**
H	Ingleside	14.8%	**14.8%**
I	Taraval	14.0%	**14.0%**
J	Tenderloin	6.7%	**6.7%**
X	Out of SF	4.5%	**4.5%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	15.00	8.00		**23.00**
B	Southern	10.00	13.00	1.00	**24.00**
C	Bayview	30.00	23.00		**53.00**
D	Mission	45.00	22.00	1.00	**68.00**
E	Northern	13.00	13.00		**26.00**
F	Park	8.00	1.00		**9.00**
G	Richmond	8.00	4.00		**12.00**
H	Ingleside	27.00	26.00		**53.00**
I	Taraval	32.00	18.00		**50.00**
J	Tenderloin	14.00	10.00		**24.00**
X	Out of SF	9.00	7.00		**16.00**
Grand Total		**211.00**	**145.00**	**2.00**	**358.00**

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	4.2%	2.2%		**6.4%**
B	Southern	2.8%	3.6%	0.3%	**6.7%**
C	Bayview	8.4%	6.4%		**14.8%**
D	Mission	12.6%	6.1%	0.3%	**19.0%**
E	Northern	3.6%	3.6%		**7.3%**
F	Park	2.2%	0.3%		**2.5%**
G	Richmond	2.2%	1.1%		**3.4%**
H	Ingleside	7.5%	7.3%		**14.8%**
I	Taraval	8.9%	5.0%		**14.0%**
J	Tenderloin	3.9%	2.8%		**6.7%**
X	Out of SF	2.5%	2.0%		**4.5%**
Grand Total		**58.9%**	**40.5%**	**0.6%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

CHILD ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	1	36	95	161	23	17	29	**362**
Q1-Q2 2023	6	32	90	147	13	23	47	**358**
Difference	5	-4	-5	-14	-10	6	18	**-4**
% Change	**500.0%**	**-11.1%**	**-5.3%**	**-8.7%**	**-43.5%**	**35.3%**	**62.1%**	**-1.1%**

CHILD ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	0-17	
Q1-Q2 2022	362	**362**
Q1-Q2 2023	358	**358**
Difference	-4	**-4**
% Change	**-1.1%**	**-1.1%**

CHILD ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	201	154	0	7	0	**362**
Q1-Q2 2023	211	145	0	2	0	**358**
Difference	10	-9	0	-5	0	**-4**
% Change	**5.0%**	**-5.8%**	**not calc**	**-71.4%**	**not calc**	**-1.1%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central			2					**2**
B	Southern		1	1	1			1	**4**
C	Bayview			3				2	**5**
D	Mission				1				**1**
E	Northern			2				1	**3**
F	Park		1						**1**
G	Richmond		2						**2**
H	Ingleside				1			1	**2**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin			4	1				**5**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**4**	**12**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**25**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	**16.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	**20.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**4.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	**12.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**4.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	**8.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**16.0%**	**48.0%**	**16.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**20.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central				2				**2**
B	Southern		2		1	1			**4**
C	Bayview		2	1	1	1			**5**
D	Mission		1						**1**
E	Northern	1	1		1				**3**
F	Park						1		**1**
G	Richmond						2		**2**
H	Ingleside		1			1			**2**
I	Taraval								**0**
J	Tenderloin		1	1	2	1			**5**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**1**	**8**	**2**	**7**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**25**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**16.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	8.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**4.0%**
E	Northern	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	**4.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**4.0%**	**32.0%**	**8.0%**	**28.0%**	**16.0%**	**12.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central		2			**2**
B	Southern	1	3			**4**
C	Bayview		5			**5**
D	Mission		1			**1**
E	Northern		3			**3**
F	Park	1				**1**
G	Richmond	2				**2**
H	Ingleside	1	1			**2**
I	Taraval					**0**
J	Tenderloin		5			**5**
X	Out of SF					**0**
Grand Total		**5**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**25**

HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
B	Southern	4.0%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**16.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**4.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**12.0%**
F	Park	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**4.0%**
G	Richmond	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
H	Ingleside	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
Grand Total		**20.0%**	**80.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HOMICIDE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1-Q2 2022	0	3	12	6	1	0	2	**24**
Q1-Q2 2023	0	4	12	4	0	0	5	**25**
Difference	0	1	0	-2	-1	0	3	**1**
% Change	**not calc**	**33.3%**	**0.0%**	**-33.3%**	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**150.0%**	**4.2%**

HOMICIDE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	0	10	8	5	0	1	0	**24**
Q1-Q2 2023	1	8	2	7	4	3	0	**25**
Difference	1	-2	-6	2	4	2	0	**1**
% Change	**not calc**	**-20.0%**	**-75.0%**	**40.0%**	**not calc**	**200.0%**	**not calc**	**4.2%**

HOMICIDE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	0	24	0	0	0	**24**
Q1-Q2 2023	5	20	0	0	0	**25**
Difference	5	-4	0	0	0	**1**
% Change	**not calc**	**-16.7%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**4.2%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Others	White	Unknown	
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern		3		3		5		**11**
C	Bayview								**0**
D	Mission		3	1	4		2		**10**
E	Northern		2		1				**3**
F	Park				1	1			**2**
G	Richmond		1					4	**5**
H	Ingleside								**0**
I	Taraval			1				1	**2**
J	Tenderloin			3				1	**4**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**9**	**5**	**9**	**1**	**7**	**6**	**37**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Others	White	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	13.5%	0.0%	**29.7%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	8.1%	2.7%	10.8%	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	**27.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.1%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	**5.4%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	**13.5%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	**5.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	**10.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**24.3%**	**13.5%**	**24.3%**	**2.7%**	**18.9%**	**16.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central								**0**
B	Southern		4	1	3	2		1	**11**
C	Bayview								**0**
D	Mission		4	2	1	1	2		**10**
E	Northern		1			1	1		**3**
F	Park			1	1				**2**
G	Richmond			1				4	**5**
H	Ingleside								**0**
I	Taraval						1	1	**2**
J	Tenderloin		1		1	1	1		**4**
X	Out of SF								**0**
Grand Total		**0**	**10**	**5**	**6**	**5**	**5**	**6**	**37**

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY PERCENTAGE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	10.8%	2.7%	8.1%	5.4%	0.0%	2.7%	**29.7%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	10.8%	5.4%	2.7%	2.7%	5.4%	0.0%	**27.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	**8.1%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**5.4%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	**13.5%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	**5.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	**10.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**27.0%**	**13.5%**	**16.2%**	**13.5%**	**13.5%**	**16.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central						**0**
B	Southern	5	6				**11**
C	Bayview						**0**
D	Mission	6	4				**10**
E	Northern	1	2				**3**
F	Park	1	1				**2**
G	Richmond	1				4	**5**
H	Ingleside						**0**
I	Taraval		1			1	**2**
J	Tenderloin	3	1				**4**
X	Out of SF						**0**
Grand Total		**17**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**37**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	13.5%	16.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**29.7%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	16.2%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**27.0%**
E	Northern	2.7%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.1%**
F	Park	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**5.4%**
G	Richmond	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	**13.5%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	**5.4%**
J	Tenderloin	8.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**10.8%**
Grand Total		**45.9%**	**40.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**13.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION										PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	Anti-Christian	Anti-Arab	
A	Central											**0**
B	Southern		4		1	1			5			**11**
C	Bayview											**0**
D	Mission	3	3	1	1	1			1			**10**
E	Northern	1	2									**3**
F	Park	1							1			**2**
G	Richmond		1			4						**5**
H	Ingleside											**0**
I	Taraval			1						1		**2**
J	Tenderloin	1		3								**4**
X	Out of SF											**0**
Grand Total		**6**	**10**	**5**	**2**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**1**	**0**	**37**

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION										PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	Anti-Christian	Anti-Arab	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	0.0%	0.0%	**29.7%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	8.1%	8.1%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	**27.0%**
E	Northern	2.7%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**8.1%**
F	Park	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	**5.4%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**13.5%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	**5.4%**
J	Tenderloin	2.7%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**10.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**16.2%**	**27.0%**	**13.5%**	**5.4%**	**16.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**18.9%**	**2.7%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Report
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	White	Other	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	0	4	3	3	11	0	0	**21**
Q1-Q2 2023	0	9	5	9	7	1	6	**37**
Difference	0	5	2	6	-4	1	6	**16**
% Change	**not calc**	**125.0%**	**66.7%**	**200.0%**	**-36.4%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**76.2%**

HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	1	0	8	4	5	2	1	**21**
Q1-Q2 2023	0	10	5	6	5	5	6	**37**
Difference	-1	10	-3	2	0	3	5	**16**
% Change	**-100.0%**	**not calc**	**-37.5%**	**50.0%**	**0.0%**	**150.0%**	**500.0%**	**76.2%**

HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1-Q2 2022	7	14	0	0	0	**21**
Q1-Q2 2023	17	15	0	0	5	**37**
Difference	10	1	0	0	5	**16**
% Change	**142.9%**	**7.1%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**76.2%**

HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY BIAS TYPE

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION												PERSON
	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	Anti-Christian	Anti-Muslim	Anti-Other Races	Anti-Arab	
Q1-Q2 2022	2	4	2	2	2	1	1	6	1	0	0	0	**21**
Q1-Q2 2023	6	10	5	2	6	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	**37**
Difference	4	6	3	0	4	-1	-1	1	0	0	0	0	**16**
% Change	**200.0%**	**150.0%**	**150.0%**	**0.0%**	**200.0%**	**-100.0%**	**-100.0%**	**16.7%**	**0.0%**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**not calc**	**76.2%**

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS) on behalf of Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SF Immigrant Rights Commission - LGBTQIA+ immigrants and City Department Recommendations
Date:	Tuesday, September 19, 2023 7:27:00 PM
Attachments:	IRC FullComm Special Hearing Minutes_5.8.23.pdf IRC Recommendations on LGBTQIA+ Immigrants_2023.pdf image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

---

From: Rivas, Jorge (ADM) <Jorge.Rivas@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:56 PM
To: Engagement, Civic (ADM) <civic.engagement@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mainardi, Jesse (MYR) <jesse.mainardi@sfgov.org>; Shore, Elena (ADM) <elena.shore@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Immigrant Rights Commission - LGBTQIA+ immigrants and City Department Recommendations

Dear Colleagues,

In May, the Immigrant Rights Commission held a special hearing at the LGBT Center on the needs of LGBTQIA+ immigrants. The Commission heard testimony from community organizations and members of the public, and developed recommendations for several City departments based on the needs identified by LGBTQIA+ immigrant community members.

On behalf of the Commission, I would like to share with you the attached recommendations, and learn about your work with LGBTQIA+ immigrants. (As you will see, some of these recommendations may be things you are already doing, and others may be considered for possible implementation in the future.)

You are welcome to email me, or we can connect virtually or in person. Please let me know when would work for you, and I'm happy to accommodate your schedule. I would love to share back with the Commission all the great work that you are doing.

Thank you for your time,
Jorge

Jorge Rivas | Executive Director | He, Him, His
Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs | City & County of San Francisco
1155 Market Street, 1st Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: (415) 581-2317
jorge.rivas@sfgov.org | OCEIA | Immigrant Rights Commission
Connect with OCEIA:

Introduction

The San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC) held a special hearing on issues concerning LGBTQIA+ immigrants at the San Francisco LGBT Center on May 8, 2023. With over 500 anti-LGBTQIA+ bills proposed across the country, in addition to local challenges facing immigrant communities, including housing and economic insecurity, the hearing focused on the needs of LGBTQIA+ immigrants in San Francisco and steps the City can take to support community members. The Commission heard testimony from the following organizations:

1. San Francisco Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI)
2. Parivar Bay Area
3. El/La Para TransLatinas
4. Oasis Legal Services
5. LGBT Asylum Project
6. UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative
7. National Center for Lesbian Rights

After extensive testimony from community organizations and members of the public, the Commission identified four major needs of the LGBTQIA+ community: 1) health care and mental health services; 2) emergency housing and shelter; 3) legal resources and services; and 4) employment and training opportunities. In response, the Commission makes the following recommendations:

- Recommendation 1: Expand Access to Health Care and Mental Health Services
- Recommendation 2: Prioritize Safe Housing and Shelter for Transgender Immigrants
- Recommendation 3: Increase Funding for Legal Support and Assistance Programs
- Recommendation 4: Support Employment and Training Programs

The IRC's role is to advise the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors and City Departments on important issues impacting San Francisco immigrants. The recommendations included below impact multiple City offices, including the Board of Supervisors, Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs, District Attorney's Office, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Human Services Agency, Mayor's Office, Department of Public Health, and the Office of Transgender Initiatives.

Recommendation 1: Expand Access to Health Care and Mental Health Services

Recommendation 1.A:
Support physical and mental health resources for transgender immigrants, including trauma-informed care, substance abuse awareness and education.

Recommendation 1.B:
Medi-Cal is expanding to all Californians regardless of immigration status, yet many people are not prepared to get the health care they need. Work with City and community partners to develop and implement a campaign centering LGBTQIA+ communities and encourage them to enroll in Medi-Cal.

Recommendation 2: Prioritize Safe Housing and Shelter for Transgender Immigrants

Recommendation 2.A:
Compile a list of shelters that are LGBTQIA+ friendly and safe for transgender immigrants and share with community partners.

Recommendation 2.B:
Work with City partners to revisit shelter application requirements, such as filling out the form in English, presenting an ID, and answering questions that may be intrusive.

Recommendation 2.C:
Make recommendations to the Mayor's plan to end transgender homelessness by 2027 with a specific focus on transgender immigrants.

Recommendation 3: Increase Funding for Legal Support and Assistance Programs

Recommendation 3.A:
Support screenings for immigration benefits including asylum and Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS).

Recommendation 3.B:
Work with the District Attorney's Office on certifying U-Visa Supplement B forms and listing the reasons when denied.

Recommendation 3.C:
Advocate for continued funding of resources for transgender immigrants.

Recommendation 3.D:
Advocate for funding to screen clients for immigration relief and provide free legal representation and wraparound services for LGBTQIA+ immigrants.

Recommendation 3.E:

Increase support to create a stronger safety net of social services for LGBTQIA+ immigrants, including continued funding for the Guaranteed Income for Trans People (GIFT) Program and expansion beyond its 55 participants.

Recommendation 4: Support Employment and Training Programs

Recommendation 4.A:
Provide training to immigrant legal services providers, especially those receiving City funding, so they have the capacity to effectively work with LGBTQIA+ immigrants.

Recommendation 4.B:
Advocate to extend the notice time an employer must give when conducting layoffs to 180 days for those on employer-based visas.

Recommendation 4.C:
Support employment resources and advocate for job opportunities for transgender immigrants.

Recommendation 4.D:
Continue to support programs like OCEIA's DreamSF Fellowship Program and encourage organizations to hire independent contractors.

Recommendation 4.E:
Promote the hiring at local organizations of LGBTQIA+ immigrants to continue the tradition of peer-led transgender organizations.

Appendix A: Immigrant Rights Commission May 8, 2023 Meeting Minutes

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

IMMIGRANT RIGHTS COMMISSION

San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission
Full Commission Meeting
May 8, 2023 at 5:30 pm PDT
SF LGBT Center, 1800 Market Street, Rainbow Room
San Francisco, CA 94102
Online: https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=mad94e66babb9af81ddba1ebdfb9373b1
Phone: 1-415-655-0001 / Access code: 2590 629 4315 / Password: 2023

Overview: Members of the Commission will attend this meeting in-person. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in-person or remotely using Webex or by calling the phone number and entering the access code above.

Each member of the public, whether attending remotely or in person, may address the Commission for up to two minutes. Members of the public attending the meeting in person will have an opportunity to provide public comment on every item. In addition to in-person public comment, the Commission will hear up to 20 minutes of remote public comment on each agenda item. The Commission will hear remote public comment on each item in the order that commenters add themselves to the queue to comment on the item. Because of the 20-minute time limit, it is possible that not every person in the queue will have an opportunity to provide remote public comment. Remote public comment from people who have received an accommodation due to disability will not count toward the 20-minute limit.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Kennelly called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

Present: Chair Kennelly, Vice Chair Paz, Commissioners Chaudhary, Gaime, Latt, Obregon, Ricarte, Ruiz, Senghor, Souza, Wang (arrived 5:41 p.m.)

Not present: Commissioners Enssani (excused), Rahimi (excused).

OCEIA staff present: Director Rivas, Clerk Shore, Filipino Language Specialist Borres, Operations and Grants Administrator Chan, Senior Communications Specialist Richardson, Deputy Director Whipple.

2. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment

This item is to allow the Commission Chair to acknowledge that the Commission is on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula.

Chair Kennelly read the land acknowledgment statement.

3. Announcements and General Public Comment

(Information)

This item is to allow Director Rivas to provide announcements on interpretation services, public comment, and other information related to today's hearing; and to allow members of the public to address the Commission on matters that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission and that do not appear on today's agenda.

Director Rivas provided announcements on how to access interpretation services and make public comment. Chair Kennelly called for general public comment.

1. A speaker who is from Brazil and works as a program director for mental health services in the LGBT Center, said that all of his clients are immigrants, and 75% of them are asylum seekers. All are Portuguese speakers, and more than half of them are HIV positive. He noted that Portuguese and Brazilian consular support is lacking for LGBTQ people in San Francisco.

4. IRC Hearing on LGBTQIA+ Immigrants in San Francisco

a. Introduction (Chair Kennelly, OCEIA Deputy Director Whipple, Commissioners Latt and Ruiz)

(Information)

This item is to allow the Chair, OCEIA Deputy Director Whipple, and Commissioners Latt and Ruiz to introduce today's hearing, thank the hearing's partners and co-sponsors, and provide an overview of the purpose of the hearing. The hearing will focus on the needs of LGBTQIA+ immigrants in San Francisco and steps the City of San Francisco can take to support community members.

Chair Kennelly welcomed attendees and recognized co-sponsors Sen. Scott Wiener, Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, and Supervisor Joel Engardio. She thanked Commissioners Jessy Ruiz and Zay Latt, staff from the Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) and the Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI), and Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area.

Deputy Director Whipple introduced the hearing. According to estimates by UCLA's Williams Institute, 1,274,500 LGBTQ foreign-born adults live in the United States, including 289,700 who are undocumented. One in three LGBTQ asylum seekers lives in California. In 2015, the Immigrant Rights Commission held a hearing on LGBTQ immigrants with then-Supervisor Scott Wiener. Community members discussed the need for culturally competent services, and gaps in resources, with many individuals being turned away because of lack of capacity. OCEIA, OTI, and Equality California began convening quarterly meetings with service providers. Currently, OCEIA provides limited funding to organizations that serve LGBTQ immigrants.

Commissioner Latt welcomed attendees and discussed the need to do more to support LGBTQ immigrants, and Commissioner Ruiz shared her experience as an asylum seeker who has struggled to find stable housing.

b. Opening Remarks (Supervisor Mandelman)

(Information)

This item is to allow Supervisor Mandelman to provide opening remarks on today's hearing.

Chair Kennelly introduced Supervisor Mandelman, who provided opening remarks. With over 500 anti-LGBTQ bills proposed across the country, and the prevalence of anti-transgender and anti-queer violence, in addition to housing and economic insecurity, and planned cuts to the City's budget, he said it is critical to figure out how to prioritize the most vulnerable. He noted the work of those serving LGBTQ immigrants at today's hearing, in addition to AGUILAS, Openhouse, and other organizations.

c. Invited Speakers

(Information/Discussion)

This item is to allow the Commission to hear from invited speakers on the topic of today's hearing.

1. Pau Crego, San Francisco Office of Transgender Initiatives
   Pau Crego, executive director of the Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI), described OTI's role in building trust between transgender communities and local government. He discussed OTI's work on housing for transgender San Franciscans, a guaranteed income pilot program, an economic fellowship program for transgender immigrants, and the City's commitment to end homelessness for transgender community members. Despite these efforts, local providers continue to face challenges and are receiving threats.

2. Anjali Rimi, Parivar Bay Area
   Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area, provided an overview of Parivar Bay Area's work, and J Jha of Parivar Bay Area described their experience seeking asylum. Director Rimi introduced videos by community members and highlighted the importance of funding resources for transgender immigrants and continuing these conversations. Parivar also has launched a community survey that is available in 10 languages.

3. Sofia Dorantes, El/La Para TransLatinas
   Sofia Dorantes, deputy director of El/La Para TransLatinas, provided an overview of the work of El/La Para TransLatinas. The organization provides trauma-informed care, advocates to end immigrant detention, and helps some of the most marginalized community members. Its staff are transgender, intersex, and gender diverse immigrants, and its two case managers serve over 300 participants. El/La Para TransLatinas, Parivar Bay Area, and the LGBT Asylum Project work together on the Trans Immigrant Coalition and held their first symposium in 2022.

4. John Iesha Ena, Samoan Community Development Center
   The Samoan Community Development Center was unable to attend the hearing.

5. Black LGBTQI+ Migrant Project (invited)
   The Black LGBTQI+ Migrant Project was unable to attend the hearing.

6. Rachel Kafele, Oasis Legal Services
   Rachel Kafele, who helped found Oasis Legal Services and directs its legal program, provided an overview of the organization's work using a preventative care model to provide legal and social services to LGBTQ immigrants. She discussed the need for funding to screen clients for immigration relief, provide free legal representation to LGBTQ immigrants, and conduct trainings so all legal providers can work effectively with LGBTQ clients. She highlighted the need for sustainable funding to provide universal representation and wraparound services for all LGBTQ immigrants.

7. Okan Sengun, LGBT Asylum Project
   Okan Sengun, executive director and co-founder of the LGBT Asylum Project, explained key differences between LGBTQ and other asylum seekers. For example, other asylum seekers often have access to the support of their families. The one-year deadline to apply for asylum can be more challenging for LGBTQ asylum seekers, who have been forced to keep their own sexuality or true gender hidden. He highlighted the need to fund LGBTQ asylum service providers in San Francisco. In 2023, his organization served 420 LGBTQ immigrants in San Francisco. The LGBT Asylum Project currently represents 28 transgender immigrants and has a waitlist.

8. Dr. Triveni Defries and Dr. Raul Gutierrez, UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative
   UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative Pediatric Co-Director Dr. Raul Gutierrez and Education and Training Director Dr. Triveni Defries discussed their work providing trauma-informed health care and medical evaluations for asylum seekers. Dr. Gutierrez stated that asylum seekers who undergo evaluations increase their

chances of attaining asylum, from 42% to 82%. UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative currently has a 100% success rate. Dr. Defries described one client whose medical evaluation reflected years of attacks and forced conversion. Although the client was successful in attaining asylum, he faces other challenges, including isolation and racism in the United States, trouble being accepted both in queer spaces here, and by other immigrants from his home country. Dr. Defries highlighted the importance of providing trauma-informed care.

9. Cara Jobson of Wiley & Jobson PC and Pamela Mercado Garcia, National Center for Lesbian Rights
   Pamela Mercado Garcia, immigration project associate with the National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR), described NCLR's work with asylum seekers. LGBTQ migrants often have trouble finding shelter that is safe. She recommended that the City provide housing and shelter assistance, and a list of shelters that are LGBTQ friendly. She discussed the need for an organizing network of professionals, and highlighted the importance of psychological evaluations and medical and psychological services. She also stressed the need to fund organizations that serve LGBTQ migrants. Cara Jobson, a private practice attorney who serves as a pro-bono attorney for NCLR, noted that individuals have a greater chance of attaining asylum if they have an attorney. She discussed the Biden administration's new rule on asylum, which considers migrants ineligible for asylum if they did not first seek asylum in a country they traveled through. Many of the countries they pass through on their way to the United States have high rates of violence against LGBTQ people.

   Chair Kennelly thanked the speakers and invited Commissioners to ask questions.

   In response to a question from Commissioner Souza, speakers discussed barriers to housing for LGBTQ immigrants. Rachel Kafele of Oasis Legal Services noted that barriers to enter shelters include the requirement to fill out the form in English, present an ID, and answer questions that may feel intrusive. She recommended making it easier to apply by lowering the threshold of what is required. Pamela Mercado Garcia of National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR) noted that shelters are not safe for many transgender immigrants, and there is a long waitlist, which further puts them at risk. Anjali Rimi of Parivar Bay Area highlighted the importance of understanding transgender needs in a housing space and community members' awareness of where they can go. J Jha of Parivar Bay Area and Sofia Dorantes of El/La Para TransLatinas discussed the difficulty of finding a job. Dr. Gutierrez noted that many community organizations have had to create their own navigation

systems. Commissioner Ruiz thanked the speakers and discussed the discrimination she encountered as a transgender woman in North Carolina and challenges she faced finding housing in San Francisco.

Commissioner Obregon asked Anjali Rimi of Parivar Bay Area about recommendations to address the needs of LGBTQ immigrants and growing resettlement programs for transgender immigrants. Anjali Rimi noted that resources for immigrants do not address the needs of LGBTQ individuals, and LGBTQ resources do not address the needs of immigrants. She highlighted the need to provide resources beyond legal services, such as information about which shelters are safe for transgender immigrants, and how to find work and educational opportunities.

In response to a question from Commissioner Chaudhary, speakers discussed how to increase awareness about asylum in the transgender community. Ruby Rose of Parivar Bay Area recommended that mental health professionals and those who work in housing learn about asylum to help inform community members. J Jha of Parivar Bay Area urged the Commission to increase the visibility of the transgender community and to make information available for all organizations.

d. Public Comment

This item is to allow members of the public to address the Commission on matters related to the topic of today's hearing.

Chair Kennelly called for public comment on this item, beginning with in-person public comment.

1. The first speaker recalled being placed in a men's shelter as a transgender female. She described having to shower at 4:00 a.m. and needing a chaperone to use the restroom. She also noted that much funding goes to staff salaries at organizations.

2. Gerardo, who identified as a gay undocumented San Francisco resident, highlighted the need to build trust. He said the District Attorney's Office has refused to certify U-Visa Supplement B forms without listing the reasons for their denial. He asked that the District Attorney's Office respond with a detailed reason for the denials.

3. Ruby Rose of Parivar Bay Area said that if her employer laid her off, she would only have 29 days to find another job, noting that she does not have a family she can go home to. She noted the importance of mental health care and transgender care. She asked the Commission to advocate to extend the 29-day limit to 180 days for those who

are laid off to find another job.

4. David described the effects of substance abuse, noting that LGBTQ immigrants are more at risk. Many have to resort to sex work. Clients ask escorts to consume drugs with them, and those who refuse are not hired again. David recommended that substance abuse awareness education be offered to LGBTQ immigrant community members.

5. Dora, who is from Colombia, has lived in the United States for one and a half years, and has moved seven times. Thanks to the LGBT Asylum Project, Dora did not to have to pay for legal representation. However, housing remains a challenge and more support is needed.

6. Alessandra Garcia, who identifies as trans Latina, stressed the importance of continuing to work together. She said the first goal is to find a safe place for everyone to live. She also highlighted the need for job opportunities for transgender immigrants.

7. Parivar Bay Area played a video clip from Ashish, who is from India and identifies as genderqueer. They work in tech and are dependent on their employer-sponsored visa. Going back to India is not an option, they said, noting that they would be persecuted.

8. Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area, said that in India, transgender people are relegated to begging and sex work. She noted that some transgender immigrants in the United States do not access asylum services because they don't know they exist, or they have been in the country for longer than a year.

9. Sasha, an intersex immigrant from Russia, suggested hosting an LGBTQ Immigrant Week or Month, with community events, and more brochures in different languages.

10. Jupiter, a transgender Latina DACA recipient working with Parivar Bay Area, highlighted the need for physical and mental health resources and employment resources. She called for a more solidified safety net of social services for LGBTQ immigrants, including continued funding for the Guaranteed Income for Trans People (GIFT) Program and expansion beyond its 55 participants; continued funding for the LGBT Asylum Project, El/La Para TransLatinas, Parivar Bay Area, and other organizations; making recommendations to the Mayor's plan to end transgender homelessness by 2027 with a specific focus on transgender immigrants; and the importance of hiring LGBTQ immigrants to continue the tradition of peer-led transgender organizations.

11. Dr. Raul Gutierrez of UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative discussed Medi-Cal's

expansion to all Californians regardless of immigration status, noting that many people are not prepared to get the health care they need. He suggested that the Commission work with the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the San Francisco Health Network to roll out a campaign targeting communities to enroll in Medi-Cal.

12. Valeria Suarez, the coordinator for OCEIA's DreamSF fellowship program, identified themselves as a queer undocumented person who migrated at the age of 16 and was never eligible for DACA. They noted the importance of screening for immigration benefits including asylum and Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS), and investing in basic needs. They called on the Commission to continue to push for programs like DreamSF and to encourage organizations to hire independent contractors. They highlighted the importance of addressing those who don't qualify for DACA, and asked how we can support the undocumented community as a whole to thrive, not just adjust.

13. Ryan Hundley, president of the board for the LGBT Asylum Project, discussed the importance of amplifying the work of non-profits, noting that much of their work is fragmented. He suggested pulling all of the information together in a way that is easy to navigate. One option is a physical location where immigrants can go to learn about City and non-profit resources.

14. Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area, recommended making every organization that is funded by OCEIA transgender-competent, and suggested that the Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI) provide the trainings.

15. J Jha of Parivar Bay Area asked for more opportunities like this hearing, where the community can define what it needs and executive it together, and suggested that the Commission use its position to convene community organizations on a regular basis.

Chair Kennelly thanked members of the public for their comments. She called for remote public comment and there was no remote public comment on this item.

e. Closing Remarks

(Information)

This item is to allow the Chair and Commissioners Latt and Ruiz to provide brief closing remarks on today's hearing.

Commissioner Latt summarized some of the key themes that were raised at the hearing, including housing, mental health, and career training opportunities, and advocacy for a more lenient timeline and fewer restrictions for community members. Commissioner

Ruiz thanked speakers and members of the public for attending the hearing. Chair Kennelly discussed the importance of addressing the needs of LGBTQ immigrants and looks forward to working with Commissioner Latt to develop recommendations on how the City can support LGBTQ immigrants.

5. Action Item: Approval of previous minutes

(Discussion/Action)

a. Approval of March 20, 2023 Full Commission Meeting Minutes

Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Immigrant Rights Commission's March 20, 2023 Full Commission meeting. Explanatory document: IRC Full Commission Minutes - March 20, 2023

Commissioner Obregon motioned to approve the March 20, 2023 Full Commission meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Chaudhary. Chair Kennelly called for public comment, and there was no public comment on this item. In response to a question from Commissioner Wang, Director Rivas stated that Commissioners may not abstain from voting unless they have a conflict of interest. The motion was approved, with 10 Commissioners voting yes and one Commissioner (Commissioner Wang) voting no.

6. Action Item: Proposed Resolution on California Domestic Workers Bill SB-686 (Commissioner Souza)

(Discussion/Action)

This item allows the Full Commission to discuss and take possible action on Commissioner Souza's proposed resolution in support of SB-686 (Durazo). The Executive Committee has voted to issue the resolution in support of SB-686, following edits by the Executive Committee and OCEIA staff. In 2021, the Full Commission issued a resolution in support of SB-321 (Durazo), the Health and Safety for All Workers Act.

Vice Chair Paz motioned to issue the resolution in support of Senate Bill 686, seconded by Commissioner Obregon. Chair Kennelly called for public comment, and there was no public comment on this item. The motion was approved unanimously by the 11 Commissioners present.

7. Adjournment

Chair Kennelly thanked everyone for attending the special hearing and adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.