

FILE NO. 250696

Petitions and Communications received from June 18, 2025, through June 26, 2025, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on July 1, 2025.

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

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), making the following appointment to the following body. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- Appointment pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(18) and 4.107, to the Human Rights Commission:
 - Eric Chang - term ending September 2, 2027

From the Office of the Controller, pursuant to California Government Code, Sections 50075.3 and 53411, and California Senate Bill 165, submitting Special Tax and Bond Accountability Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) agenda for the June 26, 2025, ISCOTT meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting an approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Form. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170(H), submitting notification of a California State grant line-item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval regarding the 2023 Organized Retail Theft Grant. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting an agenda for the July 2, 2025, Advisory Committee of Street Artists and Crafts Examiners meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 21.G.8, submitting Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive House (HSH), pursuant to Ordinance No. 10-25, submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, waiver notification. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of revised proposed regulatory language concerning commercial take of market squid. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to create the Valencia Street Entertainment Zone, on Valencia Street between 16th Street and 21st Street; the Pier 39 Entertainment Zone, on and around Pier 39, including the northern waterfront of The Embarcadero, between The Embarcadero on the south, Kearny Street on the east, Powell Street on the west, and the San Francisco shoreline on the north; the Folsom Street Entertainment Zone, on Folsom Street between 7th Street and 8th Street, Hallam Street between Folsom Street and Brush Place, and Langton Street between Folsom Street and Decker Alley; the Ellis Street Entertainment Zone, on Ellis Street between Stockton Street and Powell Street; the Yosemite Avenue Entertainment Zone, on Yosemite Avenue, between Mendell Street and 3rd Street, and Lane Street, between 3rd Street and Armstrong Avenue; the Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone, in the area bounded by Franklin Street from Grove to Market Streets, Market Street from Franklin to Haight Streets, Haight Street from Market Street to Octavia Boulevard, Octavia Boulevard from Haight to Fell Streets, Fell Street from Octavia Boulevard to Laguna Street, Laguna Street from Fell to Grove Streets, and Grove Street from Laguna to Franklin Streets, and on Gough Street from Grove to McAllister Streets; and the Yerba Buena Lane Downtown Activation Location, on Yerba Buena Lane between Market Street and Mission Street, and on the northern side of Mission Street only, excluding the public street portion of Mission Street, between Yerba Buena Lane and 3rd Street, including Jessie Square; making clarifying amendments; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. 32 Letters. File No. 250421. (10)

From Helen Ung, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to amend the City's Standard of Care for City Shelters to require City-funded family shelters to allow eligible families to remain in shelter for a continuous term of not less than one year, subject to the household's continued eligibility and compliance with shelter policies. File No. 250390. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development, regarding the proposed Resolution endorsing the Tenderloin Community Action Plan (TCAP) Investment Blueprint as the community-led strategy to support equitable recovery and revitalization in the Tenderloin, and encouraging City Departments, philanthropic, and private sector partners to use the TCAP Investment Blueprint as a guiding framework to coordinate future investments in the Tenderloin. File No. 250522. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From members of the public, regarding the Hearing on the 2025 Housing Element Rezoning and related policies including, but not limited to, affordable housing, tenant protections, and small business support; and requesting the Planning Department and Mayor's Office to present. File No. 250552. 56 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From members of the public, regarding proposed Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 250603. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From members of the public, regarding proposed Ordinance authorizing the City to reallocate approximately \$88,495,000 in prior appropriated revenue and unappropriated earned interest within the Our City, Our Home ("OCOH") Fund, to allow the City to use revenues from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax through Fiscal Year (FY) 2027-2028 for certain types of services to address homelessness, notwithstanding the expenditure percentages set forth in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810; authorizing the City to expend future revenues deposited in the OCOH Fund through Fiscal Year 2027-2028 on any programs to address homelessness as described in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810, without regard to the expenditure percentages in that section; temporarily suspending the limit on funding for short-term rental subsidies; and finding that these reallocations are necessary to achieve the purposes of the Our City, Our Home Fund pursuant to Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2811. File No. 250609. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From members of the public, regarding proposed Ordinance amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the Municipal Transportation Agency with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 250655. 7 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Joe A. Kunzler, regarding Resolution condemning antisemitism and all forms of race and religion based violence in San Francisco; and reaffirms its commitment to an open, inclusive, and safe city that actively opposes all forms of hate, including those based on religion, ethnicity, race, sex, national origin, immigration status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, and disability. File No. 250688. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 87 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Licita Fernandez, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Alexia Rotberg, regarding conditions on Mission Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From a member of the public, regarding a housing stipend proposal for renters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From a member of the public, regarding fireworks. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Edward Volk, regarding the Embarcadero Navigation Center. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Stephen J. Gorski, regarding a proposed construction project located at 2700 Sloat Boulevard. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman, regarding various subjects. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From members of the public, regarding negotiations between Blue Shield and the University of California (UC) medical system. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Bernard Maya, regarding their experiences with the Office of the Assessor-Recorder. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From a member of the public, regarding a proposed Amazon delivery center at 900 7th Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)


From Claire Gillooly Dempsey, regarding Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) activity at 478 Tehama Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Budget and Appropriation Ordinance appropriating all estimated receipts and all estimated expenditures for Departments of the City and County of San Francisco as of May 30, 2025, for the Fiscal Years (FYs) ending June 30, 2026, and June 30, 2027. 236 Letters. File No. 250589. (30)

From James Conner Green, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisors. (31)



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 20, 2025
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Appointment - Human Rights Commission

On June 20, 2025, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(18) and 4.107. This appointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (July 20, 2025).

Appointment to the Human Rights Commission:

- Eric Chang - term ending September 2, 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 appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the transmittal letter as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you wish to hold a hearing on this appointment, please let me know in writing by noon on Monday, June 30, 2025.

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

June 20, 2025

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 Section 3.100(18), (Charter § 4.107), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment:

Eric Chang to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending on September 2, 2027 (replacing Jayson Johnson - resigned).

I am confident that Mr. Chang will 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.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this appointment. Should you have any questions, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "D. Lurie", written over a horizontal line.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Issued: CCSF Special Tax and Bond Accountability Report FY23-24
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 10:44:00 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the report below from the Office of the Controller.

Thank you,

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

From: Reports, Controller (CON) <controller.reports@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:40 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Issued: CCSF Special Tax and Bond Accountability Report FY23-24

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Senate Bill 165 and Sections 50075.3 and 53411 of the California Government Code, the chief fiscal officer of the public agency will file a report with the governing body setting forth the following information.

-

Section 50075.3:

Item (a): Identify the amount of special taxes that have been collected and expended

Item (b): Identify the status of any project required or authorized to be funded by the special taxes

-

Section 53411:

Item (a): Identify the amount of bonds that have been collected and expended

Item (b): Identify the status of any project required or authorized to be funded from bond proceeds

The Controller's Office of Public Finance released the report detailing this information for Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center), Improvement Areas No. 1, 2, and 3 of

Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island), Special Tax District No. 2019-1 (Pier 70 Condominiums), Special Tax District No. 2019-2 (Pier 70 Leased Properties), and Special Tax District No. 2020-1 (Mission Rock Facilities and Services).

Please refer to the distribution e-mail below.

Office of the Controller
City & County of San Francisco



Special Tax and Bond Accountability Report for Fiscal Year FY 23-24

On June 24, 2025, the Controller's Office of Public Finance issued the City and County of San Francisco's Special Tax and Bond Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2023-2024. The report is required to be filed annually with the governing body of the City's Special Tax Districts (the Board of Supervisors) and satisfies reporting requirements pursuant to California State Senate Bill 165 and Sections 50075.3 and 53411 of the California Government Code.

The report also includes a cover memorandum detailing the City's Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center), Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island), Special Tax District No. 2019-1 (Pier 70 Leased Properties), Special Tax District No. 2019-2 (Pier 70 Condominiums), and Special Tax District No. 2020-1 (Mission Rock Facilities and Services).

Please contact Anna Van Degna, Bridget Katz, Min Guo, or Gabriella Shiferaw if you have any questions.

[Download the full report](#)



For more information, please contact the Office of Public Finance:

Anna Van Degna, *Director*: anna.vandegna@sfgov.org

Bridget Katz, *Deputy Director*: bridget.katz@sfgov.org

Min Guo, *Public Finance Specialist*: min.guo@sfgov.org

Gabriella Shiferaw, *Public Finance Analyst*: gabriella.shiferaw@sfgov.org

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

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

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



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller
ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller
Anna Van Degna
Director of Public Finance

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors,
c/o Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

FROM: Anna Van Degna, Director, Office of Public Finance
Bridget Katz, Deputy Director, Office of Public Finance
Min Guo, Public Finance Specialist, Office of Public Finance
Gabriella Shiferaw, Analyst, Office of Public Finance

DATE: June 24, 2025

SUBJECT: **Special Tax and Bond Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2023-24**

Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center)

Improvement Area No. 1, Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)

Improvement Area No. 2, Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)

Improvement Area No. 3, Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)

Special Tax District No. 2019-1 (Pier 70 Condominiums)

Special Tax District No. 2019-2 (Pier 70 Leased Properties)

Special Tax District No. 2020-1 (Mission Rock Facilities and Services)

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize certain annual reporting requirements related to the Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) ("Transbay CFD"), Improvement Area No. 1 of Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island) ("Treasure Island CFD IA1"), Improvement Area No. 2 of Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island) ("Treasure Island CFD IA2"), Improvement Area No. 3 of Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island) ("Treasure Island CFD IA3"), Special Tax District No. 2019-1 (Pier 70 Condominiums) ("Pier 70 Condo STD"), Special Tax District No. 2019-2 (Pier 70 Leased Properties) ("Pier 70 Leased STD"), and Special Tax District No. 2020-1 (Mission Rock Facilities and Services) ("Mission Rock STD").

In September 2000, the Local Agency Special Tax and Bond Accountability Act was enacted by the California State Legislature through Senate Bill 165 ("SB165") to provide accountability for any local special tax subject

to voter approval. To further this objective, the Legislature added Sections 50075.3 and 53411 to the California Government Code setting forth annual reporting requirements relative to special taxes collected and bonds issued by a local public agency. Pursuant to these, the chief fiscal officer of the public agency will, by January 1, 2002, and at least once a year thereafter, file a report with the governing body setting forth the following information:

- Section 50075.3
 - (a) Identify the amount of special taxes that have been collected and expended
 - (b) Identify the status of any project required or authorized to be funded by the special taxes
- Section 53411
 - (a) Identify the amount of bonds that have been collected and expended
 - (b) Identify the status of any project required or authorized to be funded from bond proceeds

Transbay CFD No. 2014-1

An election was held on December 29, 2014, during which the qualified electors of the Transbay CFD approved the formation of the Transbay CFD and incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1.4 billion. On January 13, 2015, the Board approved Resolution No. 1-15, declaring the results of the special election and directing the recording of a notice of special tax lien for the Transbay CFD. See the table below for a summary of bonds issued to date for the Transbay CFD.

Bond Series	Closing Date	Original Principal Amount	Project Description
2017AB	11/9/2017	\$207,500,000	\$36.1 million for street and sidewalk improvements \$171.4 million for the Salesforce Transit Center Phase 1 project
2019AB	2/26/2019	\$190,965,000	\$33.7 million for street and sidewalk improvements, BART enhancements, and Portsmouth Square park \$157.3 million for Salesforce Transit Center Phase 1 project
2020B	5/14/2020	\$81,820,000	\$81.8 million for the Salesforce Transit Center Phase 1 project
2021B	11/3/2021	\$33,880,000	\$33.9 million for the Salesforce Transit Center Phase 2 project
2022AB	12/15/2022	\$78,570,000	\$31.2 million for streetscape and pedestrian improvements, the acquisition of transit vehicles, and BART enhancements \$47.4 million for the Salesforce Transit Center Phase 2 project

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank]

Treasure Island CFD No. 2016-1

An election was held on January 24, 2017, during which the qualified electors of the Treasure Island CFD approved the formation of the Treasure Island CFD and incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$5.0 billion for the Treasure Island CFD and an amount not-to-exceed \$250.0 million for Treasure Island CFD IA1. On January 24, 2017, the Board approved Resolution No. 11-17 declaring the results of the special election and directing the recording of a notice of special tax lien for the Treasure Island CFD. On September 22, 2020, the Board approved Resolution No. 410-20 authorizing the annexation of Treasure Island CFD IA2 and the issuance of bonds in an amount not-to-exceed \$278.2 million. On December 10, 2024, the Board approved Resolution No. 618-24 authorizing the annexation of Treasure Island CFD IA3 and the issuance of bonds in an amount not-to-exceed \$731.4 million. See the table below for a summary of bonds issued to date to reimburse authorized public improvement projects for the Treasure Island CFD.

Improvement Area No.	Bond Series	Closing Date	Original Principal Amount
1	2020	10/29/2020	\$17,135,000
1	2021	8/12/2021	\$41,340,000
2	2022	2/10/2022	\$25,130,000
2	2023	12/21/2023	\$16,975,000

Pier 70 STD No. 2019-1 (Condominiums)

An election was held on January 27, 2020, during which the qualified electors of the Pier 70 Condominiums STD approved the formation of the Pier 70 Condominiums STD and incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1.698 billion for the Pier 70 Condominiums STD. On January 28, 2020, the Board approved Resolution No. 40-20, declaring the results of the special election and directing the recording of a notice of special tax lien for the Pier 70 Condominiums STD. Although no bonds have been issued for the Pier 70 Condo STD to date, pursuant to the RMA, the City began levying special taxes for the Pier 70 Condo STD in fiscal year 2022-23.

Pier 70 STD No. 2019-2 (Leased Properties)

An election was held on January 27, 2020, during which the qualified electors of the Pier 70 Leased Properties STD approved the formation of the Pier 70 Leased Properties STD and incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$1.842 billion for the Pier 70 Leased Properties STD. On January 28, 2020, the Board approved Resolution No. 42-20, declaring the results of the special election and directing the recording of a notice of special tax lien for the Pier 70 Leased Properties STD. Although no bonds have been issued for the Pier 70 Leased Properties STD to date, pursuant to the RMA, the City began levying special taxes for the Pier 70 Leased Properties STD in fiscal year 2022-23.

Mission Rock STD No. 2020-1

An election was held on April 20, 2020, during which the qualified electors of the Mission Rock STD approved the formation of the Mission Rock STD and incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$3.7 billion for the Mission Rock STD. On May 5, 2020, the Board approved Resolution No. 195-20, declaring the results of the special election and directing the recording of a notice

of special tax lien for the Mission Rock STD. See the table below for a summary of bonds issued to date to finance certain facilities and improvements authorized for the Mission Rock STD.

Bond Series	Closing Date	Original Principal Amount
2021A	5/27/2021	\$43,300,000
2021BC	11/10/2021	\$64,280,000
2023ABC	12/6/2023	\$45,895,000

Please contact Anna Van Degna (anna.vandegna@sfgov.org), Bridget Katz (bridget.katz@sfgov.org), Min Guo (min.guo@sfgov.org) or Gabriella Shiferaw (gabriella.shiferaw@sfgov.org) with any questions.



Anna Van Degna
Public Finance Director



GOODWIN CONSULTING GROUP

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS**

**SPECIAL TAX AND BOND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT
(SENATE BILL 165)**

FISCAL YEAR 2023-24

June 19, 2025

***City and County of San Francisco
Community Facilities Districts
Special Tax and Bond Accountability Report***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Senate Bill 165 Reporting Requirements.....	2
III. Authorized Facilities and Services	3
Appendix A – Special Taxes Levied and Expended	
Appendix B – Bonds Collected and Expended	

I. INTRODUCTION

On September 18, 2000, former Governor Gray Davis signed Senate Bill 165 which enacted the Local Agency Special Tax and Bond Accountability Act. In approving the bill, the Legislature declared that local agencies need to demonstrate to the voters that special taxes and bond proceeds are being spent on the facilities and services for which they were intended. To further this objective, the Legislature added Sections 50075.3 and 53411 to the California Government Code setting forth annual reporting requirements relative to special taxes collected and bonds issued by a local public agency.

The City and County of San Francisco (“City”) levied special taxes in multiple community facilities districts (“CFDs”) and one special tax district (“STD”) in fiscal year 2023-24. Furthermore, the City has issued a number of special tax bonds in connection with those districts. This report serves to satisfy the annual reporting requirements described above for the districts listed in the table below.

**City and County of San Francisco
Required SB 165 Reports
Fiscal Year 2023-24**

CFD Name	Report for GC §50075.3 Required	Report for GC §53411 Required
CFD No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center)	Yes	Yes
Improvement Area No. 1 CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)	Yes	Yes
Improvement Area No. 2 CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)	Yes	Yes
Improvement Area No. 3 CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)	Yes	No
STD No. 2019-1 (Pier 70 Condominiums)	Yes	No
STD No. 2019-2 (Pier 70 Leased Properties)	Yes	No
STD No. 2020-1 (Mission Rock Facilities and Services)	Yes	Yes

II. SENATE BILL 165 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Pursuant to Sections 50075.3 and 53411, the chief fiscal officer of the public agency will, by January 1, 2002, and at least once a year thereafter, file a report with the governing body setting forth the following information.

Section 50075.3

Item (a): Identify the amount of special taxes that have been collected and expended.

See Tables in Appendix A for each applicable district

Item (b): Identify the status of any project required or authorized to be funded by the special taxes.

See Tables in Appendix A for each applicable district. The authorized facilities and/or services to be funded from special taxes are described in Section III of this Report for each district.

Section 53411

Item (a): Identify the amount of bonds that have been collected and expended.

See Tables in Appendix B for each applicable district

Item (b): Identify the status of any project required or authorized to be funded from bond proceeds.

See Tables in Appendix B for each applicable district

III. AUTHORIZED FACILITIES AND SERVICES

CFD No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center)

Authorized Facilities

Proceeds of the Bonds and special tax revenues will primarily be used to finance a portion of the costs of acquiring public infrastructure improvements necessary for development of property within the Community Facilities District No. 2014-1 (Transbay Transit Center) (“CFD No. 2014-1”). The infrastructure authorized to be financed by CFD No. 2014-1 is identified in the Resolution of Formation. Generally, the infrastructure authorized to be financed includes:

1. Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements
 - a. Primary Streets (Mission, Howard, Folsom, Fremont, 1st, 2nd, New Montgomery)
 - b. Living Streets (Beale, Main, and Spear Streets North of Folsom to Market Street)
 - c. Alleys (Stevenson, Jessie, Minna, Natoma, Tehama, Clementina Street)
 - d. Fremont/Folsom Freeway Off-Ramp Realignment
 - e. Mid-Block Crossings
 - f. Signalization
 - g. Natoma Street
 - h. Casual Carpool Waiting Area Improvements
2. Transit and Other Transportation
 - a. Transit Delay Mitigation
 - b. BART Station Capacity
 - c. Congestion Charging Pilot
 - d. Underground Pedestrian Connector
 - e. Downtown Rail Extension (DTX)
3. Public Open Space
 - a. City Park
 - b. City Park Connections
 - c. 2nd and Howard Public Plaza
 - d. Transbay Park
 - e. Chinatown Open Space Improvements
 - f. Other Downtown Open Space Improvements
 - g. Mission Square
 - h. Under-Ramp Park
4. Other Transit Center District Public Improvements

The following table identifies the status of construction on CFD No. 2014-1 authorized projects and CFD No. 2014-1 proceeds disbursed through June 30, 2024:

Public Improvement	CFD Proceeds Spent ⁽¹⁾	Status of Improvements
Streetscape and Pedestrian		
Primary Streets (Mission, Howard, Folsom, Fremont, 1 st , 2 nd , New Montgomery)	\$15,078,568	- Construction on 2nd St. reached substantial completion in October 2020. Long-term plant establishment completed and financial closeout in progress. - Transit U at 1st St./Mission St./Fremont St. advertised and NTP anticipated for January 2025. - Design in progress for Transbay Howard Streetscape; contract advertisement anticipated in Winter 2025 -Planning phase in progress for 1st St Safety Improvements, design anticipated to start Spring 2025 - Design in progress for Mission Street; contract advertisement anticipated in early 2026.
Living Streets (Beale, Main, and Spear North of Folsom to Market)	\$2,045,810	- Beale St. phase 1 advertised Fall 2024. - Design for Main St in progress; contract advertisement for January 2025.
Alleys (Stevenson, Jessie, Minna, Natoma, Tehama, Clementina)	\$2,650,374	- Minna Natoma advertised in December 2024. - Planning for other alleys anticipated to start in 2025.
Fremont/Folsom off-ramp realignment	\$0	- Ongoing planning and coordination of environmental review and MTA legislation/approval for Phase C, D, E.
Mid-Block Crossings	\$0	
Signalization	\$0	
Natoma Street	\$0	
Casual Carpool Waiting Areas	\$113	- Phase 1 construction of Beale St. Casual Carpool completed in December 2020. - Phase 2 in design, contract advertisement anticipated in Winter 2025.
Transit and Other Transportation		
BART Station Capacity	\$357,687	- Due to cost increases due to bidding environment, inflation, COVID impacts, schedule changes, and legacy station challenges, BART is phasing the project work. Phase 1 includes renovating and modernizing existing elevator, demolishing and rebuilding wider south stairs, and relocating existing machine room. Phase 2 includes building new elevator in north side of the station, building new machine room for new elevator, and demolishing and rebuilding wider north stairs. Currently, the project is in the “design phase” of Phase 1, with 65% design anticipated to be complete. BART is currently collaborating with design consultant to obtain approval for a new work plan to complete 95% of design. The updated schedule is as follows: (i) Design: 95% in 2024, 100% in Spring 2025; (ii) Procurement: Summer 2025 – Spring 2026; and (iii) Construction: Summer 2026 to Spring 2029.
Congestion Charging Pilot	\$880,000	- The SF County Transportation Authority has paused the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study. Work to date has included public outreach conducted through August 2021; evaluating boundary options; and refining estimates of fees, program implementation costs and revenues. Policy recommendations will be completed following the resumption of public outreach activities.
Electric Bus Purchases	\$1,983,504	-The SFMTA has placed all 12 battery buses from the pilot program into revenue service and has evaluated their performance, reliability, maintainability, and operability in San Francisco’s unique environment. The results of the battery bus pilot program evaluation have been detailed in a report that the SFMTA will list on their public website. The buses continue to be used in revenue service and continue to receive improvements.
Downtown Rail Extension ⁽²⁾	\$314,683,454	- Construction is complete for Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) elements of Phase 1, including the Train Box. Design and engineering for DTX (Phase 2) is underway. In December 2021, the project was admitted into the Project Development phase of the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Capital Investment Grants (CIG) program. In 2024, the FTA approved the project’s entry into the Engineering phase of the CIG program, with a Federal funding commitment of \$3.4 billion.
Open Space		
City Park (renamed Salesforce Park) ⁽²⁾	\$82,066,498	- Construction of the rooftop Salesforce Park is complete, and the park is open to the public.
Chinatown Open Space Improvements ⁽³⁾	\$6,380,655	-The Portsmouth Square Improvement Project is currently in the Bid/Award Phase, with anticipated Bid Advertisement in early 2025. The project has completed 100% Construction Documentation and is finalizing all DBI and SF Planning approvals.
Total	\$426,126,663	

(1)Totals may not sum due to rounding.

(2) Excludes amounts used to reimburse financing costs.

(3) \$9,000,000 of Series 2019A Bonds were appropriated to Recreation & Parks Department for the Portsmouth Square open space project.

CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)

Authorized Facilities

Proceeds of the Bonds and special tax revenues will primarily be used to finance a portion of the costs of acquiring public infrastructure improvements necessary for development of property within Community Facilities District No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island) (“CFD No. 2016-1”), including Improvement Area No. 1, Improvement Area No. 2, and Improvement Area No. 3. The infrastructure authorized to be financed by CFD No. 2016-1 is identified in the Resolution of Formation. Generally, the infrastructure authorized to be financed includes: acquisition of land for public improvements or relocation of existing uses for public housing, abatement, demolition, supplemental fire water supply system, low pressure water, water tank facilities, recycled water, storm drainage system, separated sanitary sewer, joint trench, earthwork, retaining walls, highway ramps, roadways, pathways, curb and gutter, traffic improvements, streetscape improvements, shoreline improvements, parks, ferry terminal, hazardous soil removal, community facilities, any other amounts specifically identified in the DDA as a Project Cost, contributions to the City and other public agencies for costs related to open space improvements, transportation and transit facilities, and design and construction of ramps and access roads, sea level rise adaptations, and facility capital improvements constructed by the City of TIDA.

Authorized Services

The Resolution of Formation also authorizes CFD No. 2016-1 to fund certain services within the district. These services include the costs of operating and maintaining improvements constructed pursuant to the parks and open space plan within the project site and operating and maintaining TIDA owned structures and facilities within the Project Site including but not limited to Building 1, Hangers 2 & 3, Pier 1, the Historic Officer’s Quarters, Quarters 10 & 62, the Torpedo Building, Chapel, Gymnasium, roadways, paths and walkways.

The following table identifies the status of construction of authorized projects as of February 27, 2025:

	Direct Costs Stage 1⁽¹⁾	Percent Spent	Remaining Costs
<i>Hard Costs</i>			
Demo	\$8,616,813	100%	-
Geotech	\$58,472,458	100%	-
Causeway	\$15,746,082	100%	-
Treasure Island Street Improvements	\$89,082,651	100%	-
Yerba Buena Island Street Improvements	\$105,061,713	100%	-
Interim Gas Line	\$1,927,603	100%	-
Sanitary Sewer Pump Station	\$4,787,600	100%	-
Interim Sanitary Sewer Force Main	\$7,356,090	100%	-
Wastewater Treatment Plant	\$1,489,945	100%	-
12KV Improvements	\$2,415,407	100%	-
Total Hard Costs	\$294,956,360	100%	-
<i>Soft Costs</i>			
Landscape Architect	\$3,541,336	100%	-
Civil Engineer	\$12,216,477	100%	-
Geotechnical Engineer	\$15,999,661	100%	-
Environmental Engineer	\$5,865,491	100%	-
Permits & Fees & Bonds	\$18,791,978	100%	-
Other (Utilities Consultants, Legal)	\$1,202,767	100%	-
Construction Management	\$14,986,202	100%	-
Total Soft Costs	\$72,603,912	100%	-
Total TI Infrastructure Budget	\$367,560,272	100%	-

⁽¹⁾ Improvement Areas 1, 2, and 3 combine to create “Stage 1”. The Island is separated into 8 Stages and 4 Major Phases.

As of June 30, 2024, CFD proceeds have been disbursed on the following projects:

Type of Facility	CFD Proceeds Spent ⁽¹⁾	
	Improvement Area No. 1	Improvement Area No. 2
Acquisition	\$14,676,340	\$0
Abatement	\$0	\$0
Demolition	\$171,769	\$51,036
Supplemental Fire Water Supply System	\$1,382,967	\$589,502
Low Pressure Water	\$2,262,687	\$654,053
Water Tank Facilities	\$0	\$0
Recycled Water	\$973,202	\$414,836
Storm Drainage System	\$9,000,644	\$1,449,853
Separated Sanitary Sewer	\$12,151,059	\$2,164,493
Joint Trench	\$0	\$32,706
Earthwork	\$1,859,767	\$3,307,843
Retaining Walls	\$779,192	\$332,138
Highway Ramps, & Roadways	\$1,094,751	\$466,647
Traffic	\$618,791	\$263,765
Streetscape	\$93,426	\$49,235
Shoreline Improvements	\$0	\$0
Parks	\$0	\$0
Ferry Terminal	\$0	\$0
Other Soft Costs	\$3,756,429	\$17,950,018
Community Facilities	\$0	\$0
Historic Renovation	\$0	\$0
Authorized Payments & Subsidies	\$2,846,853	\$8,000,699
Sea Level Rise Adaptations	\$0	\$0
Facility Capital Improvements (Mobilization, Dust Control, Erosion Control, Surveying)	\$4,354,390	\$1,796,119
	\$56,022,266	\$37,522,942
Other		
Bond related expenses	\$0	\$0
Administrative fees	\$0	\$0
Formation costs	\$0	\$155,881
Capital reserve	\$0	\$0
	\$0	\$155,881
Total	\$56,022,266	\$37,678,823

⁽¹⁾ The amounts shown above may include interest earnings.

STD No. 2019-1 (Pier 70 Condominiums)

Authorized Facilities

Proceeds of the special tax revenues will primarily be used to finance a portion of the costs of acquiring public infrastructure improvements necessary for development of property within Special Tax District No. 2019-1 (Pier 70 Condominiums) (“STD No. 2019-1”). The infrastructure authorized to be financed by STD No. 2019-1 is identified in the Resolution of Formation. Generally, the infrastructure authorized to be financed includes:

1. Land Acquisition
2. Demolition and Abatement
3. Auxiliary Water Supply System
4. Low Pressure Water
5. Non-Potable Water
6. Combined Sanitary Sewer and Stormwater Management
7. Joint Trench & Dry Utilities
8. Earthwork and Retaining Walls
9. Roadways
10. Streetscape
11. Parks and Public Space
12. Historic Rehabilitation Required for Horizontal Improvements
13. Hazardous Soil Removal
14. Shoreline Adaptation Studies
15. Shoreline Protection Facilities
16. Noonan Replacement Space
17. Arts Building
18. Historic Building Feasibility Gap
19. Deferred Infrastructure
20. Entitlement Costs
21. Associated Public Benefits
22. Miscellaneous Horizontal Development Costs
23. Any other costs authorized to be financed by STD No. 2019-1 under the DDA and VDDA
24. Soft costs required to support the construction of the Horizontal Improvements and implementation of the DDA and VDDA
25. Development Mitigation Measures
26. Miscellaneous Costs, such as costs associated with implementing the DDA and VDDA, including any additional costs that the Parties have agreed shall be incurred by the Developer for the Project, such as master planning for each phase, audits, appraisals, workforce development costs (such as a liaison), cash payments and community outreach initiatives

As of the date of the report, bonds have not been issued for STD No. 2019-1.

Authorized Services

The Resolution of Formation also authorizes STD No. 2019-1 to fund certain services within the district. These services include:

- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation (including public events) of Public Spaces, including facilities for public enjoyment, such as public parks, public recreational facilities, public access, open space, public paseos and other public amenities, some of which may be rooftop facilities or located on privately leased property but identified as public open space in the DDA or Design for Development
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of Public Right-of-Ways (ROWs), including public streets, sidewalks, shared public ways, mid-block passages, bicycle lanes, and other paths of travel, associated landscaping and furnishings, retaining walls within the ROWs, and related amenities in the FC Project Area, including any portion of the Building 15 structure over 22nd Street, some of which may be located on private property but identified as public open space in the DDA or Design for Development.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of Shoreline Improvements in and adjacent to the FC Project Area that were completed per the DDA, such as shoreline restoration, including installation of stone columns, pilings, secant walls, and other structures to stabilize the seawall or shoreline, removal of bay fill, creation of waterfront public access to or environmental remediation of the San Francisco waterfront.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of landscaping and irrigation systems and other equipment, material, and supplies directly related to maintaining and replacing landscaped areas and water features in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation as needed of Public Spaces, including street cleaning and paving.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of lighting, rest rooms, trash receptacles, park benches, planting containers, picnic tables, bollards, bicycle racks and corrals and other furniture and fixtures and signage in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of utilities in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- General liability insurance for any Public ROWs or structures in Public ROWs that Public Works does not submit to the Board of Supervisors for City acceptance for City General Fund liability purposes and other commercially reasonable insurance coverages.
- Port, City, or third party personnel, administrative, and overhead costs related to maintenance or to contracting for and managing third-party maintenance, including rent for storage space needed to support the maintenance activities.
- Any other costs authorized to be financed by STD No. 2019-1 under the DDA and VDDA

STD No. 2019-2 (Pier 70 Leased Properties)

Authorized Facilities

Proceeds of the special tax revenues will primarily be used to finance a portion of the costs of acquiring public infrastructure improvements necessary for development of property within Special Tax District No. 2019-2 (Pier 70 Leased Properties) (“STD No. 2019-2”). The infrastructure authorized to be financed by STD No. 2019-2 is identified in the Resolution of Formation. Generally, the infrastructure authorized to be financed includes:

1. Land Acquisition
2. Demolition and Abatement
3. Auxiliary Water Supply System
4. Low Pressure Water
5. Non-Potable Water
6. Combined Sanitary Sewer and Stormwater Management
7. Joint Trench & Dry Utilities
8. Earthwork and Retaining Walls
9. Roadways
10. Streetscape
11. Parks and Public Space
12. Historic Rehabilitation Required for Horizontal Improvements
13. Hazardous Soil Removal
14. Shoreline Adaptation Studies
15. Shoreline Protection Facilities
16. Noonan Replacement Space
17. Arts Building
18. Historic Building Feasibility Gap
19. Deferred Infrastructure
20. Entitlement Costs
21. Associated Public Benefits
22. Miscellaneous Horizontal Development Costs
23. Any other costs authorized to be financed by STD No. 2019-2 under the DDA
24. Soft costs required to support the construction of the Horizontal Improvements and implementation of the DDA
25. Development Mitigation Measures
26. Miscellaneous Costs, such as costs associated with implementing the DDA, including any additional costs that the Parties have agreed shall be incurred by the Developer for the Project, such as master planning for each phase, audits, appraisals, workforce development costs (such as a liaison), cash payments and community outreach initiatives

As of the date of the report, bonds have not been issued for STD No. 2019-2.

Authorized Services

The Resolution of Formation also authorizes STD No. 2019-2 to fund certain services within the district. These services include:

- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation (including public events) of Public Spaces, including facilities for public enjoyment, such as public parks, public recreational facilities, public access, open space, public paseos and other public amenities, some of which may be rooftop facilities or located on privately leased property but identified as public open space in the DDA or Design for Development
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of Public Right-of-Ways (ROWs), including public streets, sidewalks, shared public ways, mid-block passages, bicycle lanes, and other paths of travel, associated landscaping and furnishings, retaining walls within the ROWs, and related amenities in the FC Project Area, including any portion of the Building 15 structure over 22nd Street, some of which may be located on private property but identified as public open space in the DDA or Design for Development.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of Shoreline Improvements in and adjacent to the FC Project Area that were completed per the DDA, such as shoreline restoration, including installation of stone columns, pilings, secant walls, and other structures to stabilize the seawall or shoreline, removal of bay fill, creation of waterfront public access to or environmental remediation of the San Francisco waterfront.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of landscaping and irrigation systems and other equipment, material, and supplies directly related to maintaining and replacing landscaped areas and water features in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation as needed of Public Spaces, including street cleaning and paving.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of lighting, rest rooms, trash receptacles, park benches, planting containers, picnic tables, bollards, bicycle racks and corrals and other furniture and fixtures and signage in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of utilities in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- General liability insurance for any Public ROWs or structures in Public ROWs that Public Works does not submit to the Board of Supervisors for City acceptance for City General Fund liability purposes and other commercially reasonable insurance coverages.
- Port, City, or third party personnel, administrative, and overhead costs related to maintenance or to contracting for and managing third-party maintenance, including rent for storage space needed to support the maintenance activities.
- Any other costs authorized to be financed by STD No. 2019-2 under the DDA

The following table identifies the status of construction of authorized facilities for STD No. 2019-1 and STD No. 2019-2 as of May 2025:

Special Tax District	Status of Improvements
STD No. 2019-1	Phase 1 horizontal improvements were substantially complete as of November 2022 with the issuance of a Notice of Completion by the City. Acceptance of these improvements by the Port and the City occurred in Spring 2024 and the streets are now open to the public. The balance of the Phase 1 horizontal improvements, largely comprised of the Phase 1 parks and open space, will be constructed on a schedule that coincides with the delivery of adjacent vertical development. Brookfield completed the rehabilitation of historic Building 12 in January 2022 and has signed over ten leases that have begun to create a growing community of artists, makers, and innovators.
STD No. 2019-2	Brookfield has not exercised an option to lease or purchase any Phase 1 development parcels, citing the ongoing economic impacts of the pandemic and construction costs on the viability of vertical development. The Port and Brookfield continue to explore ways to advance the project.

STD No. 2020-1 (Mission Rock Facilities and Services)

Authorized Facilities

Proceeds of the Bonds and special tax revenues will primarily be used to finance a portion of the costs of acquiring public infrastructure improvements necessary for development of property within Special Tax District No. 2020-1 (Mission Rock Facilities and Services) (“STD No. 2020-1”). The infrastructure authorized to be financed by STD No. 2020-1 is identified in the Resolution of Formation. Generally, the infrastructure authorized to be financed includes:

1. Land Acquisition
2. Demolition and Abatement
3. Auxiliary Water Supply System
4. Low Pressure Water
5. Non-Potable Water System (Blackwater Treatment Facility)
6. District Energy System
7. Sanitary Sewer, Storm Drain, and Stormwater Management
8. Joint Trench & Dry Utilities
9. Earthwork and Retaining Walls
10. Roadways
11. Streetscape
12. Parks and Public Space
13. Water-based Transportation Improvements
14. Historic Rehabilitation Required for Horizontal Improvements
15. Hazardous Soil Removal
16. Shoreline Adaptation Studies
17. Shoreline Protection Facilities
18. Deferred Infrastructure
19. Entitlement Costs
20. Associated Public Benefits
21. Miscellaneous Horizontal Development Costs
22. Any other costs authorized to be financed by STD No. 2020-1 under the DDA
23. Interim improvements required for the use of the Project Site including temporary bike lanes, landscape, hardscape, accessibility infrastructure, grading, furniture and other improvements required for the interim use of the remaining Project Site
24. Soft Costs required to support the construction of the Horizontal Improvements and implementation of the DDA, including developer management costs, third party professional services, construction management Fees, and asset management costs
25. Developer Mitigation Measures, including the formation of the Transportation Management Association and dust, vibration, asbestos and settlement monitoring
26. Insurance, Bonding and Warranty costs as required by the City in connection with the authorized improvements
27. Miscellaneous Costs, such as costs associated with implementing the DDA, including any additional costs that the Parties have agreed shall be incurred by the Developer for the Project, such as master planning for each phase, audits, appraisals, workforce development costs (such as a liaison), cash payments and community outreach initiatives

Authorized Services

The Resolution of Formation also authorizes STD No. 2020-1 to fund certain services within the district. These services include:

- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation (including public events) of Public Spaces, including facilities for public enjoyment, such as public parks, public recreational facilities, public access, open space, public paseos and other public amenities, some of which may be rooftop facilities or located on privately leased property but identified as public open space in the DDA or Design Controls or Subdivision Map.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of Public Right-of-Ways (ROWs), including public streets, sidewalks, shared public ways, mid-block passages, bicycle lanes, and other paths of travel, associated landscaping and furnishings, maintenance, trenching, backfilling, and monitoring of Lightweight Cellular Concrete infrastructure, retaining walls within the ROWs and related amenities in STD No. 2020-1, some of which may be located on privately leased property but identified as public open space in the DDA or Design Controls.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of Shoreline Improvements in and adjacent to STD No. 2020-1 that were completed per the DDA, such as shoreline restoration, including installation of stone columns, pilings, secant walls, and other structures to stabilize the seawall or shoreline, removal of bay fill, creation of waterfront public access to or environmental remediation of the San Francisco waterfront.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of landscaping and irrigation systems and other equipment, material, and supplies directly related to maintaining and replacing landscaped areas and water features in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation as needed of Public Spaces, including street cleaning and paving.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of lighting, rest rooms, trash receptacles, park benches, planting containers, picnic tables, bollards, bicycle racks and corrals and other furniture and fixtures and signage in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- Maintenance, capital repair, replacement and operation of utilities in Public Spaces and Public ROWs.
- General liability insurance for any Public ROWs or structures in Public ROWs that Public Works does not submit to the Board of Supervisors for City acceptance for City General Fund liability purposes and other commercially reasonable insurance coverages.
- Port, City, or third party personnel, administrative, and overhead costs related to maintenance or to contracting for and managing third-party maintenance, including rent for storage space needed to support the maintenance activities.
- Any other costs authorized to be financed by STD No. 2020-1 under the DDA

The following is the status of construction on authorized projects as of April 1, 2025:

Description	Estimated Public Improvement Costs	Spent To Date	Percent Complete
Phase 1A			
Entitlement Phase	\$29,330,000	\$29,330,000	100%
Hard Costs	\$80,785,667	\$81,063,047	100%
Mission Rock Utilities Systems	\$43,525,000	\$43,525,000	100%
City Reimbursables	\$19,577,000	\$17,629,004	90%
Developer Reimbursables	\$23,787,637	\$23,384,365	98%
Soft Costs	\$53,662,798	\$48,537,307	90%
Totals Phase 1A	\$250,668,102	\$243,468,723	95%
Phase 1B through Phase 4			
Phase 1B China Basin Park Hard Costs	\$40,657,253	\$40,657,253	100%
Phase 2 – 4 Hard Costs	\$120,850,000	-	-
Hard Costs Outside of GMP	\$46,750,000	-	-
Soft Costs	\$37,400,000	\$2,480,634	7%
Totals Phase 1B through Phase 4	\$245,657,253	\$43,137,887	19%
Totals for Mission Rock Project	\$496,325,355	\$286,606,610	58%

The following table identifies STD proceeds disbursed through June 30, 2024:

	Project Fund Deposits	
	Amount Allocated to Project Fund	Project Fund Proceeds Spent
Series 2021A Bonds	\$43,370,770	\$43,370,770
Series 2021B Bonds	\$46,048,115	\$46,048,115
Series 2021C Bonds	\$9,611,434	\$9,611,434
Series 2023A Bonds	\$7,474,291	\$7,474,291
Series 2023B Bonds	\$16,177,775	\$16,177,775
Series 2023C Bonds	\$15,260,836	\$15,188,466
Total ⁽¹⁾	\$137,943,221	\$137,870,851

(1) As of June 30, 2024, all Project Fund proceeds originally deposited from Series 2021 Bonds, Series 2023A Bonds and Series 2023B Bonds have been spent. Current balances in the Project Fund accounts for the Series 2021 Bonds, Series 2023A Bonds and Series 2023B Bonds reflect interest earnings.

APPENDIX A

Special Taxes Levied and Expended

**City and County of San Francisco
Community Facilities District No. 2014-1
(Transbay Transit Center)**

Special Taxes Levied and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 50075.3)

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Revenues	
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Levied	\$32,711,674
Delinquent Amount as of 09/11/2024	<u>(\$36,942)</u>
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Collected /1	\$32,711,674
Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budgeted Expenditures	
Debt Service	\$29,697,477
Administrative Expenses	\$330,050
Pay-Go	<u>\$2,684,148</u>
Total	\$32,711,674
Status of Project	
<p>Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay debt service on the outstanding CFD bonds, (ii) pay for the costs of administering the CFD, and (iii) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring and/or constructing the authorized facilities. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the CFD are shown in Section III of the report.</p>	

- /1 The total amount of the levy was received by the City, as the CFD is on San Francisco County's Teeter Plan, and therefore receives all of the special taxes levied regardless of any delinquencies.

Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

**Improvement Area No. 1 of the
City and County of San Francisco
CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)**

Special Taxes Levied and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 50075.3)

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Revenues	
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Levied	\$3,602,032
Delinquent Amount as of 12/01/2024	\$0
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Collected	\$3,602,032
Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budgeted Expenditures	
Debt Service	\$2,766,400
Authorized Expenditures	\$707,747
Administrative Expenses	\$127,885
Total	\$3,602,032
Status of Project	
<p>Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay debt service on the outstanding CFD Bonds, (ii) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring, constructing, and/or maintaining the authorized facilities or services, and (iii) pay for the costs of administering the CFD. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the CFD are shown in Section III of the report.</p>	

**Improvement Area No. 2 of the
City and County of San Francisco
CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)**

Special Taxes Levied and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 50075.3)

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Revenues	
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Levied	\$3,077,797
Delinquent Amount as of 09/11/2024	\$0
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Collected	\$3,077,797
Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budgeted Expenditures	
Debt Service	\$2,039,157
Authorized Expenditures	\$915,180
Administrative Expenses	\$123,460
Total	\$3,077,797
Status of Project	
<p>Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay debt service on the outstanding CFD Bonds, (ii) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring, constructing, and/or maintaining the authorized facilities or services, (iii) fund the Additional Special Tax Reserve Fund for the Series 2023A Bonds and (iv) pay for the costs of administering the CFD. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the CFD are shown in Section III of the report.</p>	

**Improvement Area No. 3 of the
City and County of San Francisco
CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)**

Special Taxes Levied and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 50075.3)

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Revenues	
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Levied	\$1,268,171
Delinquent Amount as of 09/11/2024	<u>\$0</u>
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Collected	\$1,268,171
Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budgeted Expenditures	
Authorized Expenditures	\$1,153,191
Administrative Expenses	<u>\$114,980</u>
Total	\$1,268,171
Status of Project	
<p>Special tax revenues were used to: (i) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring, constructing, and/or maintaining the authorized facilities or services, and (ii) pay for the costs of administering the CFD. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the CFD are shown in Section III of the report.</p>	

Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

City and County of San Francisco
Special Tax District No. 2019-1
(Pier 70 Condominiums)

Special Taxes Levied and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 50075.3)

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Revenues

FY 2023-24 Special Tax Levied	\$1,180,912
Delinquent Amount as of 09/11/2024	\$0
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Collected	<u>\$1,180,912</u>

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budgeted Expenditures
--

Debt Service	\$0
Administrative Expenses	\$104,885
Authorized Facilities	<u>\$1,076,027</u>
Total	<u>\$1,180,912</u>

Status of Project

Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring and/or constructing the authorized facilities, and (ii) pay for the costs of administering the STD. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the STD are shown in Section III of the report.

**City and County of San Francisco
Special Tax District No. 2019-2
(Pier 70 Leased Properties)**

Special Taxes Levied and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 50075.3)

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Revenues

FY 2023-24 Special Tax Levied	\$562,094
Delinquent Amount as of 09/11/2024	\$0
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Collected	<u>\$562,094</u>

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budgeted Expenditures
--

Debt Service	\$0
Administrative Expenses /1	\$14,300
Authorized Facilities	<u>\$547,794</u>
Total	<u>\$562,094</u>

Status of Project

Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring and/or constructing the authorized facilities, and (ii) pay for the costs of administering the STD. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the STD are shown in Section III of the report.

/1 Does not reflect total administrative costs associated with the special tax levy due to limitations on what the Facilities Special Tax can fund.

City and County of San Francisco
Special Tax District No. 2020-1
(Mission Rock Facilities and Services)

Special Taxes Levied and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 50075.3)

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Revenues

Special Tax	<u>Development</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Shoreline</u>
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Levied	\$6,611,122	\$1,259,843	\$1,194,226
Delinquent Amount as of 09/11/2024	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY 2023-24 Special Tax Collected	\$6,611,122	\$1,259,843	\$1,194,226

Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budgeted Expenditures

Special Tax	<u>Development</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Shoreline</u>
Debt Service	\$5,987,957	\$1,052,694	\$993,104
Administrative Expenses	\$21,700	\$97,750	\$97,750
Authorized Facilities	\$601,465	\$109,399	\$103,372
Total	\$6,611,122	\$1,259,843	\$1,194,226

Status of Project

Development Special Tax

Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay debt service on the outstanding CFD bonds, (ii) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring and/or constructing the authorized facilities, and (iii) pay for certain costs of administering the CFD.

Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the STD are shown in Section III of the report.

Office Special Tax

Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay debt service on the outstanding CFD bonds, (ii) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring and/or constructing the authorized facilities, and (iii) pay for the costs of administering the CFD. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the STD are shown in Section III of the report.

Shoreline Special Tax

Special tax revenues are used to: (i) pay debt service on the outstanding CFD bonds, (ii) pay directly for a portion of the costs of acquiring and/or constructing the authorized facilities, and (iii) pay for the costs of administering the CFD. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the STD are shown in Section III of the report.

APPENDIX B

Bonds Collected and Expended

City and County of San Francisco
Community Facilities District No. 2014-1
(Transbay Transit Center)

Bonds Collected and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 53411)

Original Sources and Uses of Bond Proceeds

Bonds:	Series 2017	Series 2019	Series 2020B	Series 2021B	Series 2022
Date of Issuance:	11/9/2017	2/26/2019	5/14/2020	11/3/2021	12/15/2022
Sources:					
Principal Amount of the Bonds	\$207,500,000.00	\$190,965,000.00	\$81,820,000.00	\$33,880,000.00	\$78,570,000.00
Original Issue Discount	(\$4,100,457.65)	(\$510,660.75)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,828,759.90
Total	\$203,399,542.35	\$190,454,339.25	\$81,820,000.00	\$33,880,000.00	\$80,398,759.90
Uses:					
2017A Improvement Account	\$31,165,181.98	\$28,993,218.09	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2022A Improvement Account	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$28,227,220.39
Allocated Bond Proceeds Account	\$149,236,351.57	\$142,381,598.53	\$76,000,000.00	\$30,040,000.00	\$43,457,508.31
BART Improvement Account	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,747,753.74
2017 Reserve Fund	\$15,364,058.98	\$14,383,279.76	\$4,446,674.40	\$2,830,424.23	\$3,235,908.53
2022 Reserve Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,592,547.68
Bond Fund /1	\$5,211,546.05	\$1,877,871.48	\$225,020.79	\$0.00	\$0.00
Costs of Issuance Fund	\$2,422,403.77	\$1,818,371.39	\$1,148,304.81	\$1,009,575.77	\$1,137,821.25
Total	\$203,399,542.35	\$190,454,339.25	\$81,820,000.00	\$33,880,000.00	\$80,398,759.90

Expenditures During Fiscal Year 2023-24 /2

Fund	Balance 7/1/2023	Balance 6/30/2024	Difference
<i>Series 2017 Bonds</i>			
2017A Improvement Account /3	\$40,568,323.35	\$39,844,652.66	(\$723,670.69)
Allocated Bond Proceeds Account	\$1,314,643.27	\$1,384,823.23	\$70,179.96
Reserve Fund /4	\$41,906,024.43	\$42,136,874.89	\$230,850.46
Bond Fund /5	\$453,993.31	\$1,008,134.90	\$554,141.59
Costs of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<i>Series 2019 Bonds</i>			
Allocated Bond Proceeds Account /6	\$57,669,770.61	\$51,807,827.67	(\$5,861,942.94)
BART Improvement Account	\$756,470.38	\$728,698.09	(\$27,772.29)
Costs of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<i>Series 2020B Bonds</i>			
Allocated Bond Proceeds Account	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Costs of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<i>Series 2021B Bonds</i>			
Costs of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<i>Series 2022 Bonds</i>			
2022A Improvement Account	\$27,210,721.85	\$28,018,324.38	\$807,602.53
BART Improvement Account	\$1,784,837.61	\$1,862,281.31	\$77,443.70
2022 Reserve Fund	\$2,623,756.33	\$2,638,250.77	\$14,494.44
Costs of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Status of Project

Bond proceeds are being used to fund the costs of authorized facilities. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the CFD are shown in Section III of the report.

- /1 Represents capitalized interest.
/2 The balances shown above may include interest earnings.
/3 The 2017A Improvement Account is shared between the Series 2017 and 2019 Bonds.
/4 The Reserve Fund is shared between the Series 2017, 2019, 2020B, 2021B, and 2022B Bonds.
/5 The Bond Fund is shared between the Series 2017, 2019, 2020B, 2021B, and 2022 Bonds.
/6 The Allocated Bond Proceeds Account is shared between the Series 2019B, 2021B, and 2022B Bonds.

**Improvement Area No. 1 of the
City and County of San Francisco
CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)**

Bonds Collected and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 53411)

Original Sources and Uses of Bond Proceeds			
Bonds:	Series 2020	Series 2021	
Date of Issuance:	10/29/2020	8/12/2021	
Sources:			
Principal Amount of the Bonds	\$17,135,000.00	\$41,340,000.00	
Original Issue Premium/(Discount)	\$952,968.65	\$5,532,597.80	
Total	\$18,087,968.65	\$46,872,597.80	
Uses:			
Improvement Fund	\$15,755,163.30	\$39,422,585.32	
Debt Service Reserve Fund	\$1,310,780.35	\$3,183,697.48	
Capitalized Interest Account	\$0.00	\$3,307,200.00	
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$1,022,025.00	\$959,115.00	
Total	\$18,087,968.65	\$46,872,597.80	
Expenditures During Fiscal Year 2023-24 /1			
Fund	Balance 7/1/2023	Balance 6/30/2024	Difference
<i>Series 2020 Bonds</i>			
Improvement Fund	\$124,327.87	\$349,160.95	\$224,833.08
Debt Service Reserve Fund /2	\$4,549,071.26	\$4,573,719.48	\$24,648.22
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<i>Series 2021 Bonds</i>			
Improvement Fund	\$29,335.46	\$30,901.48	\$1,566.02
Capitalized Interest Account	\$786,514.70	\$14.09	(\$786,500.61)
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Status of Project			
Bond proceeds are being used to fund the costs of authorized facilities. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the CFD are shown in Section III of the report.			

/1 The balances shown above may include interest earnings.

/2 The Reserve Fund is shared between the Series 2020 and 2021 Bonds.

**Improvement Area No. 2 of the
City and County of San Francisco
CFD No. 2016-1 (Treasure Island)**

Bonds Collected and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 53411)

Original Sources and Uses of Bond Proceeds			
Bonds:	Series 2022A	Series 2023A /1	
Date of Issuance:	2/10/2022	12/21/2023	
Sources:			
Principal Amount of the Bonds	\$25,130,000.00	\$16,975,000.00	
Original Issue Premium/(Discount)	\$1,440,056.00	(\$83,434.45)	
Total	\$26,570,056.00	\$16,891,565.55	
Uses:			
Improvement Fund	\$23,111,929.33	\$14,495,927.27	
Reserve Fund	\$1,895,200.00	\$1,560,826.82	
Capitalized Interest Account	\$561,236.67	\$0.00	
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$1,001,690.00	\$834,811.46	
Total	\$26,570,056.00	\$16,891,565.55	
Expenditures During Fiscal Year 2023-24 /2			
Fund	Balance 7/1/2023	Balance 6/30/2024	Difference
<i>Series 2022A Bonds</i>			
Improvement Fund	\$84,814.98	\$154,780.66	\$69,965.68
Reserve Fund /3	\$1,918,216.34	\$3,542,077.77	\$1,623,861.43
Capitalized Interest Account	\$12.02	\$0.00	(\$12.02)
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<i>Series 2023A /1 Bonds /4</i>			
Improvement Fund	\$14,495,927.27	\$37,751.49	(\$14,458,175.78)
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$834,811.46	\$8,414.14	(\$826,397.32)
Status of Project			
Bond proceeds are being used to fund the costs of authorized facilities. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the CFD are shown in Section III of the report.			

/1 The sources and uses shown above for the Series 2023A Bonds does not include the Additional Special Tax Reserve Fund, which was funded by special taxes.

/2 The balances shown above may include interest earnings.

/3 The Reserve Fund is shared between the Series 2022A and 2023A Bonds.

/4 The initial balances are as of December 21, 2023, the date of issuance of the Series 2023A Bonds.

**City and County of San Francisco
Special Tax District No. 2020-1
(Mission Rock Facilities and Services)**

**Bonds Collected and Expended
(As Required by CA Govt. Code Section 53411)**

Original Sources and Uses of Bond Proceeds						
Bonds:	Series 2021A	Series 2021B	Series 2021C	Series 2023A	Series 2023B	Series 2023C
Date of Issuance:	5/27/2021	11/10/2021	11/10/2021	12/6/2023	12/6/2023	12/6/2023
Sources:						
Principal Amount of the Bonds	\$43,300,000.00	\$54,280,000.00	\$10,000,000.00	\$8,795,000.00	\$19,090,000.00	\$18,010,000.00
Original Issue Premium/(Discount)	\$5,014,631.15	\$0.00	\$1,066,400.00	(\$179,197.25)	(\$507,675.10)	(\$478,828.60)
Total	\$48,314,631.15	\$54,280,000.00	\$11,066,400.00	\$8,615,802.75	\$18,582,324.90	\$17,531,171.40
Uses:						
Project Fund	\$43,370,769.75	\$46,048,115.13	\$9,611,433.67	\$7,474,290.92	\$16,177,775.19	\$15,260,836.35
Debt Service Reserve	\$3,274,496.40	\$4,661,672.55	\$885,472.18	\$846,388.97	\$1,798,374.52	\$1,696,581.10
Capitalized Interest Account	\$0.00	\$2,234,051.46	\$323,333.33	--	--	--
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$1,669,365.00	\$1,336,160.86	\$246,160.82	\$295,122.86	\$606,175.19	\$573,753.95
Total	\$48,314,631.15	\$54,280,000.00	\$11,066,400.00	\$8,615,802.75	\$18,582,324.90	\$17,531,171.40
Expenditures During Fiscal Year 2023-24 /1						
Fund	Balance 7/1/2023	Balance 6/30/2024	Difference			
Series 2021A Bonds						
Project Fund	\$15,116.27	\$252,299.82	\$237,183.55			
Debt Service Reserve /2	\$4,284,685.80	\$4,233,857.91	(\$50,827.89)			
Cost of Issuance Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00			
Series 2021B Bonds						
Project Fund	\$60,132.82	\$376,098.63	\$315,965.81			
Debt Service Reserve	\$4,801,370.58	\$4,744,927.68	(\$56,442.90)			
Capitalized Interest	\$12.36	\$0.00	(\$12.36)			
Cost of Issuance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00			
Series 2021C Bonds						
Project Fund	\$27,162.38	\$71,794.19	\$44,631.81			
Capitalized Interest	\$1.80	\$0.00	(\$1.80)			
Cost of Issuance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00			
Series 2023A Bonds /3						
Project Fund	\$7,474,290.92	\$18,856.80	(\$7,455,434.12)			
Debt Service Reserve	\$846,388.97	\$861,202.51	\$14,813.54			
Cost of Issuance	\$295,122.86	\$0.00	(\$295,122.86)			
Series 2023B Bonds /3						
Project Fund	\$16,177,775.19	\$40,635.38	(\$16,137,139.81)			
Debt Service Reserve	\$1,798,374.52	\$1,829,849.76	\$31,475.24			
Cost of Issuance	\$606,175.19	\$0.00	(\$606,175.19)			
Series 2023C Bonds /3						
Project Fund	\$15,260,836.35	\$112,663.84	(\$15,148,172.51)			
Debt Service Reserve	\$1,696,581.10	\$1,726,274.75	\$29,693.65			
Cost of Issuance	\$573,753.95	\$0.00	(\$573,753.95)			
Status of Project						
Bond proceeds are being used to fund the costs of authorized facilities. Acquisition and construction of the authorized facilities is ongoing. Details of the status of projects required or authorized by the STD are shown in Section III of the report.						

/1 The balances shown above may include interest earnings.

/2 The Reserve Fund is shared between the Series 2021A and 2021C Bonds.

/3 Beginning balances as of December 6, 2023, the date of issuance of the Series 2023 Bonds.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: ISCOTT Hearing on Thurs 6/26/25 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 12:28:13 PM
Attachments: [ISCOTT_1595_Agenda.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached, from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), for the agenda for the June 26, 2025 meeting of the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT).

Regards,

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

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

From: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 12:02 PM
Cc: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thurs 6/26/25 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Hello,

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on [Thursday, June 26, 2025](#).

If you have any questions, please email us.

--

Nick Chapman

Manager, [SFMTA Special Events](#)

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

Pronouns: he/him, they/them





ISCOTT AGENDA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of June 26, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1595th Regular Meeting

Online Participation

Please join Microsoft Teams Meeting at
[SFMTA.com/ISCOTTHearing](https://sfmta.com/ISCOTTHearing)

Click on the Raise your hand icon . When you are prompted to unmute, click on the microphone icon  to speak.


Phone Participation

Please dial +1 415-523-2709,,397937701# [Find a local number](#)
Phone conference ID: 397 937 701#
Dial *5 to be placed in the queue for public comment. When prompted dial *6 to unmute yourself.

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

Written Participation

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

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



MINUTES OF THE JUNE 12, 2025, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)

The Committee to adopt the Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

- A. Laidley Street between Fairmount and Harper streets
Friday, July 4, 2025, 9 am to 4 pm
Block Party - Laidley 4th of July
- B. Alvarado Street between Castro and Noe streets
Sunday, September 7, 2025, 9 am to 5 pm
Block Party - 500 Alvarado Annual
- C. Granville Way between Ulloa and Claremont streets
Sunday, September 14, 2025, 3 pm to 6 pm
Block Party – Granville Way
- D. Beckett Street between Pacific Avenue and Jackson streets
Sunday, September 21, 2025, 8 am to 8 pm
Ghost Festival
- E. Joice Street between Clay and Sacramento streets
Saturday, August 2, 2025, 8 am to 9 pm
Cameron House Chinatown Family Fun Fest
- F. Grove Street between Larkin and Hyde streets
Thursday, June 26, 2025, 7 pm to
Monday, June 30, 2025, 6 am
San Francisco Pride Parade and Celebration [correction]



REGULAR CALENDAR

- G.** Valencia Street between Duboce Avenue and 26th Street
Intersections closed: Valencia Street at Clinton Park, Brosnan, 15th, Sparrow Alley, 17th, Clarion Alley, Sycamore, 19th, 20th, Liberty, 21st, Hill, 22nd, 23rd, and 25th
Sunday, July 20, 2025, 10 am to 5 pm
Sunday Streets Mission
- H.** Lane Street between Van Dyke and Thomas avenues; Thomas Avenue between 3rd and Lane streets; Underwood Avenue between 3rd and Keith streets
Intersection closed: Lane Street at Underwood and Thomas avenues
Sunday, August 24, 2025, 7 am to 7 pm
Sunday Streets Bayview
- I.** 45th Avenue between Wawona Street and Sloat Blvd
Thursday, August 21, 2025, 2 pm to
Friday, August 22, 2025, 1 am
UICC 50th Anniversary Gala
- J.** Grant Avenue between California and Clay streets; Walter U Lum Place between Washington and Clay streets; Commercial Street between Kearny Street and Grant Avenue
(Intersection of Grant Avenue at Sacramento to remain open.)
Saturday, August 23, 2025, 8 am to 10 pm
Hungry Ghost Festival 2025
- K.** Cortland Avenue between Bennington and Gates streets; Moultrie Street between Cortland and Eugenia avenues; Anderson Street between Eugenia and Jarboe avenues; Ellsworth Street between Cortland and Eugenia avenues
Intersections closed: Cortland Avenue at Wool, Andover, Moultrie, Anderson, and Ellsworth streets
Friday, October 31, 2025, 4:30 pm to 8:30 pm
Halloween on Cortland
- L.** Harrison Street between 10th and 13th streets; 11th Street between Folsom and Division streets; 12th Street between Bernice and Harrison streets
Intersections closed: Harrison Street at 12th, Norfolk, 11th streets
Saturday, October 18, 2025, 12 pm to 6 pm
Bearrison Street Fair



M. Grove Street between Larkin and Polk streets

Friday, August 1, 2025, 9 am to

Saturday, August 2, 2025, 2 am

and

Saturday, August 2, 2025, 9 am to

Sunday, August 3, 2025, 2 am

and

Sunday, August 3, 2025, 9 am to

Monday, August 4, 2025, 2 am

(Dead & Company)

Friday, August 8, 2025, 9 am to

Saturday, August 9, 2025, 2 am

and

Saturday, August 9, 2025, 9 am to

Sunday, August 10, 2025, 2 am

and

Sunday, August 10, 2025, 9 am to

Monday, August 11, 2025, 2 am

(Outside Lands)

Friday, August 15, 2025, 9 am to

Saturday, August 16, 2025, 2 am

(Golden Gate Park concert)

Shuttle Programs @ the Bill Graham Civic Auditorium

N. Harrington Street between Mission Street and approx. 150' west; Norton Street between Mission Street and approx. 150' west; 20 - Norton/Mission Lot

Friday, July 11, 2025, 1 pm to 11:59 pm

and

Saturday, August 2, 2025, 1 pm to 11:59 pm

and

Friday, September 12, 2025, 1 pm to 11:59 pm

and

Friday, October 10, 2025, 1 pm to 11:59 pm

and

Friday, November 7, 2025, 1 pm to 11:59 pm

and

Friday, December 12, 2025, 1 pm to 11:59 pm

Excelsior Night Market



- O.** Grant Avenue between Vallejo and Green streets; Green Street between Columbus Avenue and Jasper Place
(Intersection of Grant Avenue and Green Street to remain open)
Friday, July 4, 2025, 2 pm to
Saturday, July 5, 2025, 2 am
July 4th Block Party
- P.** Grant Avenue between Vallejo and Filbert streets
(Intersections of Grant at Union and at Green to remain open)
Saturday, July 12, 2025, 10 am to 11:59 pm
and
Saturday, August 9, 2025, 10 am to 11:59 pm
and
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 6 am to 6 pm
and
Saturday, October 25, 2025, 12 pm to
Sunday, October 26, 2025, 2 am
and
Friday, December 5, 2025, 12 pm to
Saturday, December 6, 2025, 2 am
North Beach Night Markets
- Q.** Folsom Street between 9th and 11th Streets; 10th Street between Howard and Harrison streets; Dore Street between Howard and southerly terminus; Sheridan Street between 9th and 10th Streets (local access allowed); Juniper Street between Folsom Street and southerly terminus (local access allowed)
Intersections closed: Folsom St at 10th and at Dore streets
Sunday, July 27, 2025, 12:01 am to 11:59 pm
Up Your Alley Street Fair
- R.** Folsom Street between 7th and 13th streets; 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th streets between Howard and Harrison streets; Dore Street between Howard Street and terminus; and all alleys and intersections bounded by 7th, Howard, 13th, and Harrison streets
Saturday, September 27, 2025, 5 pm to
Monday, September 29, 2025, 2 am
Folsom Street Fair



- S. Hayes Street between Gough and Octavia streets; Linden Street between Gough and Octavia streets; Octavia Street between Hayes and Fell streets
Intersection closed: Linden Street at Octavia Street
Sunday, October 12, 2025, 6 am to 7 pm
Head West Marketplace
- T. Valencia Street between 22nd and 23rd streets
Thursday, July 10, 2025, 12 pm to 10 pm
Bigface x Square Pop-up
- U. Maiden Lane between Stockton Street and Grant Avenue
Friday, July 18, 2025, through
Wednesday, December 31, 2025,
11 am to 3 pm, each Tuesday through Thursday
and
Maiden Lane between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street
Friday, July 18, 2025, through
Sunday, December 28, 2025,
11 am to 6 pm, each Friday through Sunday
Union Square Alliance Maiden Lane Activations

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

Forrest Chamberlain
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Date



ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

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

NONE

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)

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

- V.** Commercial Street from 107-feet to 147-feet west of Sansome Street
 Wednesday, August 6, 2025, through
 Wednesday, August 5, 2026
 7 am to 11 pm, daily
 Heartwood - Shared Space

- W.** Commercial Street between Sansome and Montgomery streets; Leidesdorff
 Street between Sacramento and Clay streets;
 Intersection closed: Commercial at Leidesdorff streets
 Wednesday, August 6, 2025, through
 Wednesday, August 5, 2026
 7 am to 10 pm, daily
 Downtown SF - Shared Space



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

Sound Producing Devices

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

Disability Access

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

Know Your Rights under the Sunshine Ordinance

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

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

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

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

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: Approved Request to Waive 12B Requirements
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:35:45 AM
Attachments: [CMD12B0004394.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached for approved request to wave 12B requirements.

Requester: Alejandro Garcia

Department: DPH

Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Supplier ID: 0000025056

Requested total cost: \$5,000,000.00

Short Description: Arup Laboratories testing and diagnostics.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte

Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Voice (415) 554-7709 | 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.*

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2025-06-26 09:22:30 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004394	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Alejandro Garcia	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2025-06-17 16:10:29	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 206-7456
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Alejandro Garcia
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Arup Laboratories testing and diagnostics.

Supplier ID:	0000025056	Requested Amount:	\$5,000,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$5,000,000.00
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000036265
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21A GPO (DPH Only)	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-06-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2030-05-31

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false
Professional and General Services:	true
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false
Vehicles and Trailers:	false

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

- (a) ARUP LABORATORIES INC
- (b) NATIONAL COMMERCIAL REFERENCE LAB TESTING FOR ZSFGH CLINICAL LABORATORY TESTING OF BLOOD,BODY FLUIDS AND TISSUES INTENDED FOR MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS.SERVICE IS REQUIRED FOR LABORATORY TESTS NECESSARY FOR PATIENT CARE
- (c) SFDPH is using suppliers found though the group purchasing authority and ARUP is the only service supplier providing this laboratory testing of serology.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Supplier is pending compliance; in hte interim, we are seeking a waiver to provide laboratory services related to serology testing and HIV markers.

- Anatomic Pathology
- Chemistry & Toxicology
- Genetics
- Hematopathology
- Hemostasis
- Immunology
- Infectious Disease
- Oncology
- Pediatrics
- Women's Health

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Regina Chan
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
CMD Analyst Comments:	NATIONAL COMMERCIAL REFERENCE LAB TESTING FOR ZSFGH CLINICAL LABORATORY TESTING OF BLOOD,BODY FLUIDS AND TISSUES INTENDED FOR MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS.SERVICE IS REQUIRED FOR LABORATORY TESTS NECESSARY FOR PATIENT CARE - Anatomic Pathology, Chemistry & Toxicology, Genetics, Hematopathology, Hemostasis, Immunolgy, Infectious Diseease, Oncology, Pediatrics and Women's Health.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved
Reason for Determination:			
Approved under 12B.5-1(d)(2) authority			

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Sole Source – Non Property Contract
Justification Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract
Justification Reason:

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non
Property Contract Justification
Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)
Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water:	false
Bulk Power:	false
Bulk Gas:	false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)

(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.

(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)

(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.

(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

To fulfill the Board's desire to obtain the cost savings from using a GPO, pursuant to Chapter 21A.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

Arup Laboratories is a supplier through bulk purchasing/GPO/Vizient so SFDPH is using suppliers found through this purchasing authority.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

The purpose of Chapter 12B is to ensure equal access to benefits, including health benefits, regardless of one's protected category. The use of a GPO ensures DPH can access the goods and services it needs to provide healthcare to SF residents in a cost-effective and reliable manner, thereby increasing their access to healthcare regardless of their status. In this regard, the use of this Vizient contractor is aligned with the intent of Chapter 12B.

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004394
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	2025-06-17 16:29:00		

Related List Title: Metric List**Table name:** metric_instance**Query Condition:** Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 423299442b5aa2506469ff10de91bf81**Sort Order:** None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-06-17 16:10:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Draft	2025-06-17 16:10:30	2025-06-17 16:29:00	18 Minutes	true
2025-06-17 16:29:01	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Draft	2025-06-17 16:29:00	2025-06-24 10:59:55	6 Days 18 Hours 30 Minutes	true
2025-06-24 12:20:31	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-06-24 12:20:26	2025-06-24 20:00:20	7 Hours 39 Minutes	true
2025-06-17 16:29:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Dept. Head approval	2025-06-17 16:29:00	2025-06-17 16:29:00	0 Seconds	true
2025-06-24 20:00:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Completed	2025-06-24 20:00:20			false
2025-06-24 10:59:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-06-24 10:59:55	2025-06-24 12:20:26	1 Hour 20 Minutes	true
2025-06-24 20:00:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Completed	2025-06-24 20:00:20			false
2025-06-17 16:10:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Draft	2025-06-17 16:10:30	2025-06-17 16:29:00	18 Minutes	true
2025-06-17 16:29:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Dept. Head approval	2025-06-17 16:29:00	2025-06-17 16:29:00	0 Seconds	true
2025-06-24 10:59:56	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-06-24 10:59:55	2025-06-24 12:20:26	1 Hour 20 Minutes	true
2025-06-17 16:29:01	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Draft	2025-06-17 16:29:00	2025-06-24 10:59:55	6 Days 18 Hours 30 Minutes	true
2025-06-24 12:20:31	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004394	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-06-24 12:20:26	2025-06-24 20:00:20	7 Hours 39 Minutes	true

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: Grant Budget Revision Notification
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:51:49 AM
Attachments: [Grant Budget Revision Notification_6.25.25.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170(H), submitting notification of a California State grant line-item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval regarding the 2023 Organized Retail Theft Grant.

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
bos@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: Yeung, Fannie (POL) <fannie.w.yeung@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:41 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Li, Lily (CON) <lily.li@sfgov.org>
Subject: Grant Budget Revision Notification

Please see the attached notification for a State grant line-item budget revision in excess of 15%.

Thank you,

Fannie Yeung
San Francisco Police Department
Grants Manager, Fiscal Division
1245 3rd Street, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158
Tel: (415) 837-7212



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEADQUARTERS
1245 3RD Street
San Francisco, California 94158



WILLIAM SCOTT
CHIEF OF POLICE

DATE: June 25, 2025

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

CC: Lily Li, Controller's Office AOSD

FROM: Fannie Yeung, Grants Manager, SFPD

SUBJECT: Grant Budget Revision
2023 Organized Retail Theft Grant (Project 10040584)

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify the Board of Supervisors of a State grant line-item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

Attached is a copy of budget revision documentation submitted to the funding agency.

Please mark an "X" in the green cell to indicate which type of budget modification you want to select.

<div></div>	Line-Item Change <i>Select this option if you are modifying narrative details within a line item (or line items) but not changing the budget.</i>	<div>X</div>	Budget Modification <i>Select this option if you are modifying line-item dollar amounts by moving funds from one line-item to another.</i>	<div></div>	Project Income Allocation <i>Select this option if you are allocating earned project income.</i>
-------------	---	--------------	--	-------------	--

Important Note: You must provide a detailed justification for all modification requests. All modifications require BSCC Field Representative approval.

Grantee:	San Francisco PD	Grant Program:	Organized Retail Theft Prevention Grant
Address			

Contract #:	1170-23	Modification Request #	3
Term:	10/1/23 Term: 6/1/27	Effective on Invoice #	7

Line Items	Current Budget	Available Budget	Changes (+/-)	Modified Budget
Salaries & Benefits	\$ 8,288,400	\$ 7,417,383	\$ (2,200,000)	\$ 6,088,400
Services & Supplies	\$ 174,326	\$ 134,788	\$ -	\$ 174,326
Professional Services or Public Agencies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
NGO Subcontracts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Data Collection and Evaluation	\$ 500,000	\$ 441,700	\$ -	\$ 500,000
Equipment / Fixed Assets	\$ 5,928,690	\$ 4,393,690	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 8,128,690
Financial Audit (Up to \$25,000)	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000
Other (Travel, Training, etc.)	\$ 159,885	\$ 140,906	\$ -	\$ 159,885
Indirect Costs	\$ 250,000	\$ 208,171	\$ -	\$ 250,000
TOTAL	\$ 15,326,301	\$ 12,761,638	\$ -	\$ 15,326,301

JUSTIFICATION FOR MODIFICATION (leave field blank if no changes to that line item)	
Salaries & Benefits:	Reallocate \$2,200,000 in overtime savings from Q1 through Q6 for Union Square Uniformed Foot Beat High Visibility Patrol and Blitz Operations to Equipment/Fixed Assets line item for public safety technologies.
Services & Supplies:	
Professional Services:	
NGO Subcontracts:	
Equipment / Fixed Assets:	Reallocate a total of \$2,200,000 from overtime savings to the following: 1. Cellebrite Suite (\$1,500,000) - the suite will include a) Cellebrite Inseeyets: automatically extracts all data from smartphones, tablets, and cloud accounts including texts, call logs, photos, videos, app data in a standardized format; b) Cellebrite Guardian: provides a single, secure, cloud-based portal for storing, organizing, and sharing both physical and digital evidence. Every extracted file is cataloged with a full chain-of-custody audit trail, enabling investigators, analysts, and prosecutors to access and collaborate on evidence without manual file transfers; c) Cellebrite Pathfinder: uses built-in AI and pattern-recognition to analyze text messages, images, call logs, and other digital data, automatically surfacing names, locations, and links across multiple devices. Deployed at the Department's Real Time Investigations Center (RTIC), Pathfinder can begin processing each new extraction immediately, revealing connections instantaneously, enabling investigators to link suspects and criminal events in near real time. 2. PenLink PLX Expansion (\$161,000) - pulls in raw call logs and social-media data. In an organized retail theft investigation, we can map a theft ring's communications network. It automatically organizes messages by contact, flags repeated connections, plots location pings on a map to pinpoint drop-off or meet-up spots, and creates timeline views showing exactly when a suspect's device was near a crime scene. Investigators can export reports directly from PLX to share with prosecutors. By expanding from seven to ten licenses, everyone on the ORT task force can run the application at the same time, rather than waiting for an open seat in the system. 3. GrayKey (\$49,000) - decryption tool for locked phones. Expanding our licenses will allow our crime lab to access more electronic devices, increasing the speed for which we can utilize this critical evidence in investigations. Without it, we end up with a backlog and are unable to dump all phones. With GrayKey, we can cut extraction times so we're not sitting on locked phones. That means we can prioritize serious organized retail theft cases like fence operators or organized-theft ringleaders to get evidence in hand and follow leads. 4. Drone as First Responder (DFR) Program Infrastructure Installation (\$450,000) - to support installation of drone docks at 10 to 12 strategic rooftops across San Francisco as part of our DFR expansion. This initiative is aimed at deploying drones within 90 to 120 seconds to high-priority incidents including ORT and related crimes in retail corridors such as Union Square. The installation scope includes site improvements including labor and material to bring electrical connections to rooftops, power management systems, internet connections and antennas for piloting from the Real Time Investigation Center, and protective platform construction to safeguard rooftops and provide a stable base for drone docks. Information technology infrastructure costs are approximately \$120,000, and site improvement costs are estimated to be \$330,000. Once live, a remotely piloted drone can be over reported theft or related incidents in under two minutes, streaming real time video to investigators and patrol officers, helping contain suspects and protect evidence. 5. High Speed ALRP Camera Upgrades for Bay Bridge Deployment (\$40,000) - four high-speed ALPRs over two years to complement existing high-speed ALPRs on the Bay Bridge to help detect suspect vehicles.
Project Evaluation & Data Collection:	
Other (include travel costs):	
Indirect Costs:	

PERSON PREPARING REPORT

Fannie Yeung, Grants Manager
Name, Title
415-837-7212
Phone
fannie.yeung@sfgov.org
Email
6/23/25
Date

AUTHORIZED FINANCIAL OFFICER

I hereby certify that I am the authorized financial officer of the herein named agency. I further certify that I have not violated any of the provisions of Section 1090 of the Government Code in incurring the expenditures reported in this invoice, nor in any other way; that Sections 1090 through 1096 of the Government Code will not be violated in any way in the expenditure of funds pursuant to this invoice; that statement of funds above is true, correct, and in accordance with program provisions in all respects; and that all expenditures submitted after the expiration date of this contract are for the purpose of substantiating obligations legally incurred during the contract period. Furthermore, by submitting this invoice, I acknowledge that it must adhere to all of the requirements in the BSCC Grant Administration Guide, including any updates to the Guide during the term of the grant agreement.

Kimmie Wu, Chief Financial Officer
Name, Title
415-837-7213
Phone
6/23/25
Date

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: July 2, 2025 - Advisory Committee of Street Artist and Crafts Examiners Agenda
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:16:05 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-Logo](#) [Desc.png](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting an agenda for the July 2, 2025, Advisory Committee of Street Artists and Crafts Examiners meeting.

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
bos@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: Sun, Kingsley (ART) <kingsley.sun@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 9:59 AM
Subject: July 2, 2025 - Advisory Committee of Street Artist and Crafts Examiners Agenda

Greetings,

The agenda for July 2,
 2025 Advisory Committee of Street Artists and Crafts Examiners meeting has been

posted to sf.gov:

<https://www.sf.gov/meeting--jul-2-2025--advisory-committee-street-artists-and-crafts-examiners-hybrid>

Thanks,
Kingsley



Kingsley Sun
Program Associate
Pronouns: [he/him](#)
Email: kingsley.sun@sfgov.org
Office: 415-252-2228
Mobile: 415-310-8832

San Francisco Arts Commission

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

www.sfartscommission.org

[Newsletter](#) | [Flickr](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [TikTok](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

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

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

From: [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: HSH's Annual Sole Source Contracts Report Submission (FY2024-25)
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:24:41 PM
Attachments: [HSH Sole Source Contract Report FY2024-25 FINAL.pdf](#)
[Outlook-mmkozia.png](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 21.G.8, submitting Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025.

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

bos@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: Robinson, Davares (HOM) <davares.robinson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 10:55 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>
Subject: HSH's Annual Sole Source Contracts Report Submission (FY2024-25)

Good morning,

I hope this email finds you in good health. Pursuant to *Administrative Code Section 21.G.8*, I am submitting HSH's Annual Sole Source Contracts Report for fiscal year 2024-25 (attached). Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,



Davares Robinson, MA

Sunshine & Compliance Officer

San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

davares.robinson@sfgov.org | Office Phone: (628) 652-7745

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.



Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

From: Shireen McSpadden
Executive Director
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Date: June 23, 2025

Subject: Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Sole Source Contracts for FY 2024-25

Annual report to the Board of Supervisors for the Department's sole source contracts for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 in compliance with the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance as codified in Admin Code Sec. 67.24(e).

FY 2024-25 New Sole Source Contracts: HSH entered into 2 new sole source contracts with Bitfocus, Inc.

Provider	Program	Term Start Date	Term End Date	Procurement	Not to Exceed
Bitfocus, Inc.	Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)/ONE System/SaaS Licensing	4/1/2025	6/30/2030	Sole Source (Admin Code 21.30)	\$4,020,940
Bitfocus, Inc.	System Administration Services	4/1/2025	6/30/2030	Sole Source (Admin Code 21.30)	\$9,712,068

FY 2024-25 Closed Sole Source Contracts: HSH closed 1 sole source contract with RTZ Associates, Inc., which provided a bed tracking system for emergency shelter sites opened during the COVID-19 response. HSH closed this contract on 12/31/24, prior to the contract term end date of 6/30/25.

Provider	Program	Term Start Date	Term End Date	Procurement	Not to Exceed
RTZ Associates, Inc.	SIP Bed Tracking	4/1/2022	6/30/2025	Sole Source (Admin Code 21.30)	\$514,800

FY 2024-25 Renewed Sole Source Contracts: HSH did not renew or continue operations for any previously existing sole source contract.

Note: In April 2019, the Board of Supervisors unanimously passed an ordinance to streamline contracting for homeless services and siting for homeless shelters (Ordinance 61-19; San Francisco Administrative Code Section 21B). In March 2024, Ordinance No. 38-24 was adopted that extended the streamlined contracting authorities under Administrative Code 21B for an additional five years through May 5, 2029. In February 2025, Ordinance No. 10-25 was adopted that expanded the expedited approval and procurement process

for contracts and leases entered into under the amended Administrative Code Chapter 21B. Agreements entered into under this provision will be reported to the Board of Supervisors in the Streamlined Contracting Quarterly Report, as required by the amended Administrative Code, and not included in this report.



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: 21B Waiver Notification - Contract - First Place for Youth
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:33:15 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-531tewig.png](#)
[First Place for Youth - TAY Rapid Rehousing - Chapter 21B Justification - DocuSigned.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive House (HSH), pursuant to Ordinance No. 10-25, submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, waiver notification.

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
bos@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: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 11:43 AM
To: Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; OCA (ADM) <oca@sfgov.org>; Macaulay, Devin (CON) <devin.macaulay@sfgov.org>; Yuan, Jane (CON) <jane.yuan@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>; Pan, Eufern (MYR) <eufern.pan@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Whitley, Gigi (HOM) <gigi.whitley@sfgov.org>; Velasquez, Edilyn

(HOM) <edilyn.velasquez@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>; Gil, Hailey (HOM) <hailey.gil@sfgov.org>

Subject: 21B Waiver Notification - Contract - First Place for Youth

Good morning Aly,

Please find attached written notice for a waiver of Chapter 21B (authorized under Ordinance No. 010-25) for HSH to enter into a new grant agreement with First Place for Youth for the administration of 48 rapid rehousing subsidies for young adults.

The administration of rapid rehousing subsidies for young adults is a project addressing homelessness, part of the Core Initiative of addressing homelessness.

Thank you,
Dylan



Dylan Schneider, MPA (She/Hers)

Manager of Legislative Affairs

San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

dylan.schneider@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: hsh.sfgov.org | Follow: [@SF_HSH](https://twitter.com/SF_HSH) | Like: [@SanFranciscoHSH](https://twitter.com/SanFranciscoHSH)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the Personal Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.



DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING



Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Department & Agreement Information (*required)

Department Name*: Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

Agreement Type*: Grant

Department Contact Name*: Gigi Whitley

Department Contact Phone #*: 415-699-4203

Department Contact Email*: Gigi.Whitley@sfgov.org

For Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders:

Contract/Req/PO PeopleSoft ID#: 1000035588

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: \$8,298,502

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 7/1/2025

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 6/30/2029

Supplier ID: 0000020151

Supplier Name: First Place for Youth

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*:

First Place for Youth (FPFY) has provided Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) case management services for Transitional Age Youth (TAY) since 2019 through the Rising Up initiative—a public-private partnership between the City and five nonprofit organizations. The initiative has supported over 500 youths and expanded TAY access to the private rental market. As of July 1, 2025, the private funding supporting case management will sunset, and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) will assume funding for the continuation of these case management services. FPFY will provide housing focused case management for 32 youth and continue partnering with Brilliant Corners for the administration housing location, landlord liaison, subsidy administration and housing coordination services.

This new agreement also supports the administration of 48 new TAY RRH subsidies. The RRH program provides time-limited housing subsidies to support placements in the private rental market. Participating households receive a range of services including housing location and coordination, landlord liaison support, subsidy administration, housing-focused case management, and workforce development.

This agreement is funded through Our City, Our Home and serves TAY households experiencing homelessness, ages 18 to 24, and those ages 25 to 29 who have been part of the homelessness response system (HRS) as TAY and do not have custody of minor children.

Core Initiative Information

This lease or contract is a “Core Initiative Lease” or a “Core Initiative Contract” per [Administrative Code Section 21B.2](#) because it is a “Project Addressing _____”:

- ☒ **Homelessness**, defined as “projects designed to prevent homelessness through the provision of housing subsidies or other services, and projects designed to provide shelter, housing, food, and/or social services to people experiencing homelessness.”

Describe why the contract or lease is necessary to support the Core Initiative(s) selected above:

New Agreement/Contract Amendment: *(First Place for Youth - TAY Rapid Rehousing):*

440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

628.652.7700
sf.gov/HSH



DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELESSNESS AND
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING



Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

This new agreement adds capacity to the homelessness response system by providing time-limited housing subsidies and supportive services to TAY households. TAY Rapid Rehousing provides medium term RRH to TAY. The goals of these services are to reduce the length of time participants spend experiencing homelessness, support the served population in retaining their housing and exiting to rent stability.

Funded through Our City, Our Home fund, the FFPY for TAY RRH grant was awarded through a competitive Solicitation of Interest and aligns with the San Francisco's Home by the Bay plan by advancing targeted strategies to support TAY in securing and maintaining stable housing. This grant supports the continued operation of Rising Up services and expands the TAY RRH program, including services for additional youth.

Signature

Shireen McSpadden

Department Head or Designee Name

DocuSigned by:

Shireen McSpadden
Signature

6/13/2025

Select date

Date

440 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

628.652.7700
sf.gov/HSN

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: Notice of Revised Proposed Regulatory Language - Commercial Take of Market Squid
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:48:08 PM
Attachments: [Market Squid Revised Proposed Reg Text.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of revised proposed regulatory language concerning commercial take of market squid.

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

bos@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: California Fish and Game Commission <fgc@public.govdelivery.com>

Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 10:46 AM

To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Notice of Revised Proposed Regulatory Language - Commercial Take of Market Squid

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

[View as a webpage / share](#)



California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Revised Proposed Regulatory Language

Greetings,

A notice of revised proposed regulatory language concerning commercial take of market squid has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at:
<https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#149>

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
California Fish and Game Commission

[Click here to visit our regulations page](#)

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

[Sign Up](#)

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

[California Fish and Game Commission](#)
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Help](#)

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Proposed Regulatory Language

Section 53.01, Title 14, CCR, is amended to read:

§ 53.01 Definitions.

- (a) *Brail gear, dip nets or scoop nets* means any net attached to a rigid frame operated by hand or mechanical device deployed from the vessel to scoop fish or invertebrates.
- (b) *Daily trip limit* means a routine management measure which may be used to limit take of squid on a per-vessel basis within a calendar day.
- (c) *Drum seine* means a purse seine net which is stored, deployed and retrieved with the aid of a mechanized drum (reel) mounted on the stern of the vessel.
- (d) *Egg escapement* means the number or proportion of a female squid's lifetime supply of eggs that she is able to deposit, on average, before being taken in the fishery.
- (e) *Egg escapement method* means a management tool which may be used to determine whether the fleet is fishing above or below a predetermined sustainable level of exploitation. The method requires establishing a threshold value to ensure that an adequate number of eggs are deposited prior to harvest.
- (f) *Fishing year or fishing season* under the Market Squid FMP means the period April 1 through March 31.
- (g) *Fishery Control Rules* means specific management strategies such as seasonal catch limits, daily trip limits, area closures, time closures, and sustainable levels of egg escapement which provide for a sustainable market squid fishery.
- (h) *Fleet capacity goal* means an optimal number of vessels where the number of vessels matches the available squid resource.
- (i) *Forage* means the role of market squid in the food chain as a critical source of food for higher predators, including birds, fish and marine mammals.
- (j) *Lampara* means a rectangular net constructed with graduated mesh sizes, a definite bunt (bag), and fitted with floats. It is laid out by the fishing vessel in a circle and closed at least partially on the bottom by pulling the headline in advance of the float line.
- (k) *Light boat* means a vessel engaged in the commercial taking or attempting to take market squid which uses bright lights to aggregate squid for commercial purposes including live bait.
- (l) *Market squid* means *Doryteuthis opalescens*.
- ~~(m) *Market Squid Fishery Management Plan (Market Squid FMP)* means Chapters 1 through 5 of the Market Squid Fishery Management Plan approved by the Commission on August 27, 2004, hereby incorporated by reference.~~

~~(n)-(m)~~ National Marine Fisheries Service, NMFS or NOAA Fisheries means the federal fisheries management agency which is contained in the United States Department of Commerce.

~~(o)-(n)~~ Overfished is defined at Fish and Game Code Section 97.5, and in the Market Squid FMP also means a condition that may exist when either the egg escapement threshold is not met, or catches of squid exceed any specified allowable level.

~~(p)-(o)~~ Overfishing is defined at Fish and Game Code Section 98, and in the Market Squid FMP also may mean that harvests of squid are occurring at times when either the egg escapement threshold is not being met, or catches are exceeding specified allowable levels. These catches may not be sustainable.

~~(q)-(p)~~ PFMC or Council means the Pacific Fishery Management Council established pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

~~(r)-(q)~~ Point of concern means one or more of the following conditions affecting market squid that, if found or are expected to exist, may trigger the application or adjustment of one or more management measures by the commission:

- (1) Catch is projected to significantly exceed the current seasonal catch limitation.
- (2) Any adverse or significant change in the biological characteristics of the market squid (age composition, size composition, age at maturity, or recruitment) is discovered.
- (3) An overfished condition exists or is imminent (defined as when the egg-escapement method threshold is not realized in two consecutive years).
- (4) Any adverse or significant change in the availability of market squid as forage or in the status of a dependent species is discovered.
- (5) An error in data or a change to an indicator of stock status is detected that requires adjustment to fishery control rules to ensure sustainable resource management.

~~(s)-(r)~~ Points of concern process means a process authorizing the commission to apply or adjust fishery management measures at any time during the year based on the confirmation of the existence of one or more resource-based points of concern identified in a fishery management plan pursuant subsection 50.03(a), Title 14, CCR.

~~(t)-(s)~~ Purse seine means a rectangular net constructed with uniform mesh sizes, without a prominent bunt (bag), and fitted with floats. It is laid out with the end attached to a skiff while the deploying vessel encircles the squid. The end of the net is then brought up to the deploying vessel and is closed ~~on~~ near the bottom by pulling a purse line (draw string) threaded through rings along the leadline, preventing the catch from escaping. Purse seines used to take market squid or onboard vessels in possession of market squid are fitted with a rib line.

(t) *Rib line* means a separate line made of soft rope or other non-metallic line that is a minimum of 36 inches above the leadline on a purse seine net. The rib line must encompass the purse seine net within 60 feet of both ends of the net.

(u) *Round haul vessels* mean those that employ the use of lampara, purse seine, and drum seine net gear to commercially harvest squid.

(v) *Seasonal catch ~~limitation~~ limit* means an amount of allowable catch which may be taken within a designated geographic area in a fishing season, specified in short tons and excluding discard mortality. The attainment (or expected attainment) of this limit will cause closure of the directed commercial fishery as specified in regulation.

(w) *Tons* means short tons, and is the standard unit of weight for purposes of describing catches and limits for the market squid fishery, notwithstanding subsection 50.00(c), Title 14, CCR.

(x) *Vessel capacity* means the gross registered tonnage, as listed on a federal Coastal Pelagic Species permit or calculated from length, breadth and depth measurements provided on United States Coast Guard documentation papers.

(y) *Weekend closures* mean a routine management measure which may be used to prohibit take of market squid during certain days of a week.

(z) Definitions contained in Chapter 1, and Article 1 of Chapter 5.5, of Subdivision 1, Division 1, Title 14, CCR, and Chapters 1 and 2 of Division 0.5 of the Fish and Game Code apply to the market squid fishery in addition to definitions of this Section.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 7071, 7078 and 8425, Fish and Game Code. Reference: Sections 7071, 7075, 7078, 7083, 7086, 8420 and 8425, Fish and Game Code.

Proposed Regulatory Language

Section 53.02, Title 14, CCR, is repealed:

~~§ 53.02. Process and Timing.~~

~~(a) Management of market squid stocks will conform to the goals, objectives, criteria, procedures, and Fishery Control Rule guidelines of the Market Squid FMP, and other applicable state and federal laws and regulations.—~~

~~(b) Periodic monitoring and assessment of squid fisheries will be conducted, and, at a minimum, will include the collection and review of reported catches. The department will provide management recommendations to the commission as needed, and in-season if a need is identified.—~~

~~(c) The director may establish and appoint members to an advisory committee to assist the department with development and review of fishery assessments, management options and proposals, and plan amendments.—~~

~~(d) Management measures and actions may be developed, considered, and adopted in compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act and implemented at any time of year to achieve management plan goals and objectives, and may apply to any or all management areas, or portions of management areas at the discretion of the commission.—~~

~~NOTE: Authority cited: Section 7071, 7078 and 8425, Fish and Game Code.—~~

~~Reference: Sections 7071, 7075, 7083, 7652, 8420 and 8425, Fish and Game Code.—~~

Proposed Regulatory Language

Section 53.03, Title 14, CCR, is repealed:

~~§ 53.03. Market Squid Fishery Management Plan (Market Squid FMP) Project.—~~

~~(a) The Department's Recommended Proposed Project in the Market Squid FMP involves a combination of limitations on total harvest, regulation on the use of squid fishing gear (including lights), use of time closures to allow for periods of uninterrupted spawning, restricted access and other limits on the commercial fleet capacity, mechanisms to allow for adequate squid escapement, and area closures designed to minimize impact to sensitive non-target species and habitat. These management measures described in the Market Squid FMP will be utilized in managing the squid fishery toward meeting goals and objectives of the Market Squid FMP.—~~

~~(b) Other management measures as described in the Market Squid FMP, including but not limited to vessel trip limits, squid replenishment areas, seasonal closures, and marine protected areas may be used as needed to achieve the goals and objectives of the Market Squid FMP.—~~

~~(c) A fishery management measure may be adopted by the commission instead of, or in addition to, measures included in the adopted Market Squid FMP Project where specified in statute or state or federal regulation.—~~

~~(d) Consistent with the goals of the Restricted Access program, the Commission established a sixth permit class for Non-Transferable Market Squid Light Boat Permits in addition to the original five permit classes and an experimental permit class identified in the discussion of the program in the Market Squid Fishery Plan.—~~

~~NOTE: Authority cited: Section 7071, 7078 and 8425, Fish and Game Code.—~~

~~Reference: Sections 7071, 7075, 7082, 7083, 8420 and 8425, Fish and Game Code.—~~

Revised Proposed Regulatory Language

Section 149, Title 14, CCR, is amended to read:

§ 149. Commercial ~~Taking-Take~~ of Market Squid.

Requirements of this Section apply both to vessels taking squid and to vessels attracting squid with lights for the purpose of commercial take. Incidental commercial take of market squid that meets the criteria specified in subsection ~~(l)-(m)~~ below, and commercial take of market squid for live bait as described in subsection ~~(m)-(n)~~ below are not subject to the requirements of this Section, unless expressly specified.

(a) Permit Required. No person shall take, land, or attract squid by light for commercial purposes, except as provided in subsections (a)(1), ~~(l)~~ and (m), and (n) below, unless the owner of that vessel has a valid market squid permit issued pursuant to Section 149.1 of these regulations for use on that vessel that has not been suspended or revoked.

(1) A market squid permit is not required for the seine skiff of a permitted vessel. For the purposes of this section, a seine skiff is a vessel that does not use lights to attract squid and its primary purpose is to assist the deployment of a net for a permitted vessel.

(b) Seasonal Catch ~~Limitation~~-Limit.

(1) For the period from April 1 through March 31 of the following year, a total of not more than 118,000 short tons of market squid may be taken statewide for commercial purposes.

(2) Closure Process

(A) The department shall estimate, from the current trend in landings, when the Seasonal Catch Limit will be reached, and will publicly announce the effective date of closure of the directed commercial fishery on the department's website at: wildlife.ca.gov/marine. ~~VHF/channel 16 between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 12:00 a.m. (midnight).~~

(B) It shall be the responsibility of all operators of permitted market squid vessels to monitor ~~VHF/channel 16~~ the department's website at: wildlife.ca.gov/marine to determine when the Seasonal Catch Limit is expected to be reached and the fishery closed. Any announcement issued or made by the department on ~~VHF/channel 16~~ its website shall constitute official notice.

(c) Time Closures. North of a westerly extension of the United States — Republic of Mexico boundary line:

(1) Fishing Days: Market squid may not be taken for commercial purposes ~~between 1200 from 0700 hours (noon) on Friday and through 1200 hours (noon) on Sunday of each week, except between a line due west from Point Lobos (36° 31.461'~~

North Latitude) and a line due west from Pigeon Point (37° 11.000' North Latitude) where market squid may not be taken for commercial purposes from 0700 hours on Friday through 2359 hours on Sunday of each week.

(2) Seasonal Closure: When the Seasonal Catch Limit defined in subsection (b) has been reached and the commercial fishery is closed, squid may be taken for commercial purposes only incidentally to the take of other target species and subject to the limitations defined in subsection ~~149(l)~~ (m) below or for live bait as defined in subsection ~~149(m)~~ (n) below through March 31.

(d) Closed Areas for Seabirds. Market squid may not be taken for commercial purposes utilizing attracting lights in ~~all waters that portion of the Gulf of the Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary. Boundaries of the Sanctuary are that was previously defined as the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary with boundaries~~ defined as those in effect on August 27, 2004, pursuant to Title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 922, Subpart H. This regulation also applies to vessels pursuing squid for live bait purposes.

(e) Records. Pursuant to Section 190 of these regulations, any operator of a commercial market squid vessel, or person who possesses a valid Market Squid Vessel Permit, Market Squid Brail Permit, or Market Squid Light Boat Permit shall complete and submit an accurate record of ~~his/her~~ their squid fishing, lighting, or brailing activities on a form (Market Squid Vessel Logbook — DFW 149a (Rev. 05/01/15), or Market Squid Light/ Brail Boat Logbook — DFW 149b (Rev. 05/01/15), which are located in Appendix A of Subdivision 1 of Division 1 of Title 14, CCR) provided by the department, as appropriate to the type of fishing activity. Logbook records shall be transmitted to the department on or before the 10th day of each month following the month that fishing activity occurred.

(f) Rib Line. After December 31, 2030, it is unlawful to take market squid for commercial purposes using a purse seine net that is not pursed using a rib line as defined in Section 53.01. All purse seine nets onboard any vessel taking or possessing market squid for commercial purposes must have a rib line attached and the rib line must be used to purse the net. A rib line must be made of soft rope or other non-metallic line. All rib lines must be made available for inspection upon demand by authorized Department personnel pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2012.

~~(f)~~(g) Use of Lights to Aggregate Squid.

(1) General Regulations. It is unlawful to attract squid by light except as authorized under permits described in subsection 149.1(b) of these regulations.

(A) Use of lights—Lights used to aggregate squid are considered is a form of take. Lights commonly used to aggregate squid that are turned on or in use are prima facie evidence that the vessel's operator and crew are attempting to attract squid for commercial purposes.

(B) Lights used to aggregate squid for commercial purposes shall not be turned on or in use during weekend closures as defined by subsection (c)(1) of this section.

(2) Exceptions for Live Bait Purposes.

(A) Notwithstanding subsection (g)(1), This regulation does not apply to seine skiffs of a permitted vessel, or to vessels pursuing squid for live bait purposes only are not required to possess a permit described in subsection 149.1(b).

(B) Subsection (g)(1)(B) does not apply to vessels pursuing squid for live bait purposes only during the weekend closure, if the following conditions are met:

1. Lights shall only be used to aggregate squid while actively taking or searching for squid and shall be turned off immediately upon completion of fishing for live bait.

2. All squid taken shall be maintained in a condition to be sold as live bait. Squid taken under this exception shall not be used as live bait aboard the vessel that took it, and any squid not sold shall be returned to the water prior to the end of the weekend closure.

3. The operator of any vessel intending to utilize this live bait exception shall provide prior notification via email to LEDMarineNotifications@wildlife.ca.gov prior to the vessel leaving port on that fishing trip. The notification shall include all of the following: operator's name, vessel name, anticipated fishing date(s), port of departure, expected port of landing, fishing block(s) where live bait fishing activity will occur, live bait method of take, description of how sales of live bait will occur, Dealer ID number, and, if applicable, Live Bait Dealer ID number.

~~(g)~~(h) Maximum Wattage. Each vessel fishing for squid or lighting for squid shall utilize a total of no more than 30,000 watts of lights to attract squid at any time.

~~(h)~~(i) Light Shields. Each vessel fishing for squid or lighting for squid will reduce the light scatter of its fishing operations by shielding the entire filament of ~~each or device~~ capable of emitting light used to attract squid and orienting the illumination directly downward, or providing for the illumination to be completely below the surface of the water. The lower edges of the shields shall be parallel to the deck of the vessel.

~~(i)~~(j) Forfeiture. Squid landed or possessed in violation of this Section or any other provision of the Fish and Game Code or these regulations shall be forfeited to the department. The squid shall be sold or disposed of in a manner to be determined by the department. The proceeds from all sales shall be paid into the Fish and Game Preservation Fund.

~~(j)~~(k) Citations for violations of this Section may be issued to the vessel operator, crewmembers, and/or the holder of a market squid permit issued pursuant to Section 149.1 ~~of these regulations~~.

~~(k)~~(l) Exemption from Tidal Invertebrate Permit. Operators and crewmembers of a commercial market squid vessel or light boat operating under the provisions of a commercial market squid permit are not required to possess a Tidal Invertebrate Permit, but are subject to the provisions of Section 123 ~~of these regulations~~.

~~(l)~~(m) Incidental Take Allowance. Pursuant to this subsection, market squid may be taken for commercial purposes incidentally when engaged in fishing activities for other target species. Other requirements of this Section, except subsection (g), do not apply to incidental take. Incidentally-taken squid shall meet all of the following criteria:

(1) The volume of squid landed or possessed on a vessel shall not exceed 2 tons per trip.

(2) Market squid taken incidentally to other fisheries shall not exceed 10 percent of the total volume by weight of all fish landed or possessed on a vessel.

~~(m)~~(n) Exemption for Live Bait. Squid taken for live bait purposes shall only be possessed for use as live bait or sold as live bait. Other requirements of this Section do not apply to take of live squid for bait, unless expressly specified.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 7078, 7701, 7708, 8026, 8425 and 8429.5, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 7701, 7708, 8026, 8425, 8429.5, 8429.7, 12159 and 12160, Fish and Game Code.

Proposed Regulatory Language

Section 149.1, Title 14, CCR, is amended to read:

§ 149.1 Market Squid Fishery Restricted Access Program.

(a) Permit Required. On and after April 1, 2005, no person shall take, land, or attract squid by light for commercial purposes, except as provided in subsections ~~149(l) and 149(m)~~ 149(a)(1), 149(m) and 149(n), unless the owner of that vessel has a valid market squid permit for use on that vessel that has not been suspended or revoked.

[... No changes to subsections (b) through (r) ...]

Authority cited: Sections 713, 1050, 7071, 7078, 7923, 8026, 8425, 8428 and 8429.5, Fish and Game Code. Reference: Sections 1050, 7050, 7071, 7701, 7708, 7852.2, 7923, 8026, 8101, 8425, 8428, 8429.5 and 8429.7, Fish and Game Code.

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: File No. 250421 - Entertainment Zones - 4 Letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:39:46 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 4 letters regarding:

File No. 250421 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to create the Valencia Street Entertainment Zone, on Valencia Street between 16th Street and 21st Street; the Pier 39 Entertainment Zone, on and around Pier 39, including the northern waterfront of The Embarcadero, between The Embarcadero on the south, Kearny Street on the east, Powell Street on the west, and the San Francisco shoreline on the north; the Folsom Street Entertainment Zone, on Folsom Street between 7th Street and 8th Street, Hallam Street between Folsom Street and Brush Place, and Langton Street between Folsom Street and Decker Alley; the Ellis Street Entertainment Zone, on Ellis Street between Stockton Street and Powell Street; the Yosemite Avenue Entertainment Zone, on Yosemite Avenue, between Mendell Street and 3rd Street, and Lane Street, between 3rd Street and Armstrong Avenue; the Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone, in the area bounded by Franklin Street from Grove to Market Streets, Market Street from Franklin to Haight Streets, Haight Street from Market Street to Octavia Boulevard, Octavia Boulevard from Haight to Fell Streets, Fell Street from Octavia Boulevard to Laguna Street, Laguna Street from Fell to Grove Streets, and Grove Street from Laguna to Franklin Streets, and on Gough Street from Grove to McAllister Streets; and the Yerba Buena Lane Downtown Activation Location, on Yerba Buena Lane between Market Street and Mission Street, and on the northern side of Mission Street only, excluding the public street portion of Mission Street, between Yerba Buena Lane and 3rd Street, including Jessie Square; making clarifying amendments; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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
bos@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: [Jaclyn Chou](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 1:19:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Jaclyn Chou

crackerjacks22@yahoo.com

From: [Mark Fabela](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 1:28:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Mark Fabela

markdfabela@yahoo.com

From: [Jennifer Jake Ibarra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 1:29:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Jake Ibarra

jakemckenna09@gmail.com

From: [Shana Mahaffey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 1:33:16 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm a resident of Hayes Valley — someone who is actively engaged in this great neighborhood and values the small businesses that give it its unique identity. That's why I'm deeply concerned about the proposed Entertainment Zone, which threatens to upend the balance of a dense residential area by prioritizing destination-driven activity over livability. Without public notice, community outreach, or departmental oversight, Supervisor Mahmood introduced an amendment on June 2 that would reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone - the largest in San Francisco. There was no warning to neighbors. No management plan. No mention of Hayes Valley on the committee agenda. And now we know it was planned that way. Public records show the Supervisor's office coordinated the rollout behind closed doors with a small, handpicked group of political allies often referred to in the neighborhood as "the country club," while the rest of the community was left in the dark. I appreciate HVSafe for keeping neighbors informed and giving us a way to speak up, especially as this process has catered to the agendas of a select few instead of the neighborhood at large.

Let's be clear: this isn't revitalization. It's destabilization. Hayes Valley already bears the brunt of citywide issues from public safety lapses to encampments, drug activity, and vandalism. We've learned to live with these challenges while doing our best to stay connected, informed, and supportive of one another. But this amendment does nothing to solve those problems. It only adds more chaos, late night noise, sidewalk drinking, and even more strain on our already stretched public services. We're especially alarmed that this ordinance appears designed to codify the ongoing weekend closure of Hayes Street, which has already caused hardship for local residents and businesses. That closure needs to end — not be embedded into law through a broader zoning change that bypassed the community at large. This feels like an end-run around community input on a closure that remains deeply contested. What's more troubling is the City's fixation on turning Hayes Valley into yet another "activation zone," when we are already blessed with numerous open spaces nearby. The obsession with Hayes Street and the push to create a party atmosphere doesn't serve us as residents. We've seen what happens when destination zones are rushed: they're underutilized, poorly managed, and often lead to unintended consequences. If revitalization is the goal, focus on areas that actually need it - like downtown. Don't uproot a dense, mixed-use neighborhood under the guise of "activation." As residents, we have every right to expect livability and sanity in front of our homes.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now before it becomes precedent for how we govern

If this can happen in Hayes Valley without warning, without input, and now with clear evidence of backroom coordination — it can happen anywhere. We urge you to stand with us and show that public policy should be grounded in inclusion and accountability, not insider deals.

Sincerely,
Shana Mahaffey
smahaff@yahoo.com

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 250421 - Entertainment Zones - 27 Letters
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:29:06 PM
Attachments: [27 Letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 27 letters regarding:

File No. 250421 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to create the Valencia Street Entertainment Zone, on Valencia Street between 16th Street and 21st Street; the Pier 39 Entertainment Zone, on and around Pier 39, including the northern waterfront of The Embarcadero, between The Embarcadero on the south, Kearny Street on the east, Powell Street on the west, and the San Francisco shoreline on the north; the Folsom Street Entertainment Zone, on Folsom Street between 7th Street and 8th Street, Hallam Street between Folsom Street and Brush Place, and Langton Street between Folsom Street and Decker Alley; the Ellis Street Entertainment Zone, on Ellis Street between Stockton Street and Powell Street; the Yosemite Avenue Entertainment Zone, on Yosemite Avenue, between Mendell Street and 3rd Street, and Lane Street, between 3rd Street and Armstrong Avenue; the Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone, in the area bounded by Franklin Street from Grove to Market Streets, Market Street from Franklin to Haight Streets, Haight Street from Market Street to Octavia Boulevard, Octavia Boulevard from Haight to Fell Streets, Fell Street from Octavia Boulevard to Laguna Street, Laguna Street from Fell to Grove Streets, and Grove Street from Laguna to Franklin Streets, and on Gough Street from Grove to McAllister Streets; and the Yerba Buena Lane Downtown Activation Location, on Yerba Buena Lane between Market Street and Mission Street, and on the northern side of Mission Street only, excluding the public street portion of Mission Street, between Yerba Buena Lane and 3rd Street, including Jessie Square; making clarifying amendments; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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
bos@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: [Mary McFadden](#)
To: [MahmoodStaff](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [WaltonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposed to Hayes Valley Rezoning "Entertainment Zone" & Board of Supervisors overreach
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:46:22 PM

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

Yet again the Board has chosen to ignore the people you are supposed to serve. Instead you impose the plans of profiteers onto residents and local businesses. This ordinance, like so many other unresearched, unsupported, and unfunded projects, does nothing to improve the cityscape. It does serve the interests of the wealthy speculators and the politicians they have purchased with their donations.

Basically you are creating a drinking and recreational drug use area, a party zone.

Three venues are open all year: the War Memorial Opera House complex, Davies Symphony Hall and SF Jazz. Already the vehicular and human traffic from those creates a host of problems for merchants and the public. Ride shares create jams, MUNI is cutting service, BART is less and less reliable, the Metro stations are filthy, the streets lined with the unhoused and unhealthy.

Should there suddenly be a crop of new venues opening up in Hayes Valley, other than placing more responsibility onto SFPD to deal with late night drunks, overtime for public works to clean up the mess, and stressing out merchants who pay rent and business taxes to defend themselves against revelers who don't come to shop, but to entertain themselves without restraint.

The Board has not examined the consequences. An MIT study by Compo & Ryan found that entertainment zones didn't work in already established areas, but only in underutilized areas, like downtowns that were empty after work or former industrial sites. Alcohol Justice, a pro-party zone group found that strict regulations limiting opening times, establishing noise reduction policies, a steady police presence, as well as a clear taxation of vendors is necessary "to prevent a rapid escalation of criminal activity, violence, robbery, and sexual assault."

None of this has been done. So the Board must:

- Remove Hayes Valley from this ridiculous "entertainment zone" ordinance.
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future.
- Stop this legislation before it becomes a dangerous precedent.

This isn't revitalization. It's reckless policymaking.

M . McFadden

From: [Yolaida Duran](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:46:36 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a small business owner in Hayes Valley—and I want to be clear: the proposed expansion of the Entertainment Zone ordinance in Hayes Valley threatens the survival of businesses like mine. Without public notice, formal review, or basic outreach to our business community, Supervisor Mahmood introduced a last-minute amendment on June 2 to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in the city.

We now know through public disclosures that a select few within HVNA/HVMC were looped in months ago, while independent small business operators —the very people who have shaped this neighborhood for years were deliberately excluded. This wasn't oversight. It was intentional. Our voices have been dismissed for over a decade, and this latest maneuver is no different. Adding insult to injury, a broad list of businesses was included as "supporters" in the Hayes Valley Management Plan Questionnaire without their knowledge or consent. That's not just exclusion that's misrepresentation. This isn't how business policy should be made. It's certainly not how neighborhood economies should be restructured.

Many of us have already opted out of neighborhood events centered around alcohol and amplified activity, because we've seen firsthand that these gatherings don't drive sales — they drive disruptions. This amendment would only make that worse. Turning our corridor into a full-time destination district won't revitalize it. It will bury it. Retailers don't benefit from street drinking. Service providers don't benefit from sidewalk chaos. And families, staff, and customers don't feel safe when public space becomes party space.

We are blessed with open spaces nearby. We don't need more programming. We need policy that stabilizes — not destabilizes — Hayes Valley. If the City wants to invest in nightlife, do it downtown where it's needed. We were a thriving business corridor before the pandemic — but the prolonged weekend closure has already caused lasting damage: we've lost revenue, foot traffic, and vendor access with no data, no support, and no acknowledgment from the City. Now, layering an Entertainment Zone on top will only compound those challenges. Meanwhile, bars and restaurants have already benefited from expansive, underutilized parklets — at the expense of broader retail and service stability. Retail and service businesses still make up the majority of this corridor — yet this policy prioritizes nightlife and alcohol at their expense. Why implement a program that favors a minority of operators over the core fabric of the neighborhood?

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now — before it becomes precedent for how we govern

This policy doesn't support small business. It undermines the very mix of uses that make neighborhoods livable and resilient. We've already lost ground due to the closure. Please listen — and amend accordingly—before this does irreversible harm.

Sincerely,

Yolaida Duran

allaprimahayes@att.net

Alla Prima

From: [Parhizgar Azin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:47:17 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm a resident of Hayes Valley — someone who is actively engaged in this great neighborhood and values the small businesses that give it its unique identity. That's why I'm deeply concerned about the proposed Entertainment Zone, which threatens to upend the balance of a dense residential area by prioritizing destination-driven activity over livability. Without public notice, community outreach, or departmental oversight, Supervisor Mahmood introduced an amendment on June 2 that would reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone - the largest in San Francisco. There was no warning to neighbors. No management plan. No mention of Hayes Valley on the committee agenda. And now we know it was planned that way. Public records show the Supervisor's office coordinated the rollout behind closed doors with a small, handpicked group of political allies often referred to in the neighborhood as "the country club," while the rest of the community was left in the dark. I appreciate HVSafe for keeping neighbors informed and giving us a way to speak up, especially as this process has catered to the agendas of a select few instead of the neighborhood at large.

Let's be clear: this isn't revitalization. It's destabilization. Hayes Valley already bears the brunt of citywide issues from public safety lapses to encampments, drug activity, and vandalism. We've learned to live with these challenges while doing our best to stay connected, informed, and supportive of one another. But this amendment does nothing to solve those problems. It only adds more chaos, late night noise, sidewalk drinking, and even more strain on our already stretched public services. We're especially alarmed that this ordinance appears designed to codify the ongoing weekend closure of Hayes Street, which has already caused hardship for local residents and businesses. That closure needs to end — not be embedded into law through a broader zoning change that bypassed the community at large. This feels like an end-run around community input on a closure that remains deeply contested. What's more troubling is the City's fixation on turning Hayes Valley into yet another "activation zone," when we are already blessed with numerous open spaces nearby. The obsession with Hayes Street and the push to create a party atmosphere doesn't serve us as residents. We've seen what happens when destination zones are rushed: they're underutilized, poorly managed, and often lead to unintended consequences. If revitalization is the goal, focus on areas that actually need it - like downtown. Don't uproot a dense, mixed-use neighborhood under the guise of "activation." As residents, we have every right to expect livability and sanity in front of our homes.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now before it becomes precedent for how we govern

If this can happen in Hayes Valley without warning, without input, and now with clear evidence of backroom coordination — it can happen anywhere. We urge you to stand with us and show that public policy should be grounded in inclusion and accountability, not insider deals.

Sincerely,

Parhizgar Azin

azinparhiz@gmail.com

From: [Richard Johnson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:48:43 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm a resident of Hayes Valley — someone who is actively engaged in this great neighborhood and values the small businesses that give it its unique identity. That's why I'm deeply concerned about the proposed Entertainment Zone, which threatens to upend the balance of a dense residential area by prioritizing destination-driven activity over livability. Without public notice, community outreach, or departmental oversight, Supervisor Mahmood introduced an amendment on June 2 that would reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone - the largest in San Francisco. There was no warning to neighbors. No management plan. No mention of Hayes Valley on the committee agenda. And now we know it was planned that way. Public records show the Supervisor's office coordinated the rollout behind closed doors with a small, handpicked group of political allies often referred to in the neighborhood as "the country club," while the rest of the community was left in the dark. I appreciate HVSafe for keeping neighbors informed and giving us a way to speak up, especially as this process has catered to the agendas of a select few instead of the neighborhood at large.

Let's be clear: this isn't revitalization. It's destabilization. Hayes Valley already bears the brunt of citywide issues from public safety lapses to encampments, drug activity, and vandalism. We've learned to live with these challenges while doing our best to stay connected, informed, and supportive of one another. But this amendment does nothing to solve those problems. It only adds more chaos, late night noise, sidewalk drinking, and even more strain on our already stretched public services. We're especially alarmed that this ordinance appears designed to codify the ongoing weekend closure of Hayes Street, which has already caused hardship for local residents and businesses. That closure needs to end — not be embedded into law through a broader zoning change that bypassed the community at large. This feels like an end-run around community input on a closure that remains deeply contested. What's more troubling is the City's fixation on turning Hayes Valley into yet another "activation zone," when we are already blessed with numerous open spaces nearby. The obsession with Hayes Street and the push to create a party atmosphere doesn't serve us as residents. We've seen what happens when destination zones are rushed: they're underutilized, poorly managed, and often lead to unintended consequences. If revitalization is the goal, focus on areas that actually need it - like downtown. Don't uproot a dense, mixed-use neighborhood under the guise of "activation." As residents, we have every right to expect livability and sanity in front of our homes.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now before it becomes precedent for how we govern

If this can happen in Hayes Valley without warning, without input, and now with clear evidence of backroom coordination — it can happen anywhere. We urge you to stand with us and show that public policy should be grounded in inclusion and accountability, not insider deals.

Sincerely,

Richard Johnson

rlj415@sbcglobal.net

From: [Peggy Baslow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:49:16 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a small business owner in Hayes Valley—and I want to be clear: the proposed expansion of the Entertainment Zone ordinance in Hayes Valley threatens the survival of businesses like mine. Without public notice, formal review, or basic outreach to our business community, Supervisor Mahmood introduced a last-minute amendment on June 2 to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in the city.

We now know through public disclosures that a select few within HVNA/HVMC were looped in months ago, while independent small business operators —the very people who have shaped this neighborhood for years were deliberately excluded. This wasn't oversight. It was intentional. Our voices have been dismissed for over a decade, and this latest maneuver is no different. Adding insult to injury, a broad list of businesses was included as "supporters" in the Hayes Valley Management Plan Questionnaire without their knowledge or consent. That's not just exclusion that's misrepresentation. This isn't how business policy should be made. It's certainly not how neighborhood economies should be restructured.

Many of us have already opted out of neighborhood events centered around alcohol and amplified activity, because we've seen firsthand that these gatherings don't drive sales — they drive disruptions. This amendment would only make that worse. Turning our corridor into a full-time destination district won't revitalize it. It will bury it. Retailers don't benefit from street drinking. Service providers don't benefit from sidewalk chaos. And families, staff, and customers don't feel safe when public space becomes party space.

We are blessed with open spaces nearby. We don't need more programming. We need policy that stabilizes — not destabilizes — Hayes Valley. If the City wants to invest in nightlife, do it downtown where it's needed. We were a thriving business corridor before the pandemic — but the prolonged weekend closure has already caused lasting damage: we've lost revenue, foot traffic, and vendor access with no data, no support, and no acknowledgment from the City. Now, layering an Entertainment Zone on top will only compound those challenges. Meanwhile, bars and restaurants have already benefited from expansive, underutilized parklets — at the expense of broader retail and service stability. Retail and service businesses still make up the majority of this corridor — yet this policy prioritizes nightlife and alcohol at their expense. Why implement a program that favors a minority of operators over the core fabric of the neighborhood?

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now — before it becomes precedent for how we govern

This policy doesn't support small business. It undermines the very mix of uses that make neighborhoods livable and resilient. We've already lost ground due to the closure. Please listen — and amend accordingly—before this does irreversible harm.

Sincerely,

Peggy Baslow

bad@kittywantstoshred.com

From: [Magie Crystal](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:49:59 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a small business owner in Hayes Valley—and I want to be clear: the proposed expansion of the Entertainment Zone ordinance in Hayes Valley threatens the survival of businesses like mine. Without public notice, formal review, or basic outreach to our business community, Supervisor Mahmood introduced a last-minute amendment on June 2 to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in the city.

We now know through public disclosures that a select few within HVNA/HVMC were looped in months ago, while independent small business operators —the very people who have shaped this neighborhood for years were deliberately excluded. This wasn't oversight. It was intentional. Our voices have been dismissed for over a decade, and this latest maneuver is no different. Adding insult to injury, a broad list of businesses was included as "supporters" in the Hayes Valley Management Plan Questionnaire without their knowledge or consent. That's not just exclusion that's misrepresentation. This isn't how business policy should be made. It's certainly not how neighborhood economies should be restructured.

Many of us have already opted out of neighborhood events centered around alcohol and amplified activity, because we've seen firsthand that these gatherings don't drive sales — they drive disruptions. This amendment would only make that worse. Turning our corridor into a full-time destination district won't revitalize it. It will bury it. Retailers don't benefit from street drinking. Service providers don't benefit from sidewalk chaos. And families, staff, and customers don't feel safe when public space becomes party space.

We are blessed with open spaces nearby. We don't need more programming. We need policy that stabilizes — not destabilizes — Hayes Valley. If the City wants to invest in nightlife, do it downtown where it's needed. We were a thriving business corridor before the pandemic — but the prolonged weekend closure has already caused lasting damage: we've lost revenue, foot traffic, and vendor access with no data, no support, and no acknowledgment from the City. Now, layering an Entertainment Zone on top will only compound those challenges. Meanwhile, bars and restaurants have already benefited from expansive, underutilized parklets — at the expense of broader retail and service stability. Retail and service businesses still make up the majority of this corridor — yet this policy prioritizes nightlife and alcohol at their expense. Why implement a program that favors a minority of operators over the core fabric of the neighborhood?

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now — before it becomes precedent for how we govern

This policy doesn't support small business. It undermines the very mix of uses that make neighborhoods livable and resilient. We've already lost ground due to the closure. Please listen — and amend accordingly—before this does irreversible harm.

Sincerely,

Magie Crystal

magie@allaprimalingerie.com

Alla Prima

From: [Daniel Derdula](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [PolSELLI, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:51:03 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm a resident of Hayes Valley — someone who is actively engaged in this great neighborhood and values the small businesses that give it its unique identity. That's why I'm deeply concerned about the proposed Entertainment Zone, which threatens to upend the balance of a dense residential area by prioritizing destination-driven activity over livability. Without public notice, community outreach, or departmental oversight, Supervisor Mahmood introduced an amendment on June 2 that would reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone - the largest in San Francisco. There was no warning to neighbors. No management plan. No mention of Hayes Valley on the committee agenda. And now we know it was planned that way. Public records show the Supervisor's office coordinated the rollout behind closed doors with a small, handpicked group of political allies often referred to in the neighborhood as "the country club," while the rest of the community was left in the dark. I appreciate HVSafe for keeping neighbors informed and giving us a way to speak up, especially as this process has catered to the agendas of a select few instead of the neighborhood at large.

Let's be clear: this isn't revitalization. It's destabilization. Hayes Valley already bears the brunt of citywide issues from public safety lapses to encampments, drug activity, and vandalism. We've learned to live with these challenges while doing our best to stay connected, informed, and supportive of one another. But this amendment does nothing to solve those problems. It only adds more chaos, late night noise, sidewalk drinking, and even more strain on our already stretched public services. We're especially alarmed that this ordinance appears designed to codify the ongoing weekend closure of Hayes Street, which has already caused hardship for local residents and businesses. That closure needs to end — not be embedded into law through a broader zoning change that bypassed the community at large. This feels like an end-run around community input on a closure that remains deeply contested. What's more troubling is the City's fixation on turning Hayes Valley into yet another "activation zone," when we are already blessed with numerous open spaces nearby. The obsession with Hayes Street and the push to create a party atmosphere doesn't serve us as residents. We've seen what happens when destination zones are rushed: they're underutilized, poorly managed, and often lead to unintended consequences. If revitalization is the goal, focus on areas that actually need it - like downtown. Don't uproot a dense, mixed-use neighborhood under the guise of "activation." As residents, we have every right to expect livability and sanity in front of our homes.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now before it becomes precedent for how we govern

If this can happen in Hayes Valley without warning, without input, and now with clear evidence of backroom coordination — it can happen anywhere. We urge you to stand with us and show that public policy should be grounded in inclusion and accountability, not insider deals.

Sincerely,
Daniel Derdula
ddesign@sonic.net

From: [Doug Ridgway](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:52:46 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a small business owner in Hayes Valley—and I want to be clear: the proposed expansion of the Entertainment Zone ordinance in Hayes Valley threatens the survival of businesses like mine. Without public notice, formal review, or basic outreach to our business community, Supervisor Mahmood introduced a last-minute amendment on June 2 to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in the city.

We now know through public disclosures that a select few within HVNA/HVMC were looped in months ago, while independent small business operators —the very people who have shaped this neighborhood for years were deliberately excluded. This wasn't oversight. It was intentional. Our voices have been dismissed for over a decade, and this latest maneuver is no different. Adding insult to injury, a broad list of businesses was included as "supporters" in the Hayes Valley Management Plan Questionnaire without their knowledge or consent. That's not just exclusion that's misrepresentation. This isn't how business policy should be made. It's certainly not how neighborhood economies should be restructured.

Many of us have already opted out of neighborhood events centered around alcohol and amplified activity, because we've seen firsthand that these gatherings don't drive sales — they drive disruptions. This amendment would only make that worse. Turning our corridor into a full-time destination district won't revitalize it. It will bury it. Retailers don't benefit from street drinking. Service providers don't benefit from sidewalk chaos. And families, staff, and customers don't feel safe when public space becomes party space.

We are blessed with open spaces nearby. We don't need more programming. We need policy that stabilizes — not destabilizes — Hayes Valley. If the City wants to invest in nightlife, do it downtown where it's needed. We were a thriving business corridor before the pandemic — but the prolonged weekend closure has already caused lasting damage: we've lost revenue, foot traffic, and vendor access with no data, no support, and no acknowledgment from the City. Now, layering an Entertainment Zone on top will only compound those challenges. Meanwhile, bars and restaurants have already benefited from expansive, underutilized parklets — at the expense of broader retail and service stability. Retail and service businesses still make up the majority of this corridor — yet this policy prioritizes nightlife and alcohol at their expense. Why implement a program that favors a minority of operators over the core fabric of the neighborhood?

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now — before it becomes precedent for how we govern

This policy doesn't support small business. It undermines the very mix of uses that make neighborhoods livable and resilient. We've already lost ground due to the closure. Please listen — and amend accordingly—before this does irreversible harm.

Sincerely,

Doug Ridgway

doug@rebeccaovermann.com

Rebecca Overmann

From: [Jack Downing](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:53:46 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Jack Downing

majorjackdowning@gmail.com

From: [Rebecca Overmann](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:54:56 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a small business owner in Hayes Valley—and I want to be clear: the proposed expansion of the Entertainment Zone ordinance in Hayes Valley threatens the survival of businesses like mine. Without public notice, formal review, or basic outreach to our business community, Supervisor Mahmood introduced a last-minute amendment on June 2 to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in the city.

We now know through public disclosures that a select few within HVNA/HVMC were looped in months ago, while independent small business operators —the very people who have shaped this neighborhood for years were deliberately excluded. This wasn't oversight. It was intentional. Our voices have been dismissed for over a decade, and this latest maneuver is no different. Adding insult to injury, a broad list of businesses was included as "supporters" in the Hayes Valley Management Plan Questionnaire without their knowledge or consent. That's not just exclusion that's misrepresentation. This isn't how business policy should be made. It's certainly not how neighborhood economies should be restructured.

Many of us have already opted out of neighborhood events centered around alcohol and amplified activity, because we've seen firsthand that these gatherings don't drive sales — they drive disruptions. This amendment would only make that worse. Turning our corridor into a full-time destination district won't revitalize it. It will bury it. Retailers don't benefit from street drinking. Service providers don't benefit from sidewalk chaos. And families, staff, and customers don't feel safe when public space becomes party space.

We are blessed with open spaces nearby. We don't need more programming. We need policy that stabilizes — not destabilizes — Hayes Valley. If the City wants to invest in nightlife, do it downtown where it's needed. We were a thriving business corridor before the pandemic — but the prolonged weekend closure has already caused lasting damage: we've lost revenue, foot traffic, and vendor access with no data, no support, and no acknowledgment from the City. Now, layering an Entertainment Zone on top will only compound those challenges. Meanwhile, bars and restaurants have already benefited from expansive, underutilized parklets — at the expense of broader retail and service stability. Retail and service businesses still make up the majority of this corridor — yet this policy prioritizes nightlife and alcohol at their expense. Why implement a program that favors a minority of operators over the core fabric of the neighborhood?

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now — before it becomes precedent for how we govern

This policy doesn't support small business. It undermines the very mix of uses that make neighborhoods livable and resilient. We've already lost ground due to the closure. Please listen — and amend accordingly—before this does irreversible harm.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Overmann

rebecca@rebeccaovermann.com

Rebecca Overmann, Inc

From: [B.G.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:57:27 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm a resident of Hayes Valley — someone who is actively engaged in this great neighborhood and values the small businesses that give it its unique identity. That's why I'm deeply concerned about the proposed Entertainment Zone, which threatens to upend the balance of a dense residential area by prioritizing destination-driven activity over livability. Without public notice, community outreach, or departmental oversight, Supervisor Mahmood introduced an amendment on June 2 that would reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone - the largest in San Francisco. There was no warning to neighbors. No management plan. No mention of Hayes Valley on the committee agenda. And now we know it was planned that way. Public records show the Supervisor's office coordinated the rollout behind closed doors with a small, handpicked group of political allies often referred to in the neighborhood as "the country club," while the rest of the community was left in the dark. I appreciate HVSafe for keeping neighbors informed and giving us a way to speak up, especially as this process has catered to the agendas of a select few instead of the neighborhood at large.

Let's be clear: this isn't revitalization. It's destabilization. Hayes Valley already bears the brunt of citywide issues from public safety lapses to encampments, drug activity, and vandalism. We've learned to live with these challenges while doing our best to stay connected, informed, and supportive of one another. But this amendment does nothing to solve those problems. It only adds more chaos, late night noise, sidewalk drinking, and even more strain on our already stretched public services. We're especially alarmed that this ordinance appears designed to codify the ongoing weekend closure of Hayes Street, which has already caused hardship for local residents and businesses. That closure needs to end — not be embedded into law through a broader zoning change that bypassed the community at large. This feels like an end-run around community input on a closure that remains deeply contested. What's more troubling is the City's fixation on turning Hayes Valley into yet another "activation zone," when we are already blessed with numerous open spaces nearby. The obsession with Hayes Street and the push to create a party atmosphere doesn't serve us as residents. We've seen what happens when destination zones are rushed: they're underutilized, poorly managed, and often lead to unintended consequences. If revitalization is the goal, focus on areas that actually need it - like downtown. Don't uproot a dense, mixed-use neighborhood under the guise of "activation." As residents, we have every right to expect livability and sanity in front of our homes.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future
- Stop this now before it becomes precedent for how we govern

If this can happen in Hayes Valley without warning, without input, and now with clear evidence of backroom coordination — it can happen anywhere. We urge you to stand with us and show that public policy should be grounded in inclusion and accountability, not insider deals.

Sincerely,

B G

sfresident.42years@hotmail.com

From: [Lina Brenner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 3:08:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Lina Brenner

lina.brenner@gmail.com

From: [Arlyn Bull](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 3:26:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Arlyn Bull

arlynbull@gmail.com

From: [Rachel Scott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 4:21:52 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Please consider the other changes made to other areas that are reverting back due to poor planning and lack of acknowledgment of the businesses in the area. I spend a lot of time in this areas and shop at many of the businesses. I do not want to see them suffer. Additionally, as a healthcare worker, we already have issues with substance use and violence in our streets please don't tax our system further with giving people free reign in a large space.

Sincerely,

Rachel Scott
Rachel Scott
rachscott84@att.net

From: [Rachael Dominguez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 4:38:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Rachael Dominguez

rachael67@hotmail.com

From: [Elisabeth Cardoza](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 4:52:46 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Cardoza

bookeepinglisa@gmail.com

From: [Leah Bershad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 5:01:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a small business owner/operator in Hayes Valley—and I want to be clear: the proposed expansion of the Entertainment Zone ordinance in Hayes Valley threatens the survival of businesses like mine. Without public notice, formal review, or basic outreach to our business community, Supervisor Mahmood introduced a last-minute amendment on June 2 to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in the city.

We now know through public disclosures that a select few within HVNA/HVMC were looped in months ago, while independent small business operators —the very people who have shaped this neighborhood for years were deliberately excluded. This wasn't oversight. It was intentional. Our voices have been dismissed for over a decade, and this latest maneuver is no different. Adding insult to injury, a broad list of businesses was included as "supporters" in the Hayes Valley Management Plan Questionnaire without their knowledge or consent. That's not just exclusion that's misrepresentation. This isn't how business policy should be made. It's certainly not how neighborhood economies should be restructured.

Many of us have already opted out of neighborhood events centered around alcohol and amplified activity, because we've seen firsthand that these gatherings don't drive sales — they drive disruptions. This amendment would only make that worse. Turning our corridor into a full-time destination district won't revitalize it. It will bury it. Retailers don't benefit from street drinking. Service providers don't benefit from sidewalk chaos. And families, staff, and customers don't feel safe when public space becomes party space.

We are blessed with open spaces nearby. We don't need more programming. We need policy that stabilizes — not destabilizes — Hayes Valley. If the City wants to invest in nightlife, do it downtown where it's needed. We were a thriving business corridor before the pandemic — but the prolonged weekend closure has already caused lasting damage: we've lost revenue, foot traffic, and vendor access with no data, no support, and no acknowledgment from the City. Now, layering an Entertainment Zone on top will only compound those challenges. Meanwhile, bars and restaurants have already benefited from expansive, underutilized parklets — at the expense of broader retail and service stability. Retail and service businesses still make up the majority of this corridor — yet this policy prioritizes nightlife and alcohol at their expense. Why implement a program that favors a minority of operators over the core fabric of the neighborhood?

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future

- Stop this now — before it becomes precedent for how we govern

This policy doesn't support small business. It undermines the very mix of uses that make neighborhoods livable and resilient. We've already lost ground due to the closure. Please listen — and amend accordingly—before this does irreversible harm.

Sincerely,

Leah Bershad

leahbershad@gmail.com

Reliquary

From: [Debra Blum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 5:20:58 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Debra Blum

debrakblum@gmail.com

From: [Timothy Zovreboff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 5:33:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a small business owner/operator in Hayes Valley—and I want to be clear: the proposed expansion of the Entertainment Zone ordinance in Hayes Valley threatens the survival of businesses like mine. Without public notice, formal review, or basic outreach to our business community, Supervisor Mahmood introduced a last-minute amendment on June 2 to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in the city.

We now know through public disclosures that a select few within HVNA/HVMC were looped in months ago, while independent small business operators —the very people who have shaped this neighborhood for years were deliberately excluded. This wasn't oversight. It was intentional. Our voices have been dismissed for over a decade, and this latest maneuver is no different. Adding insult to injury, a broad list of businesses was included as "supporters" in the Hayes Valley Management Plan Questionnaire without their knowledge or consent. That's not just exclusion that's misrepresentation. This isn't how business policy should be made. It's certainly not how neighborhood economies should be restructured.

Many of us have already opted out of neighborhood events centered around alcohol and amplified activity, because we've seen firsthand that these gatherings don't drive sales — they drive disruptions. This amendment would only make that worse. Turning our corridor into a full-time destination district won't revitalize it. It will bury it. Retailers don't benefit from street drinking. Service providers don't benefit from sidewalk chaos. And families, staff, and customers don't feel safe when public space becomes party space.

We are blessed with open spaces nearby. We don't need more programming. We need policy that stabilizes — not destabilizes — Hayes Valley. If the City wants to invest in nightlife, do it downtown where it's needed. We were a thriving business corridor before the pandemic — but the prolonged weekend closure has already caused lasting damage: we've lost revenue, foot traffic, and vendor access with no data, no support, and no acknowledgment from the City. Now, layering an Entertainment Zone on top will only compound those challenges. Meanwhile, bars and restaurants have already benefited from expansive, underutilized parklets — at the expense of broader retail and service stability. Retail and service businesses still make up the majority of this corridor — yet this policy prioritizes nightlife and alcohol at their expense. Why implement a program that favors a minority of operators over the core fabric of the neighborhood?

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance
- Demand real public process and community input before changing any neighborhood's future

- Stop this now — before it becomes precedent for how we govern

This policy doesn't support small business. It undermines the very mix of uses that make neighborhoods livable and resilient. We've already lost ground due to the closure. Please listen — and amend accordingly—before this does irreversible harm.

Sincerely,
Timothy Zovreboff
t@minimal.com
minimal

From: [Kristina Gestuvo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 5:39:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Kristina Gestuvo

kgestuvo@gmail.com

From: [Kay J](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 6:57:10 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Kay J

kayjensen080@gmail.com

From: [Betty Chu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 6:57:31 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Betty Chu

pippin-60-some@icloud.com

From: [Genny Stich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 6:59:58 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Genny Stich

gennymca@gmail.com

From: [Stephanie Chai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:02:28 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points. Sincerely,

Stephanie Chai
Stephanie Chai
stephkchai@gmail.com

From: [Fred Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:57:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing as a deeply concerned San Francisco resident — not just about what's happening in Hayes Valley, but about what it says about how our city governs. On June 2, Supervisor Bilal Mahmood quietly introduced a sweeping amendment to reclassify over 20 blocks of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone — the largest in San Francisco. There was no public notice, no formal outreach, no management plan, and no transparency. Not even a line item on the agenda. It was a political maneuver, and now it's headed for a full vote. This is not how policy should be made.

The very people most impacted — small businesses, service workers, families, and neighbors were never asked. There was no justification beyond “wine walks” and political loyalty. Public records now shed light on the fact that planning discussions were deliberately held behind closed doors with just a handful of participants solely representatives of a neighborhood nonprofit that helped spearhead the plan with the Supervisor. Broader community stakeholders were left out entirely. That's not real engagement it's a missed opportunity to build genuine support.

Meanwhile, the reality on the ground is far more serious: Hayes Valley is a dense, overstressed neighborhood already coping with safety breakdowns, encampments, struggling businesses, and uneven city response. And now we're being told that more alcohol, more noise, and less oversight is somehow the answer? This isn't progress. It's deflection — and it's coming for all of us. Hayes Valley is just the first neighborhood being sacrificed under this new framework. If it can happen there quietly, quickly, without consent... it can happen anywhere. That's why I'm asking you to speak up.

Please:

- Vote to remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance
- Demand proper oversight and public engagement before expanding Entertainment Zones
- Refuse to let one district's political agenda reshape the entire city

This city belongs to all of us not just those with insider access. Good governance means listening to communities, not turning neighborhoods into party zones to score political points.

Sincerely,

Fred Clark

fredanson40@yahoo.com

From: [Hayes Valley Small Business Assoc.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FelderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [Polselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Hayes Valley Small Business Association Team](#)
Subject: Today's BOS Meeting Agenda Item 10: Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 8:19:12 AM

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

We write again to express our urgent opposition to the proposed designation of Hayes Valley as an Entertainment Zone.

This legislation was introduced without notice, transparency, or meaningful engagement with the small businesses that keep this corridor functioning. Many of our members among the longest-standing independent operators in the neighborhood are already struggling under a weekend street closure that was supposed to be temporary. Quality foot traffic has declined, longtime customers avoid the area, and ongoing event programming continues to divert attention away from local commerce. Now, this amendment seeks to make those harms permanent - with no consultation and no recourse.

Let us be clear: Hayes Valley is not a nightlife district. It is a mixed-use neighborhood of residents, families, and storefront businesses. To designate 20 blocks as a permanent Entertainment Zone favoring a destination-driven bar economy is simply reckless. It disregards the decades of investment and community-building that define this corridor.

What's most disturbing is that this ordinance would deepen an already polarizing situation. The street closure remains divisive and unresolved ...a failed experiment that a broad plurality of residents and merchants have been working in good faith to end. Rather than address these concerns, this legislation sidesteps them entirely and seeks to entrench the closure through an even more expansive, permanent framework. We've already seen how this plays out. The street closure permit has no enforcement, no compliance standards, and no consequences for ongoing violations. Now, the same entity behind that closure (HVNA) is poised to manage the Entertainment Zone. We expect more of the same: no accountability, no transparency, and no regard for impacted businesses.

It must also be said: to blindly defer to the district Supervisor is not leadership — it's abdication. The Board may assume Supervisor Mahmood has conducted broad outreach. He has not. Our only meeting with him, in March, ended abruptly after we clearly stated that an Entertainment Zone would be devastating to our businesses. There was no follow-up, no further contact. What followed instead was a staged press event, orchestrated with those already aligned with his agenda. This is not consensus. It is manufactured alignment in the face of broad contradiction. Why is HVNA, a self-appointed gatekeeper being elevated, while the true plurality of neighborhood voices is ignored? Why are bars and nightlife operators being given a free hand to reshape a corridor they do not represent? What's happening here reflects a pattern born out of COVID -- a hollowing out of public process. Input became selectively crafted. Dialogue became scripted. That same playbook is being used here in Hayes Valley again, in a dangerous and exclusionary way -- and our businesses are being forced to carry the cost.

We urge the Board to act: Remove Hayes Valley from this ordinance. Without a Supervisor who is

willing to defend the full spectrum of community voices, we are at a profound disadvantage.
Please do not codify that disadvantage into law.

Sincerely,
HVSBA

From: [Hayes Valley Safe Team](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FelderStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Poliselli, Angelina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra \(MTA\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(MYR\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: June 24 BOS Meeting Item 10: 250421 - Hayes Valley Entertainment Zone
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 10:30:54 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

We urge you to remove Hayes Valley from the Entertainment Zone ordinance. This proposal was introduced without notice, without transparency, and without meaningful consultation with the people who live and work here. Retailers were sidelined. Residents were left out. And now it's being framed as a model for "activation" when in fact, it's a blueprint for exclusion.

Over the past several weeks, we've spoken with neighbors, businesses, and longtime stakeholders across Hayes Valley. The message has been loud and clear: this was never publicly vetted, and no one wants to give HVNA *or any single group* unilateral control to orchestrate a party atmosphere in our streets. The most disturbing and indefensible part of this process is how deliberately it has advanced - quietly and under the radar. Hayes Valley is already a dense, mixed-use neighborhood. We are not lacking in open space --- what we are lacking is basic respect for the safety, sanity, and economic stability of those who live and work here. This ordinance ignores all of that.

The Entertainment Zone ordinance does not revitalize, rather it rewrites the rules to benefit a narrow slice of the economy: nightlife operators, bar alliances, and political allies. It would replace local-serving small businesses with destination-driven, event-based traffic that serves someone else's vision - not ours. We've seen this pattern before. In 2021, we warned the City that Hayes Valley's Formula Retail Ban was being quietly eroded. VC-backed chains like Cotopaxi, Todd Snyder, Brooklinen, and Pact were allowed in despite the ban, undermining the neighborhood's small business identity. We raised the alarm with Supervisor Preston and others, cautioning that without action, our local-serving fabric would be lost. Now it's happening again — under a different name. Entertainment Zones are the new formula retail threat. Instead of chains, it's politically connected nightlife. Instead of retail creep, it's zoning encroachment... pushed by the same players who failed to protect this corridor in the first place. HVNA/MC's Lloyd Silverstein, who has publicly dismissed concerns about formula retail by saying "the train has left the station," is now working closely with nightclub and event operators to push through a zoning designation that prioritizes one business model over all others. What's especially concerning is that the few individuals based on Linden Street are presenting themselves as spokespeople for the broader neighborhood —despite having little engagement with or investment in the commercial corridor they seek to reshape. Rather than activating their own alley, which remains largely underutilized, they are redirecting energy and disruption onto Hayes Street and beyond which will result in lasting consequences for residents and retailers.

This process has been exclusionary by design. Do not reward that with permanent legislation. Remove Hayes Valley from the ordinance.

Respectfully,
HVSafe

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: Supporting Sup. Fielder's Family Shelter Stay Policy - File No. 250390
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:54:08 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Helen Ung, regarding:

File No. 250390 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to amend the City's Standard of Care for City Shelters to require City-funded family shelters to allow eligible families to remain in shelter for a continuous term of not less than one year, subject to the household's continued eligibility and compliance with shelter policies.

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
bos@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: Helen Ung <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 8:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Supporting Sup. Fielder's Family Shelter Stay Policy

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I am writing to ask you to support Sup. Jackie Fielder's ordinance FILE NO. 250390 [Administrative Code - Family Shelter Stay Policy], requiring City-funded shelters to allow unhoused families to remain in shelter for at least one year. The City's current policy to evict unhoused families after 90 days is not just unreasonable, it will only worsen our homelessness crisis by turning more people and families out onto our already crowded streets.

In a City where over 8,000 people are experiencing unsheltered homelessness, family shelter evictions are one symptom of a much larger problem. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing claims that 90 days is enough time for families to find housing, but as reports have shown, many families—particularly those from immigrant communities—have struggled to find appropriate, affordable homes in that timeframe. With as many as 1800 students in the SFUSD currently without housing, we cannot turn more families with children out on the streets for failing to find housing through no fault of their own.

HSH has blamed struggling families for a “lack of active participation in the shelter program.” This is a misdiagnosis of the problem. The current family shelter eviction policy has caused significant panic and fear amongst families who were not given adequate notice, nor were in some cases even informed. These families' inability to find affordable housing while sleeping on gymnasium floors and working precarious jobs is a result of the policy decisions that prioritize profits over housing that is accessible to poor and working class people.

Please support Sup. Fielder's ordinance to allow families to remain in shelter for a year. It's a simple solution that provides much needed stability for families who are already in very desperate situations, and is the most equitable way the city can prevent families from falling deeper into homelessness for the long-term.

Sincerely:

Helen Ung

uhelen94@gmail.com

54 Terra Vista Ave Apt 3

San Francisco, California 94115

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: TNDC Public Comment Letter -- File No. 250522
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:25:41 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[TNDC Public Comment -- TCAP Resolution.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached from Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation regarding:

File No. 250522 - Resolution endorsing the Tenderloin Community Action Plan (TCAP) Investment Blueprint as the community-led strategy to support equitable recovery and revitalization in the Tenderloin, and encouraging City Departments, philanthropic, and private sector partners to use the TCAP Investment Blueprint as a guiding framework to coordinate future investments in the Tenderloin.

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
bos@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: Jesse Rawlins <jrawlins@tndc.org>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 2:42 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Cc: Khoo, Arthur (BOS) <arthur.khoo@sfgov.org>; lisa.liew@sfgov.org; Wong, Jocelyn (BOS) <jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org>; Curtis Bradford <CBradford@tndc.org>; DPH-klamont <klamont@tndc.org>

Subject: TNDC Public Comment Letter -- Resolution No. 250522

Dear Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of The Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC), we request your support to endorse the Tenderloin Community Action Plan (TCAP) Blueprint by adopting Resolution No. 250522. Please find our public comment letter attached.

We appreciate the leadership of Supervisor Bilal Mahmood in sponsoring this resolution, and we urge your support in tandem. Together, we can make the Tenderloin a thriving community. Please stand with us by supporting Resolution No. 250522.

Sincerely,

**Jesse Rawlins, MSW, Policy and Administration Practice
Policy Manager**

email: jrawlins@tndc.org

mobile: (415) 361-0967

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)
210 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.tndc.org



At TNDC, we believe that everyone deserves to thrive. We support tenants and community members in building transformative communities through Homes, Health, and Voice. Together, we can build a future with economic and racial equity. Join us at tndc.org!



Curtis Bradford, Community Organizing Manager
Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
201 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

June 20, 2025

City of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Legislative Chamber, Room 250
City Hall, 1 Drive Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Approve Resolution No. 250522 (Tenderloin Community Action Plan Blueprint)

Dear Board of Supervisors:

The Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) has been an integral partner with the City of San Francisco and other community representatives in developing the Tenderloin Community Action Plan (TCAP) Blueprint. We request your support to endorse the TCAP Blueprint by adopting Resolution No. 250522.

TNDC is the largest affordable housing developer and operator in the City of San Francisco, and we mainly work in the Tenderloin. The majority of our staff work in the neighborhood, and most of our tenants call the Tenderloin home. We see the problems of the Tenderloin every day, and we believe that the TCAP Blueprint will address these problems by meeting immediate needs and supporting systems-change.

The TCAP Blueprint is the result of nearly three-years of a community-created and neighborhood-led planning process through hundreds of community meetings, thousands of stakeholders engaged, over 1,200 surveys collected with an 18-month vetting process, and multiple town halls to develop a robust plan to resource and improve the Tenderloin. Those who have lived and worked in the Tenderloin, many for decades, have collectively reached broad consensus on the priorities of the Tenderloin community. This proves that when community is empowered, the community can lead the way forward.

This process turned an initial City commitment of \$4 million into \$6.6 million in leveraged resources—and, more importantly, into the Blueprint as a shared roadmap that community can use to hold us all accountable. This Blueprint calls for community-driven solutions, and those can be achieved through more participatory budgeting processes where the City of San Francisco can align its efforts to the priorities identified by the community. The Blueprint sets out seven, clear data-backed priorities for the next five years:

1. Street Stewardship and Cleanliness;
2. Eliminating the Open Air Drug Trade and Use;
3. Public Space Improvements and Activation;

4. Youth Investment;
5. Strengthening Services for Community Wellness;
6. Small Business Support; and
7. Housing that is affordable, dignified, and well supported

By formally embracing these priorities, the Board of Supervisors can:

- Align budgets with on the ground needs and the priorities identified by the community;
- Accelerate neighborhood recovery where cleaner, safer streets and vibrant public spaces will restore foot traffic for local businesses and give families the stability they deserve;
- Honor community leadership so that residents who have spent years shaping this plan can see their vision reflected in City policy;
- Advance Downtown Restoration because no plan for Downtown or Mid-Market will be successful without also investing in the Tenderloin neighborhood.

In addition, we request that any policies advanced and implemented through the TCAP Blueprint use a “do no harm and do the most good” approach to ensure that inequities for those that are most marginalized are not maintained and increased. This is important and should be a critical component in moving the Blueprint forward.

We appreciate the leadership of Supervisor Bilal Mahmood in sponsoring this resolution, and we urge your support in tandem. Together, we can make the Tenderloin a thriving community. Please stand with us by supporting Resolution No. 250522.

Sincerely,

Curtis Bradford

Curtis Bradford, Community Organizing Manager

JBRn

Jesse Rawlins, Policy Manager

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: File No. 250552 Hearing on the 2025 Housing Element Rezoning - 56 letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:03:02 PM
Attachments: [56 Letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 56 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250552 - Hearing on the 2025 Housing Element Rezoning and related policies including, but not limited to, affordable housing, tenant protections, and small business support; and requesting the Planning Department and Mayor's Office to present.

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
bos@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: sm4art2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Suzanne Martin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 12:54:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Suzanne Martin
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: centralcitydemocrats@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Michael Nulty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:13:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Blanket upzoning is a simplistic approach to a complex problem. It's crucial to adopt a more strategic and community-focused approach that addresses the specific needs of each area, ensuring that increased density leads to truly affordable and sustainable housing for all.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Michael Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: rbinsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Rita Pisciotta](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 1:26:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

No upzoning for North Beach ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rita Pisciotta
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: damianinglin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Damian Inglin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:45:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Stop It Already!!! At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public OPPOSITION to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

DAMIAN INGLIN IN D2

Sincerely,
Damian Inglin
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: barbara@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Barbara Mann](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:53:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Barbara Mann

From: kielygomes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Karen Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:54:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS): Save our historic city!! Build new housing in the Bayview, not in our Victorian neighborhoods! We are a tourist destination for our heritage, I walk in Alamo Square daily and love hearing all the foreign languages spoken there! Save D8, D5, etc.

Sincerely,
Karen Schwartz
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: janesmalley1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Jane Smalley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:55:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

I live in District 1. We have already suffered the effects of extinguishing historic and neighborhood land marks.

Please stop.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Jane Smalley
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: upzoneoverreachemail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Vance Nesbitt](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:55:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

KEEP SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO!

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need honest leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Sincerely,
Vance Nesbitt
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: rosetaylor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Rose Taylor](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 4:08:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rose Taylor
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: natashjadewolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Natashja Dewolf](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 4:20:04 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Natashja Dewolf
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: sheiladowell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Sheila Dowell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 4:40:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sheila Dowell
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Hatun Noguera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 5:25:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [John Robert Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 5:25:53 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: jvmahoney67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [John Mahoney](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 5:53:45 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I 100% oppose the current upzoning plans. I encourage you to listen to city voters and Not approve the current proposal.

Sincerely,
John Mahoney
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: raander2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Rose Ann Anderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 7:59:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I live in a historic district which would be negatively impacted by height limits, and by any change in multi unit buildings. Ingleside Terrace is a lovely old multi ethnic neighborhood. Instead why not see that the many vacant units at Merced Towers be used to help fill the mandate from the state? Can City land be used to develop new units (McLaren Park). Please don't ruin parts of San Francisco that makes her unique.

Sincerely,
Rose Ann Anderson
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: sarahmhardman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Sarah Byun](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 8:34:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Sarah Byun
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: lard_leashes.0c@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Danielle Pearson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 9:02:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives
- San Francisco is already too densely populated.
- Invest in creating affordable housing in nearby much less densely populated suburbs outside of SF.

We need to clean up crime, drugs and homelessness. These are the issues we need focus on. The city of SF is already way too densely populated. The last thing it needs is more people living in SF.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Sincerely,
Danielle Pearson
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: ftblote@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Francine Lofrano](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 9:57:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but these YIMBY activists offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen landlord safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning
- Educate the public and support neighborhood-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives and we need the City to stop catering to YIMBY activists and developers!

Please listen to your constituents and the people who actually live in the neighborhoods that will be impacted. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Francine Lofrano
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: amhsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Arthur Hubbard](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 10:02:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): I am not convinced that up zoning as planned will be within reach of many people. Those living in the neighborhoods will not be moving into new developments. Who is the target audience? Why has the Westerly on Sloat at 47th Ave not been fully occupied after all these years? Can the city infrastructure, water, sewer, fire services, roadways, parking, public transportation etc support up zoning?

Sincerely,
Arthur Hubbard
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: rick.elfman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Richard Elfman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 1:00:41 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Richard Elfman
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: bapresta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Barbara Presta](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 4:53:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco is a charming city because of its neighborhoods. At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan. Thus proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like "just build more housing and then I can live here," but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you to not destroy the charm and desire-ability of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Barbara Presta
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: lefteri28@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Lefteris Eleftheriou](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 10:22:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Lefteris Eleftheriou
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: tvobsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Anthony Villa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 11:23:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Anthony Villa
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: franlugo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Fran Lugo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 11:53:03 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public comments to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning

Supporters fall back on slogans like "just build more housing & my children can live here.
This plan is wonderful as we need to build build build!

Please just move forward, & build

I bought my first home at age 26. My mother told me to buy a bike and sell the car for cash downpayment. After that I got a Real Estate license at age 31. I had worked for a builder in Orange County -Donald Bren. He built affordable housing & rentals. Smart City of Irvine, Newport Beach & Tustin Ranch. Best education to help everyone have a home. This man is very wealthy now but also made great cities.

Sincerely,
Fran Lugo
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: SunRose7818@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Susan Wolff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 2:09:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):The water level at the United Irish Cultural Center is 21' down.I have the Geotechnical report. The level at 2700 Sloat cannot be much different. The parcels are about 15 feet apart.A tall building cannot be built.The new plans of IrishCC cannot be built either since they contain swimming pools, mezzanine+ garage for 46 cars.This is 3 levels .That cannot be built in 21'.Furthermore there are no known inspections of buildings on same block.No hydrant upgrade.The corruption in SF and the incompetent Coastal Commission cannot realize this.

Sincerely,
Susan Wolff
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: r.clausen415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Rachael Clausen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 2:27:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Rachael Clausen
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Randall Mazzei](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 3:14:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: noguera@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Hatun Noguera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 5:05:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Hatun Noguera
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: timepuzzle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [John Robert Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 5:06:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Robert Smith
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: asmtoyou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Amy Mc Manus](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:00:47 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Mc Manus
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: asmtoyou@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Amy Mc Manus](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:00:55 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This City is crowded enough!!!! No more high rises.

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Amy Mc Manus
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: myoldgoat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Micahel Regan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:58:25 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

We need to rid ourselves of these cycling zealots. They are selfish and unwilling to share.

Sincerely,
Micahel Regan
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: sflronline@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Herbert Mintz II](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:35:47 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Herbert Mintz. I have lived in the Sunset/Parkside district for more than 30 years. This neighborhood, like the rest of the City, has its issues but upzoning won't solve them. I ask who benefits from Mayor Lurie's proposed upzoning scheme? Only wealthy developers, real estate company and affluent clients.

I am not alone in my thinking.

Please recall that at the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Sincerely,
Herbert Mintz II
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: colmbrady650@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Colm Brady](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:48:27 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Colm Brady

From: colmbrady650@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Colm Brady](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:49:50 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Colm Brady

From: [D3 Zoning Coalition](#)
To: [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Dennis-Phillips, Sarah \(ECN\)](#); rachel.tanner@sfgov.org; [Chen, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Draft Upzoning Plan for District 3
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:22:59 AM
Attachments: [Letter to Supervisor Sauter 6.20.25\[4\].pdf](#)

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

Supervisor Sauter,

Please see the attached letter from longstanding organizations in District 3 sharing our collective concerns with the Mayor's proposed draft upzoning plan as it would impact our existing tenants, small businesses, historic resources, and thriving diverse culture. We look forward to working with you address these issues.

Sincerely,

North Beach Business Association, Stuart Watts, President
North Beach Tenants Committee, Theresa Flandrich, Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association, Robyn Tucker, Chair
Russian Hill Community Association, Kathleen Courtney, Chair
Telegraph Hill Dwellers, Nick Ferris, President
Upper Chinatown Neighborhood Association, Hanmin Liu, Chair

From: bevnull@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Beverly Rullhausen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:06:27 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on y COMMENTS (optional):Parking on Lakeshore Drive is already terrible. The proposed hi rise is not going to have parking for most of its residents. Which will bring them to my street. Already conjested. Plus, when the Zoo is open, there won't be room for the patrons to park. Plus the hi rise will block out most of the light to the zoo animals.

Sincerely,
Beverly Rullhausen
San Francisco, CA 94132

From: roxandtodd@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Roxanne Stachon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:45:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Hello -

I am writing to express my deep concern about the proposed Upzoning Plan. I have attended public meetings to hear presentations about the plan, and read the information that has been made available online to the public. I understand the City's desire to continue to add housing. I agree that more housing, in particular affordable housing is needed, and I support of the addition of housing in our City. However, the proposed rezoning approach is not one that I can support.

The scale of upzoning being recommended will forever change the landscape of San Francisco in a manner that will have a negative impact on our public infrastructure, neighborhood character and livability for current and future residents. At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, it was clear to me that there is overwhelming public opposition to this blanket upzoning plan. Doubling or tripling building heights across the city is not only ludicrous from a livability and responsible planning standpoint, but it also appears that the plan proposes this approach with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and without consideration of broad community input.

Before this plan moves forward, I urge you to:

- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data
- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need better alternatives and I urge you to listen to the valid concerns of your constituents.

Thank you,
Roxanne Stachon

Sincerely,
Roxanne Stachon
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: carolynandkeith@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Keith Robert Saggers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:07:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I fully support your plan to upzone the Fisherman's Wharf area between Columbus and Embarcadero, Jefferson Street and Bay Street,

To 60ft. and 80ft.

Please follow thru, I live here and it is not Sacred North Beach, the area needs redeveloping.

Keith Saggers
2310 Powell St.
San Francisco
CA94133

Sincerely,
Keith Robert Saggers
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: k88_joyce@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kathleen Joyce](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:02:13 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Kathleen Joyce
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: john33sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [John Nulty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:37:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: johngarrity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [John Garrity](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:36:41 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
John Garrity
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: sandydmiller@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Sandy Miller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:43:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Dear Representative,

The proposed plan will permanently ruin our liveable city plus our quality of life. Mayor Lurie's proposed upzoning is radical and unnecessary. When I voted for Mayor Lurie, there was no mention of plans to Manhattanize our zoning.

1. Every SF property owner must be officially notified of this plan's proposals BEFORE this radical plan is voted on. There has been no notice.

This plan will ruin our city and our quality of life. It is fundamentally a transfer of wealth from thousands of ordinary SF homeowners to wealthy developers and investors.

2. San Francisco must immediately SUE the state for relief from this Housing quota. Lincoln Mitchel proposed this, and it should have been done months ago!
SF is already the 2nd densest city in the US.

Decades of high prices for SF housing are tangible proof of SF's liveable, desirable 4-story character.

Getting a 4 story buildout on most lots in SF would satisfy the maximum number of additional units that should be required of us by the state. The city must immediately offer incentives to owners who are willing to raise their existing homes and build additional stories of affordable housing underneath.

35 story luxury towers lining major arterials with 6 lanes of gridlock traffic are NOT family housing. Family housing is organized around schools, libraries, neighborhood commercial, and outdoor open spaces -- all with safe, separated pedestrian paths for walkable access. Around the world it is most successful at 4,5,6 stories high.

Under the proposed radical Manhattanization plan:

The urban experience on the ground would change radically, with huge numbers of additional residents plus their additional cars. There is no capacity or infrastructure for this.

Thousands of homes and back yards will be without direct sunlight for 365 days of the year.

Their views of sky and sunlight would be gone, blocked by views of massive walls of towers.

Thousands of SF residents would see their property values plummet while the developers profit.

I say this having worked directly with the San Francisco Planning Department from 1989 to 1999 on urban design projects including projects focused on additional housing possibilities.

In 1993 the San Francisco Planning Department and the Cal Poly San Francisco Urban Design Program won a national AIA Urban Design Award of Excellence for our work.

Very truly yours,

Sincerely,
Sandy Miller
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: chella@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [KC Leigh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 1:29:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Sincerely,
KC Leigh
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: mos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [M O'Sullivan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 2:55:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
M O'Sullivan
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: sfino7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Don Ino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 12:47:58 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Don Ino
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: fraley@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Michael Fraley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 1:58:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Michael Fraley
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: jane@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Jane Shivers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 2:44:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a proposal that would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. They recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like “just build more housing and then I can live here,” but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

I am opposed to changing the height requirements for buildings and making them high, blocking views and blocking light. Part of San Francisco's neighborhoods appeal is that buildings aren't tall like in NY. Don't let developers build monster buildings.

Sincerely,
Jane Shivers
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: montereydivngwoman@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Barbara J Dwyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 3:42:08 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

NO ON UPZONING: There is no "housing crisis"

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, Supervisors and Planning heard overwhelming public opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan. This proposal would double or triple building heights across the city with no affordability mandates, no displacement protections, and no real community input.

The way in which this city is trending is driving out small business people and property owners such as myself. Every day, drug-addicted and street people arrive from all over the US to take advantage of "free" housing and cash benefits, in addition to the city's tolerance of street drug use.

If the city were building workforce housing with preconditions---such as prohibiting drug use and crime--I would support low-rise "affordable housing." Instead, the city and state--led by Scott Weiner---forces taxpayers to house drug addicts and antisocial homeless people, who destroy wherever they live.

In terms of working residents, our population is down by some 7%. San Francisco has lost an estimated 45,000 people since the pandemic. The 20-something generation is fleeing the city.

Residents see through the city's justification that this plan is about meeting the state's housing mandate—one that's clearly outdated, inflated, and out of touch with San Francisco's current reality. We recognize this proposal for what it is: a developer giveaway, not a path to real affordability.

Supporters fall back on slogans like "just build more housing and then I can live here," but offer no credible explanation for how market-rate developers will produce homes that everyday people can actually afford.

This plan creates uncertainty and invites speculation. And once it's adopted, there's no going back. The state has banned downzoning—even if this approach proves harmful, unpopular, or ineffective.

Before this plan moves forward, we urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and strengthen tenant safeguards
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic character
- Require deep affordability in all upzoned projects
- Reject density decontrol and excessive blanket upzoning
- Release feasibility data and pause upzoning in vulnerable areas
- Educate the public and support community-driven alternatives

We need bold leadership. We need better alternatives.

Please listen to your constituents. We are counting on you.

Sincerely,
Barbara J Dwyer

San Francisco, CA 94114

From: eddysapiro@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Eddy Sapiro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:07:11 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and renters
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
- Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
- Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eddy Sapiro
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: judydoane@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Judith Doane](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 8:15:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and renters
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
- Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
- Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Judith Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: morkhan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Moraya Khan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 1:00:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and renters
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
- Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
- Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Moraya Khan
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: nlfederico@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Nancy Federico](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 7:14:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and renters
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
- Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
- Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): When will you start to actually listen to your citizens who will be negatively, drastically affected by the decisions you make that Do Not Affect You?

Sincerely,
Nancy Federico
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: jestjewels@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Eleanor Carpenter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 9:54:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, San Franciscans voiced overwhelming opposition to Mayor Lurie's blanket upzoning plan — a sweeping proposal that would double or triple building heights and density across the city, with no affordability mandates, no protections for tenants or small businesses, and no real community input.

This plan empowers developers while silencing residents.

It is being rushed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated, inflated, and disconnected from San Francisco's reality. The mandate should be challenged — not used to justify a sweeping deregulation of local zoning.

You can not rewrite the city's land use overnight with most residents unaware. And once this plan is adopted, there is no going back — even if it proves disastrous.

We urge you to:

- Protect small businesses and renters
- Respect neighborhood scale and historic resources
- Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
- Extend the approval timeline and engage the public

Don't rush a decision that will reshape the city forever. San Francisco deserves better — and leadership that listens.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eleanor Carpenter
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: jvistnes1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Jessica Vistnes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 10:08:15 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I attended the Town Hall meeting on Chestnut Street last night about the upzoning plan and left EXTREMELY distressed at what is being proposed.

I have attended a number of planning commission meetings at City Hall and heard Rachel Tanner's presentation before. Since she was held up and arrived late, Lori Brooke made her presentation first. The points that Lori Brooke made all made sense to me and the counterproposal that she has written, that I'm sure you have seen, seemed very reasonable. The points that Rachel Tanner made in explaining the rezoning, and has made before, did not make sense to me. The first point she made that didn't make sense to me is that the certain parts of the city have not done their share when she showed a slide where most of the building has taken place recently. As Lori Brooke stated in her presentation, and I agree, that is because our part of the city has been developed over the past 100 years and there are not a lot of empty lots to be developed as there are in other parts of the city. The other point she made was when she showed a slide of one of the tall buildings in Pacific Heights and said those buildings could not be built today and this rezoning plan would allow them to be built again as if that was a good thing. It seems like they haven't been allowed for very good reasons, particularly after the building of the Fontana Apartments destroyed views for people all over the city. At all the presentations that Rachel Tanner has made at the meetings at City Hall, she showed vistas from two viewpoints in the city to make the point that it wouldn't destroy views. Those viewpoints seem especially chosen from a high viewpoint and do not demonstrate the devastating effect that tall buildings will have on iconic views, for residents and tourists alike. 14 foot towers in front of Fort Mason will block views of Alcatraz. Tall buildings near the Palace of Fine Arts will block that view from many places.

Some participants also made some very good points about building in a liquefaction zone and what was learned from building projects about the need to tie basements together on the whole street when building a new building. They also had good points about the new buildings on Union that are not fully sold and have empty first floors and how promises about units meant for senior citizens was not enforced and not met.

There are so many difficult issues to consider. WHY IS THIS BEING RUSHED? It could really destroy one of the prettiest parts of San Francisco. I urge you to slow down and reconsider this plan, which once done cannot be undone especially after tall buildings are built.

Sincerely,
Jessica Vistnes
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: lyndadp@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Lynda De Petris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT: Make San Francisco Affordable, Not Just Buildable
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 12:24:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Subject: Please Support a Smarter, Fairer Upzoning Approach

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for your ongoing leadership and your commitment to San Francisco's future. As a longtime resident, I support more housing — especially affordable housing — but I'm deeply concerned about the Mayor's proposed blanket upzoning.

At the recent Land Use Committee hearing, residents across the city voiced strong and valid concerns. This plan would double or triple building heights across much of the city, without requiring affordability, protecting renters or small businesses, or providing meaningful community input. It seems designed to satisfy a state housing mandate that is outdated and inflated — not to meet the real needs of San Franciscans.

I urge you to push back against the Mayor's approach and challenge the state mandate, which does not reflect our city's current population trends, economic conditions, or infrastructure limitations.

Our infrastructure — transit, public safety, sewers, schools — is already strained. Adding broad density without first addressing these systemic weaknesses risks overwhelming the services we all depend on.

Instead of upzoning across the board, the city should focus on targeted growth across the city and broader growth in areas that need and can benefit from it most — like the Tenderloin, Bayview-Hunters Point, parts of the Mission, and other underinvested communities. With thoughtful, equity-driven planning, these neighborhoods can see real revitalization, affordability, and opportunity — not just more market-rate development.

We can also take inspiration from cities like Boston's Seaport District, or our own Mission Bay, where development was focused, guided by infrastructure improvements, and backed by long-term planning.

I respectfully urge the Board to:

- Challenge the state mandate and advocate for local flexibility
- Focus growth where investment is needed most
- Require real affordability in all upzoned projects
- Protect renters, small businesses, and neighborhood character
- Slow the process and expand community engagement

This is a once-in-a-generation decision. Let's get it right — not by rushing, but by listening, planning, and putting San Franciscans first.

Sincerely,
Lynda De Petris
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 250603 - Fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:11:53 PM
Attachments: [2 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

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

File No. 250603 - Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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
bos@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: [Danny Talavera](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)
Subject: Please Keep Tennis Reservations Free for All
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:27:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I grew playing tennis with my dad and two brothers in the city. I would never had had such an opportunity if there were financial barriers to accessing the courts.

Please reject this proposed barrier to our public spaces and vote no on court reservation fees.

Thank you,

Danny

From: [Rick Yee](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)
Subject: Recreation and Parks Department Fee Proposal
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 9:30:39 PM

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

To Whom it May Concern,

I am against RPD's proposal to charge a 'reservation fee' to use public facilities, especially pickleball and tennis courts. I am especially put off by their idea to charge pickleball 4 times as much to use the same court as tennis players. My reasoning: A single tennis court can accommodate 4 pickleball courts. To reserve the tennis court will cost \$5, but using the same court for pickleball will cost \$20. I think this is very unfair.

This fee will have a disproportionate impact on low income residents and seniors. It will discourage people on a fixed income from using facilities for exercise, recreation and social activities.

Thank You for your time,

Ricky Yee

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 250609 - 2 letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:20:51 PM
Attachments: [2 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

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

File No. 250609 - Ordinance authorizing the City to reallocate approximately \$88,495,000 in prior appropriated revenue and unappropriated earned interest within the Our City, Our Home (“OCOH”) Fund, to allow the City to use revenues from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax through Fiscal Year (FY) 2027-2028 for certain types of services to address homelessness, notwithstanding the expenditure percentages set forth in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810; authorizing the City to expend future revenues deposited in the OCOH Fund through Fiscal Year 2027-2028 on any programs to address homelessness as described in Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2810, without regard to the expenditure percentages in that section; temporarily suspending the limit on funding for short-term rental subsidies; and finding that these reallocations are necessary to achieve the purposes of the Our City, Our Home Fund pursuant to Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 2811.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Voice (415) 554-7709 | 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: larry@saintrubidium.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposition C, Our City Our Home
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 4:52:43 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C such as [me who campaigned for Prop C](#) and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Larry Ackerman

From: [Kyriell Noon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Preserve the Integrity of Prop C
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 10:12:13 AM

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,

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Section 4 from the trailing legislation (File No. 250609) associated with Proposition C, Our City Our Home (2018):

Section 4. Under the authority in Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 2811, the Board of Supervisors authorizes the City to expend future revenues that will be deposited in the OCOH Fund through fiscal year 2026-27, after addressing the specified costs required under subsections 2810(b)(1) and (2), among any or all of the eligible programs to address or prevent homelessness as described in subsections 2810(b)(3)\A)-(D), notwithstanding the specific percentage allocations that would otherwise apply, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by appropriation.

This is a major departure from the provisions of Prop C. Voters specifically required a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors to approve any changes to Prop C allocations. Section 4 of this legislation weakens the voters' deliberate safeguard by enabling reallocation with only a simple majority vote.

The removal of the supermajority requirement is a major departure from previous versions of Prop C trailing legislation. This change undermines the will of the voters and puts the integrity of citizen initiatives at risk. The Board and Mayor must honor the intent of the voters as well as the citizen initiative process protected in the San Francisco Charter.

We call on you to respect the will of the voters and proponents of Prop C like Hamilton Families and reject this section of the trailing legislation.

Sincerely,
Kyriell Noon

Kyriell Noon (he/him/his) | Chief Executive Officer | Hamilton Families
2567 Mission Street | San Francisco, CA 94110 | 415-520-8197
<https://hamiltonfamilies.org>

Our mission is to end family homelessness in the San Francisco Bay Area.

CONFIDENTIAL: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that

disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 250655 - 6 letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:39:25 PM
Attachments: [6 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 6 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250655 - Ordinance amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the Municipal Transportation Agency with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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
bos@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: [Kimcarolyn Olds](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the RV Ban
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 7:45:23 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. This approach, which targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city, is not only a tired and recycled idea. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter. There are over 1,400 people in San Francisco living in their vehicles, and the City lacks a significant amount of shelter beds and capacity to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

Kimcarolyn Olds
oldsfrfx@aol.com
8406 Sleepy Hollow Road
Fort Washington, Maryland 20744

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); dorseyintern@gmail.com; [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Response to District 6 Email
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 2:43:30 PM

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

Here is my response, Kondrad. Be sure to pass it on to my Supervisor who is a sponsor of this gross legislation:

The sun burns through the cool, opaque fog, revealing our New Day as promised by the mayor. Really it's a New Rigor in eliminating poor, suffering people from public view. Have you caught on that this white man is merely copying and escalating London Breed's anti-homeless people policies? Have you caught on how palatable people find fascism from white men? Today's episode of *WTF LEVI HEIR LURIE* revolves around this week's SFMTA meeting and the advancement of City Hall's bulldozing of the homeless.



Here are a couple articles that go over the details of San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie's proposed 2-hour parking limit for RVs aka RV ban:

SFMTA board advances plan to remove RVs from city streets

SF proposes a citywide two-hour parking limit for RVs. Can it be enforced?

SFMTA approves rules that would evict most people living in RVs

El Tecolote investigation into last year's RV parking ban that passed and then was repealed, "This is how the mass eviction of a Latinx RV community became the city's blueprint for displacement."



I will be sharing my feelings attending this meeting and thoughts I have about this new policy.



Here we go again. Instead of standing on the steps with other people protesting the RV ban as I did last year, I stayed behind the line of reporters' cameras. Do people see the connection between those abductions and this RV ban? Between the targeting of immigrants attending their immigration appointments and the immigrants living in these RVs? Do people realize San Francisco local government is capitulating to federal government, because to not would mean actually revolting against the federal government, against America? The "Moderate Democrats" aka Semi-Socially Liberal Conservatives are facilitating a type of San Francisco that's welcoming to cis white gay men, Hillary Clinton-esque feminists and properly wealthy immigrants—as long as they're all conformist bots who obey commands to terrorize those less powerful than them; they wear casual professional clothing inside as well as outside the office because personal expression and imagination has been beaten out of them.

After listening to all the logical, data-driven, as well as emotional reasons this RV ban is a terrible policy, as is always the case, we filled SFMTA chambers. Someone handed out El Tecolote newspapers that featured their latest investigative report on last year's RV ban. I thought that was a brilliant move. We need more educating of the public and let MTA's Board we *know* what they did. It's one hellavu damning report exposing bending of laws, ignoring of ethical concerns and Supervisor Melgar's complicity as well as lead in it.

I saw familiar faces, fellow advocates who keep showing up again and again and again to say NO to City Hall's War against the Poor. We listened to mayoral appointees argue this was a humane approach to RV homelessness, regaling the offers of housing people will receive, RV permits of protection they'll receive, RV buyback opportunities, and other services. These policy people are really good at faking enthusiasm and feigning ignorance. The longer we listened to their arguments for this RV ban, the more disgusted I became. To those unfamiliar with City Hall anti-homeless tactics and broken promises, yes, this could sound like a good plan. You have to zoom out to count how many paid working hours went into these RV ban-type policies, how much of a failure the last RV ban was, how much

of a failure everything is if it doesn't actually address the root issue of homelessness—NOT HAVING A HOME. Goading, coercing, and threatening people does not get them a stable home. Unhealthy anxiety and fear only compound their dire situation. People literally die because all of this money is being spent to **not** house homeless people. Simple as that.

The SFMTA and their Clerk are also the most condescending people I have encountered in City Hall. They seem to relish in telling the public to shut up and not express an iota of anger or support. This was also the case with last year's RV ban meeting. In my public comment against this RV ban, I started with,

"It always impresses me how seriously you take people suppressing their rage and their emotions in these chambers in city hall. You tell us to be quiet, to be silent, to be bots. So I guess you're just gonna get silent rage and you won't know when the pressure is too much and people just burst."

It's true.

Homeless advocates have got to stop leaving LGBTQ+ people out of their homeless advocacy.

I always, justly so, hear how homelessness disproportionately impacts people of color, disabled people, immigrants, elders and poor people in general. I hardly hear LGBTQ+ people mentioned, nor transgender people. It's gross and needs to stop. Include us in your advocacy. That's why I'm always pointing that out in my public comments, because if I don't, certain directors of certain nonprofits won't.

In my SFMTA public comment, I made a point about how this is also a transgender as well as immigrant sanctuary city. Did they take the special needs of homeless transgender people into consideration? In a time where we trans people are also being heavily targeted, attacked and erased? Or the needs of trans immigrants who do live in SF. Did you know tens of thousands of trans immigrants live in California? Bet not. 1/3 to 1/2 transgender people are homeless at some point in our lives. I wonder why?

So many people made public comment against this RV ban.

No one was for it, though that doesn't matter in a top-down government run by CEO Lurie. Homeless, immigrant, monolingual Spanish-speakers pleaded for more time, for real help. The stakes are so much higher for them now that we have increased and militarized, stealth ICE raids in California. For them to show up to a government meeting, exposing their faces and location on camera is real bravery... and desperation. One disabled, elder woman named Melody made public comment too. She made one against last year's RV ban, and her cries stuck with me. "Remember me!" she had screamed at Supervisor Mandelman. Yet he heartlessly made a comment in support of the RV ban after hearing her pleas.

Melody's life has only gotten worse since last year.

She was swept during an "encampment resolution" in January. She said she now thinks about killing herself every day. She pleaded with the SFMTA Board for mercy, pleading for them to stop harming and torturing her every week, every day. She then asked them to advocate on her behalf for Daniel Lurie to pay for her coffin. *Give me my coffin and stop torturing me...The mayor has the money to get me my coffin!* Chills ran down my spine, ice cold dread filled me. We are responsible for Melody and we're killing her. We are not protesting city hall until they actually **serve** us, The People. Enough of us aren't even showing up to city hall at all, or expressing our anger elsewhere at these powerful politicians, commissioners, directors, supervisors. We are not holding them accountable for Melody's slow, torturous death. And I don't know what to do about it.

The only director who voted no on this RV ban was Vice Chair Stephanie Cajina, again. I loathe identity politics because I think it is used to trick people and makes us complacent. "Oh the first Latina Supervisor won't hurt the Latinx community because she's one of us," being the general thinking. Wrong, as El Tecolote's investigative report details. However, it is very telling that the only Latina on the SFMTA Board is the only one to repeatedly vote NO, understanding and caring about the health and protection of Latinx people and immigrants whose homelessness has risen *a lot (maybe 50% if my memory is correct)* since COVID-19, as well as everyone else living in RVs.

Meanwhile Chair Janet Tarlov thought we were all stupid.

She thought we didn't understand what SFMTA was voting on and what we were giving public comment about. She had the Spanish translator read some policy points in Spanish after public comment was over. How fucking offensive, Janet. This RV ban is broken into The Carrot and The Stick, to use the metaphor these government folks used. SFMTA voted YES on The Carrot aspect, and Janet thinks we should be happy about that. But we're smarter than Janet, understanding that this is a package deal and we want NONE of it. The Carrot isn't even guaranteed. There aren't enough offers of housing for all the RV people. So far there are 65 new rapid housing with 50 housing allotments. There are not secure plans to get more, citing the mayor will try to get more budgeted. It was admitted if there isn't enough housing for everyone, well they at least have the RV Permit (part of The Carrot) so people can park longer than 2 hours.

Through the Mayor's Office there is \$3 million set aside for signage, enforcement and *towing*. Again, so much money is spent to **not** house people.

In the age of ICE raids, Mayor Lurie is creating a database of who lives in RVs, which RVs and where they are.

The most disturbing part to me is the database this RV ban plans to create. A citywide survey has already been conducted where RVs on every street were recorded. If you were not recorded during this survey, you have to appeal (process TBD) to receive the permit that exempts you from the 2-hour parking limitation. You will have to prove you were present in San Francisco when the survey took place. Among other contingencies, you need to be in this database to receive any assistance from City Hall. So if you're an immigrant who's afraid of ICE finding out where you live, you just have to trust Mayor Daniel Lurie and City Attorney David Chiu to not betray you. I wouldn't trust my kittens' lives in their hands honestly and seriously. We've seen ICE use their nefarious methods in San Francisco already. I repeatedly point out how David Chiu settled against Black, Latinx and trans people futures when he made both GIFT program lawsuit settlements. I do not trust these two men and I would tell immigrants to not trust them either. One social worker made public comment laying out how housing vouchers via HUD could be shared with ICE, as had already been done elsewhere.

HUD and ICE Collude to Target Mixed-Status Families

In a move that will have major impact in New York, California, and Texas, the two agencies recently agreed to work together in ways that threaten thousands of Americans.

HUD teams with ICE in crackdown on mixed-status housing

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is now sharing data with immigration officials, aiming to remove mixed-status families from public housing. Advocates say the agreement could lead to evictions, surveillance, and fear for thousands of immigrant households.

Will every immigrant living in an RV get a security guard to protect them from ICE? Will Lurie or Chiu bail them out from a detention center should ICE somehow become aware of this database? (That's my good faith argument that Lurie's not just gonna hand the database over).

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 1:31 PM DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org> wrote:

Dear Lea,

Thank you for reaching out and sharing your concerns regarding the proposed 2-hour RV parking restriction. We appreciate the time you took to articulate the broader impacts this policy could have on vehicle residents, particularly families, immigrants, and individuals facing housing insecurity.

Your points about a decent and dignified standard of living, the lack of affordable alternative housing, the lack of shelter capacity and the realities faced by people living in RVs are important and not overlooked. We understand the urgency of these issues and the need for compassionate, long-term solutions.

We will be sure to share your message and perspective with Supervisor Dorsey. Thank you again for engaging with our office and contributing your voice to this ongoing conversation.

Warm regards,

Konrad Kruszka

Legislative Intern

Office of Supervisor Matt Dorsey

District 6 – City and County of San Francisco

From: [Caephren McKenna](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the RV Ban
Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:23:44 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 reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. This approach, which targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city, is not only a tired and recycled idea. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter. There are over 1,400 people in San Francisco living in their vehicles, and the City lacks a significant amount of shelter beds and capacity to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

Caephren McKenna
caephren@gmail.com
392 44th Street
Oakland, California 94609

From: alvearreuben@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the RV Ban
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 9:14:40 AM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. This approach, which targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city, is not only a tired and recycled idea. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter. There are over 1,400 people in San Francisco living in their vehicles, and the City lacks a significant amount of shelter beds and capacity to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

alvearreuben@gmail.com
261 Onondaga Avenue
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94112

From: pugh.lindsay.a@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the RV Ban
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 3:42:37 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 reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. This approach, which targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city, is not only a tired and recycled idea. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter. There are over 1,400 people in San Francisco living in their vehicles, and the City lacks a significant amount of shelter beds and capacity to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

pugh.lindsay.a@gmail.com
2113 Brandonview Ave
Henrico, Virginia 23231-3908

From: [Selena Nadav](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject the RV Ban
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 6:58:02 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. This approach, which targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city, is not only a tired and recycled idea. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from our federal government.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter. There are over 1,400 people in San Francisco living in their vehicles, and the City lacks a significant amount of shelter beds and capacity to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

Selena Nadav
s.marchab@gmail.com
400 Splitrock
Vallejo, California 94589

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 \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Thank you for opposing anti-Semitism File No. 2506858
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:42:49 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Joe A. Kunzler regarding:

File No.250688 - Resolution condemning antisemitism and all forms of race and religion based violence in San Francisco; and reaffirms its commitment to an open, inclusive, and safe city that actively opposes all forms of hate, including those based on religion, ethnicity, race, sex, national origin, immigration status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, and disability.

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
bos@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: Joe A. Kunzler <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 4:37 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Thank you for opposing anti-Semitism

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

Just wanted to add my name thanking the SF Board of Supervisors for opposing anti-Semitism.

Right now, providing close air support, coaching and more to a Jewish-American politician close to home.

Grateful;

Joe A. Kunzler
growlernoise@gmail.com

PS: I heard about this from Assemblyangel-in-Chief Stefani's Instagram

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: Julien DeFrance 8 letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:56:33 PM
Attachments: [8 Letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 8 letters from Julien DeFrance regarding various subjects.

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

bos@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.*

And the camera gives us, and us,
The past side.



On the 11th of 1975, at 10:15, John Deere (john@deere.com) wrote:
[Affirmance of Deere's, and Deere's, and all of their past, the company]
[How to that event?]
[Why do I see many people here in that city? The answer is "Deere"]
[A huge city. Why are you people taking these pictures? "Where are the Deere offices?"]
[Please advise]
[Contact: John Deere]
[Contact: John Deere]
[Contact: John Deere]

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Muni Customer Service](#); [CON. Munifunding \(CON\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [DPW. \(DPW\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); constituentrqst@sfmta.com
Subject: MUNI Bus 49 - 6683 - 444 - Thursday June 19th, 3:00 PM
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:10:33 PM

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

As crowded as it gets. Homeless, crackheads and other fare offenders by the dozen.

Where are the fare officers?

Why are the MUNI operators letting all of these criminals in?

Whoever doesn't pay, shouldn't get to board. It's as simple as it gets. Every other city, every other country does it. Why can't SF show a bit of common sense for once?

Please advise.

JD.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [SFPD_Chief \(POL\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FelderStaff](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#); [SFPD Mission Station, \(POL\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: Peddlers all over Mission St from 14th to 16th St
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 4:05:04 PM

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

According to Mission Local: 100 days after S.F. pledged to clean up 16th St., drugs and vending rage on.

<https://missionlocal.org/2025/06/100-days-after-sf-pledge-to-clean-up-at-16th-st-drugs-and-vending-rage-on/>

“Side streets are marginally better, especially those with private security.”

We’ve all been witnesses. Just steps away from the mobile SFPD command vehicle, and blocks away from the SFPD Mission station, this is all utterly unacceptable.

The taxpayers we are are simply fed up with these situations.

Bring DPW. Seize and trash all of this junk. Make arrests.

Show courage. Show strength. And no more room for leniency.

It’s more than time we finally put an end to this whole mess!

Please advise.

JD.

On Jun 16, 2025, at 20:39, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
Dear Interim Chief of Police,

What’s the point of having a police mobile command on 16th/Mission to allow such a shit show right across the street, one or two blocks away?

Time to make some arrests.

Besides all of the trash and filth, we cannot keep on allowing and encouraging this type of illegal activity.

Supervisor Fielder, why are you so silent, complicit even, on this particular matter?

Please advise.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [constituents@sfmta.com](#); [CON_Munifunding@CON](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [DPW, DPW - Lower Neighbors](#); [contact@lowernobhill.org](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Enardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EnardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [WaltonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowernobhill.org](#); [LowerNothNeighbors@gmail.com](#); [Schulman@lowernobhill.org](#); [SFPD Chief \(POL\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station \(POL\)](#); [Nagano, Tomio \(BOS\)](#); [Muni Customer Service](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [SauterStaff](#)
Subject: URGENT - Recurring FERN ST CHAOS Every Friday/Saturday/Sunday nights!
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:49:59 AM
Attachments: [image2.png](#)
[image3.png](#)

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
Dear SFMTA Board,

Good morning,

Every weekend, both 100 and 200 blocks of Fern St at taken over by lawlessness, hordes of unruly vehicles parking all over our sidewalks, red zones, permanent no parking zones, and also blocking access to the garages of our residential buildings.

Despite repeated incidents, SFMTA (before midnight) and SFPD (after midnight) repeatedly failed to respond to the reports/incidents, leading to a complete chaos down our street, and some of our neighbors unable to access their buildings for several hours, at times, backing up the entire street at the same time.


These 311 cases simply get closed without response or citation.

We cannot tolerate such absurd levels of leniency. Why can't there be SFMTA / SFPD enforcement of these issues? If folks are unable or unwilling to do their job, perhaps they need to be fired and replaced.

Why can't these vehicles simply be cited and towed?

PLEASE! Give these morons the lesson they fully deserve. CITE AND TOW THEM ALL AWAY!

Thank you.





10:36





Blocked Driveway & Illegal Parking

137 Fern St

Remove immediately | Nature of Request: Parking on Sidewalk | License Plate Number: Many | Vehicle Make: Many | Vehicle Model: Many | Vehicle Color: Many | Vehicle Type: Car (4 door)

CLOSED 4h #101002131377

Case is a Duplicate. This issue has already been reported through an earlier request.



Blocked Driveway & Illegal Parking

150 Fern St

Many vehicles parked on and blocking sidewalk | Nature of Request: Parking on Sidewalk | License Plate Number: Many | Vehicle Make: Many | Vehicle Model: Many | Vehicle Color: Many | Vehicle Type: Car (4 door)

CLOSED 12h #101002131110

Case is a Duplicate. This issue has already been reported through an earlier request.



Blocked Driveway & Illegal Parking

110 Fern St

Permanent no parking zone | Nature of Request: Other
Illegal Parking | License Plate Number: Many | Vehicle
Make: Many | Vehicle Model: Many | Vehicle Color: Many |
Vehicle Type: Car (4 door)

CLOSED 3h #101002131038

Case Resolved. Officer responded to request under
251722835. Unable to Locate.



Blocked Driveway & Illegal Parking

10:36



Reports

Submitted by You (7,340)



Case is a Duplicate. This issue has already been reported
through an earlier request.



Blocked Driveway & Illegal Parking

110 Fern St

Permanent no parking zone | Nature of Request: Other
Illegal Parking | License Plate Number: Many | Vehicle
Make: Many | Vehicle Model: Many | Vehicle Color: Many |
Vehicle Type: Car (4 door)

CLOSED 3h #101002131038

Case Resolved. Officer responded to request under CAD
251722835. Unable to Locate.

251722833. Unable to Locate.



Blocked Driveway & Illegal Parking

151 Fern St



Red line and sidewalk parking - recurring Saturday night issue. Cite and tow away all of these offenders. | Nature of Request: Other Illegal Parking | License Plate Number: Many | Vehicle Make: Many | Vehicle Model: Many | Vehicle Color: Many | Vehicle Type: Car (4 door)

CLOSED 3h #101002131008

Case Resolved. Officer responded to request under # 251722790. Unable to Locate.




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

We demand a neighborhood that's free of crime, free of all drug cartel activity, free of homeless encampments, free of crackheads and other addicts, free of trash, free of needles, free of urine and feces...

We demand more parks, more activations, more beautification efforts by the city.

<https://lowernobhill.org/f/neighborhood-open-space-survey-results>





Survey Results

Green Lower Nob Hill

5/15/2025

Prepared by Elijah Ball for the LNHNA Open Space Working Group



Background

Between **June 2024 and May 2025**, we collected a total of **126 responses** through a **community survey** aimed at understanding public space needs and neighborhood priorities in **Lower Nob Hill**.

To reach a broad range of voices, we distributed the survey by putting up flyers and handing it out directly to people on the street and at local businesses. The survey included a mix of open-ended and multiple-choice questions covering topics such as safety, accessibility, community use, and desired neighborhood improvements.

The results offer valuable insight into how residents and visitors experience the neighborhood today and what they hope to see in the years ahead.



Survey Demographics:

A **vast majority (94%) are residents**, showing strong local engagement. Very few identified as **workers (2.4%)** or **visitors (2.4%)**. Only **1.6% selected “Other,”** suggesting minimal ambiguity in how people relate to the area.

95% of respondents do not have children or dependents, suggesting a **predominantly child-free or single-resident community**. Only **5% have 1–2 dependents**, and **none reported 3 or more**.

This supports a planning focus on **adult-centric amenities and open space uses** unless outreach specifically targets families going forward.

The **majority of respondents skew older**, with **over half (56.45%) aged 45 and above**. The largest single group is **ages 55–64**, making up nearly a **quarter of all responses**.

This indicates: **Engagement is highest among older adults**, especially those approaching or in retirement.

Findings...

Q: What's your favorite open space in San Francisco, and what do you enjoy most about it?


Golden Gate Park dominated with the highest number of mentions. Respondents love its **variety, greenery, and accessibility**.

Huntington Park was a close second, especially noted for its **tranquility, elegance, and neighborhood integration**.

Presidio, Dolores Park, and Lafayette Park also ranked highly praised for their **views, vibe, and community energy**.

Several respondents appreciated **oceanfront spaces** like **Crissy Field** and **Ocean Beach** for their **relaxation and natural beauty**.

Parks with **good maintenance, dog-friendly features, and social gathering options** (e.g., Washington Square, Salesforce Park) were consistently valued.



Q: What people like most about Lower Nob Hill (top themes)

Restaurants lead the list, people love the variety, walkability, and access to great food.


Architecture, especially historic and Edwardian, is widely appreciated.

Location and centrality are big draws, residents value being close to transit, downtown, and other neighborhoods.


Diversity (of people, culture, and food) is a core part of the neighborhood's identity.

Other frequently noted themes include **transit access, bars, shops, and community feel**.

Walkability continues to be a major advantage, along with affordability relative to surrounding neighborhoods.



Q: What people like most about Lower Nob Hill (top themes)



Q: Where are specific areas of concern? (key themes)


Homelessness and **drug use** are by far the most prominent concerns, particularly regarding visibility, lack of services, and safety.

Words like “**street**,” “**sidewalk**,” “**cleanliness**,” “**feces**,” “**trash**,” and “**crime**” appear frequently, indicating frustration with day-to-day sanitation and safety.


Lack of green space and the **impact of shelters** on the area were also repeated often.

Multiple mentions of specific trouble spots: **Sutter, Bush, Hyde, Leavenworth, Jones, and Post**.

Other concerns include transit issues, lighting, small business decline, and a need for wraparound housing services.




Q: Where are specific areas of concern? (key themes)



Q: What does community mean to you? (key themes)

- **People, neighbors, and connection** are at the heart of how respondents define community.
- Words like **“feel,” “place,” “safe,” “together,” “supporting,” and “trust”** are prominent, underscoring both emotional and physical dimensions of community.
- Other notable concepts include **“shared goals,” “joy,” “helping,” “home,” and “respect.”**

Overall, respondents overwhelmingly associate community with **mutual care, familiarity, inclusiveness, and a sense of belonging** even in a dense urban setting.




Q: What does community mean to you? (key themes)



Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

1. **Green Space and Parks**
2. **Cleanliness and Public Maintenance**
3. **Addressing Homelessness and Drug Use**
4. **Public Safety and Comfort**
5. **Community Events and Programming**
6. **Small Business Activation and Street Life**
7. **Transportation Access and Walkability**




Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

1. Green Space and Parks

This was the most frequently cited need. Residents emphasized the lack of accessible green space in Lower Nob Hill and expressed interest in parks, rooftop gardens, trees, shaded seating areas, and space for dogs and children.

What residents want:

- A walkable, accessible open space in the neighborhood
- Dog-friendly areas
- Greenery and biodiversity (trees, flowers, pollinator habitat)
- A place to relax, read, picnic, or gather




Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

2. Cleanliness and Public Maintenance

Concerns about unsanitary sidewalks, litter, and general neglect were widespread. Residents frequently cited the need for clean, well-maintained public areas.

What residents want:

- Sidewalks and public spaces free of feces, trash, and urine
- Better trash collection and public hygiene infrastructure
- More trash cans, cigarette receptacles, and upkeep




Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

3. Addressing Homelessness and Drug Use

There was an overwhelming call for compassionate yet visible responses to open drug use and the overconcentration of shelters and services in the area. While opinions varied, many called for thoughtful solutions that prioritize safety and dignity.

What residents want:

- Fewer people visibly suffering in the streets
- More wraparound services and housing options, especially outside LNH
- Reduction in open-air drug use and loitering




Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

4. Public Safety and Comfort

Many responses focused on feeling unsafe walking in the neighborhood, especially at night. Concerns about crime, harassment, loitering, and aggressive behavior were frequent.

What residents want:

- Increased visibility and lighting
- Beat cops or some form of presence
- Safe streets for walking, especially for families and elders




Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

5. Community Events and Programming

Residents voiced strong support for spaces that encourage gathering, civic pride, and connection from block parties and farmer's markets to small concerts and clean-up days.

What residents want:

- Block parties, music events, markets
- Opportunities to meet neighbors and build relationships
- Public spaces that reflect community identity




Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

6. Small Business Activation and Street Life

Respondents wanted more neighborhood-serving businesses and fewer empty storefronts. There's a desire for a lively, mixed-use environment not just green space, but a complete street.

What residents want:

- Affordable commercial space
- Cafes, bakeries, hardware stores, food vendors
- More eyes on the street to enhance vitality and safety




Q: What would you like to see in our neighborhood in the next 2 years? Long-term?

7. Transportation Access and Walkability

Some residents cited the need for better bus service, more walkable routes, and less vehicle dominance—especially in relation to access to parks and services.


What residents want:

- Better MUNI service, fewer encampments on bus stops
- Walkable, well-lit connections between blocks
- Traffic calming and bike-friendly streets




Q:Where and how do you typically socialize in the neighborhood?

- **Bars and Restaurants** are by far the most common social setting in Lower Nob Hill, reflecting the area's nightlife and dining culture.
- **Parks and Outdoor Spaces** especially Huntington Park and Lafayette Park—are valued as social alternatives, particularly for walking or meeting casually.
- **Home-based socializing** and **neighbor interactions within apartment buildings** are common, especially among longer-term residents.
- **Coffee shops and cafes** remain important as casual social hubs, though slightly less so than bars.
- A smaller number of residents socialize through **community events, art walks, or neighborhood cleanups**.
- A few respondents mentioned **not socializing at all**, citing safety concerns, isolation, or neighborhood decline.



Q:Where and how do you typically socialize in the neighborhood?

This data suggests that creating a non-commercial, outdoor social hub such as a well-designed public plaza or pocket park could meet a significant unmet need for a more inclusive, daytime gathering place.



Q: What are some of your favorite destinations in the neighborhood?

Bars and Lounges are the top destination type, underscoring the neighborhood's strong nightlife scene.

Restaurants and **Cafes/Coffee Shops** follow closely, pointing to food and drink as central to neighborhood life.


Retail and Groceries like Trader Joe's are frequent mentions, emphasizing the importance of convenience.

Parks and Outdoor Spaces such as Huntington Park are well-loved, especially among those seeking calm or daytime activity.

Arts and Cultural Destinations have a niche following but show potential for growth.

Few people cited **fitness or wellness spaces** as favorites, possibly indicating a gap or lack of appealing options.

A handful of respondents noted **they don't have favorite destinations**, which may reflect dissatisfaction or disengagement with the area.



Q:Where do you consider the heart of the neighborhood to be?


No clear center: Most respondents felt there is no definitive heart of the neighborhood highlighting a diffuse identity or lack of a communal anchor.

Union Square: While not technically within Lower Nob Hill, it's referenced frequently, likely due to proximity and visibility.

Sutter & Leavenworth and **Trader Joe's area:** These corners are among the most commonly mentioned actual intersections, suggesting potential as organizing nodes.

Bush & Taylor and **Sutter & Jones:** Also named often, hinting at perceived activity or centrality.

Huntington Park and **Grace Cathedral** were identified but less frequently, likely due to their stronger ties to adjacent Nob Hill.



Q:Where would you position open space(s)?

Cosmo Alley most frequently cited, often described as underused and full of potential.

Post & Larkin (including adjacent parking lots) seen as centrally located and in need of activation.

Former Le Colonial site mentioned as a sizable, inactive property with potential.

651 Geary (empty lot) identified as one of the only undeveloped parcels left.

Bush Street corridor called out for its length and untapped corner lots.


Union Square vicinity seen as a strategic location if not overly commercialized.

Vacant/underused lots a general desire to repurpose existing unproductive land.

Rooftops especially of newer buildings or hotels.

Alleyways (general) specifically ones that are already underutilized.

Sutter & Leavenworth noted as a central convergence point.



Q: Are there any groups or organizations that you are a part of the would benefit from open space beyond what we already have?

1. **Book Clubs** Several people participate in or want a local book club that could meet outdoors.
2. **Dog Owners** Informal dog meetups and dog-friendly design are a major need.
3. **Neighborhood Clean-Up** Cleanup crew wants gathering space to build social ties while improving the neighborhood.
4. **Groups for Children or Seniors** While many respondents weren't in family-focused groups, they noted these populations would benefit.
5. **Yoga & Wellness Groups** Interest in classes like yoga or drum circles came up multiple times.
6. **LNHNA & Local Advocates** People involved in the Lower Nob Hill Neighborhood Alliance and similar efforts seek public space for organizing and civic events.
7. **Others** Dozens of responses weren't affiliated with specific groups but expressed strong interest in informal community-building through green, safe space.

This shows that even among people not in formal organizations, there's clear appetite for flexible, inclusive outdoor areas especially for walking, sitting, chatting, and casually meeting others.

Q: What would you like to see in the neighborhood?

Parks by far the most requested amenity.

Community centers places to gather beyond commercial settings.

Playscapes spaces that support kids and intergenerational play.

Dog runs highlighting a strong dog-owner presence.

Street gardens interest in greening efforts.


Outdoor entertainment like movie nights or performances.

Improved pedestrian crossings safety and accessibility.

Farmers markets local, accessible food and gathering opportunities.

Activated alley-scapes and cross-block connections improving circulation and unused space.

Biking infrastructure support for safer active transport options.



Q: How do you rank the following characteristics in importance: Safety, accessibility, inclusivity, and comfort?


Survey respondents ranked **Safety**, **Accessibility**, **Inclusivity**, and **Comfort** on a scale of 1 (most important) to 4 (least important). Here are the key takeaways:

Safety: Most frequently ranked as the number one priority. The overwhelming majority of respondents identified safety as their top concern. It was consistently prioritized above all other categories.

Accessibility: Frequently ranked second or third. Considered essential for ensuring that people of all abilities can enjoy neighborhood spaces. Often paired with safety in responses, highlighting a desire for safe and reachable spaces.

Inclusivity: Commonly ranked third, though some placed it higher. Seen as important, but generally secondary to safety and accessibility. Responses reflected a desire for welcoming spaces—but only if they are clean and secure first.

Comfort: Most frequently ranked as the lowest priority. Viewed as a secondary concern once basic needs like safety and access are addressed. Still mentioned in relation to amenities like shade, seating, and overall cleanliness.



In Summary...

In Summary...


Key Takeaways from the Lower Nob Hill Open Space Survey

(June 2024 – May 2025, 126 respondents)

- **Public Safety & Cleanliness Are Top Priorities:**
The most frequently cited concerns were open drug use, sidewalk cleanliness, and public safety. Respondents emphasized the need for cleaner streets, fewer encampments, and better enforcement of quality-of-life issues.
- **Strong Demand for Green & Social Space:**
Many respondents expressed a desire for new public open spaces especially parks, dog runs, rooftop gardens, and community gathering spots like alley activations and farmers markets. Cosmo Alley, Post & Larkin, and other underutilized lots were frequently suggested as potential locations.
- **Walkability, Access & Local Identity Matter:**
Walkability and transit access are highly valued. People want safer pedestrian crossings, more greenery along sidewalks, and improved wayfinding and neighborhood branding. Some mentioned the lack of a “neighborhood heart” and called for a stronger local identity.
- **Informal Social Hubs Exist but Lack Support:**
Residents most commonly socialize at local bars, cafés, and while walking around the neighborhood. However, many noted a lack of free or family-friendly gathering spaces that don’t revolve around drinking or spending money.
- **Inclusive, Accessible Design Is Critical:**
When ranking design values for new open space, *safety* overwhelmingly ranked #1, followed by *accessibility*. Residents also emphasized comfort, inclusivity, and the need for multi-use space that welcomes all ages.
- **Community Spirit Is Present—but Needs Support:**
Many expressed a strong connection to the area and desire for more community centered programming like events, art, music, book clubs, and safe places to simply gather. Others mentioned wanting to build community but not knowing where to start.

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

Once again, the folks at the "Hague Residential Trust" are in town.
 We just can't leave them. Or else, they have some other (big) business arrangement.
 Please, please, please, please!
 As for the so-called "Hague Residential Trust", where do you think another round of some kind might be possible?
 Thanks with all of this business! Take care, please!



From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: MTABoard@sfmta.com; constituentrqst@sfmta.com; [CON. Munifunding \(CON\)](#); [Muni Customer Service](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#); [Nagano, Tomio \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Homeless trash/stench on MUNI 49 BUS (6644/420)
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:56:59 PM

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

Sunday, June 22nd. 12:35.

Bus 49

Between Van Ness/Sutter headed to Market/Oak and Mission

References:

- Bus Number: 6644
- Digital Display: 420

Why was that fare-offender homeless man and so many others allowed to board to begin with?

Only those who pay should be allowed to board.

Additionally, you cannot keep on exposing legitimate MUNI patrons to such obvious safety and sanitary hazards.

Please advise.

PS: The picture doesn't unfortunately capture the stench part of the MUNI experience, but I'll leave this one up to your imagination.



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: JFK Drive
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:59:28 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Licita Fernandez regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

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
bos@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: Licita Fernandez <Licita.Fernandez.497176420@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2025 10:44 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 24/7 closure of JFK drive has left many people unable to access Golden Gate Park

and its institutions. The current closure is for those who live close enough, have the money to pay for parking, or are able bodied enough to travel on foot or bicycle.

We need to go back to the compromise that was struck and reopen JFK as it was before the pandemic!

Sincerely,
Licita Fernandez

From: [A R](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: Mission Street ongoing Conditions
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 7:47:13 AM

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

Hey Supervisors and Mayor,

The attached picture shows the public works gentleman who is on Mission between 16th and 15th each morning. He takes pics of the conditions on his iPad and repeatedly looks stunned at how much waste humans can make in one night.

I'm sending this as it is a direct example of how unsustainable and irresponsible the mayors strategy is. It makes no sense to be critical of proactive community programs that seek to help our city's most vulnerable; while also allowing this inefficiency to occur. We're defunding several city services just to have this gentleman go out each morning and pick up trash that will be there again by noon. This is such a short sighted, hypocritical solution - it's clear the mayor lacks long term strategy on how to run this city. I'm just happy he's making it blatantly evident for everyone to see. So much for innovation.

Let's hold them accountable,
Alexia Rotberg



Sent from my iPhone

> On Jun 17, 2025, at 2:53 PM, A R <rotbergalexia@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Hi Supervisors I wanted to send these pictures from 2:30 pm today 6/17/25. You'll see they show the Mission Street 16th station with mobile SFPD unit and a cruiser. Less than a block away, right across the street, and within eye distance, people are selling and using. Even with public works staff nearby... The police at the BART station in no way are helping clear or clean streets; they simply sit in their vehicles. Separately cops come on weekends and assist public works staff in clearing illegal vending on Mission street, but that isn't the same presence as that at the BART station and it's just as futile as a solution. This is a waste of tax payer dollars and residents of the mission are sick of being pawns In Mayor Lurie's political performance. The streets in the mission surrounding the station speak for themselves, and the Mayor isn't fooling anyone.

>

> Please hold the administration accountable.

>

> Alexia Rotberg

> <image0.jpeg>

> <image1.jpeg>

> <image2.jpeg>

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Jun 16, 2025, at 7:16 PM, A R <rotbergalexia@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>> Hi Supervisors,

>>

>> Just wanted to provide another update from 1600 15th street, sidewalk conditions as of 6:30 pm today 6/16/25. See attached image.

>>

>> Every day I leave for work at 8 am, and see public works staff hard at work cleaning up the prior nights shenanigans. And when I come home at 5 pm, the place is right back to how it was.

>>

>> This is an inefficient and short sighted use of public funds especially when we know most of the people and their waste - came from 6th street. The mayor wants to blindly fund public works and public safety in the city at the expense of nearly every other department (and neighborhood) but he clearly has no long term strategy or concept of performance metrics.

>>

>> When the Mayor says he cares about small businesses and property - he certainly can't mean the store owners on mission street who's storefronts become the headboard for those who sleep outside each night or nod off during the day. What sustainable solutions does the mayor have?

>>

>> In the middle of budget discussions I implore you all to ask the mayor and administration what their long term strategy is? What measures of performance/ returns on public investments are we seeing?

>>

>> Who's holding this administration accountable?

>>

>> Thanks,

>> Alexia Rotberg

>> <image0.jpeg>

>>

>>

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: Proposal for Temporary Housing Relief for Cost-Burdened Renters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 2:03:27 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from a member of the public, regarding a housing stipend proposal for renters.

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
bos@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: US_Citizen00 <US_Citizen00@proton.me>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 6:08 AM
To: MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; US_Citizen00@proton.me
Subject: Proposal for Temporary Housing Relief for Cost-Burdened Renters

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

Housing Stipend Proposal for Cost-Burdened Renters

Subject: Proposal for Temporary Housing Relief for Cost-Burdened Renters

Dear [Supervisor / Editor / Organization Name],

I'm writing as a resident and renter in San Francisco who is increasingly concerned about the ongoing disconnect between the city's declining quality of life and its rising housing costs.

Even as we face rising crime, deteriorating public transit, and empty storefronts, rents continue to surge — driven by a housing shortage, restrictive zoning, and algorithmic rent-setting by large landlords. For those of us renting here, it feels as though we're shouldering the cost of long-term policy failures we did not create.

This is not sustainable — economically, socially, or ethically.

I propose that the City explore a **temporary cost-of-living housing stipend** or renter rebate program for cost-burdened tenants (those spending more than 30–40% of income on rent). This could:

- Help stabilize working and middle-class renters
- Mitigate displacement while housing production catches up
- Show good-faith support for the residents who keep the city running

Programs like Section 8 are limited and underfunded, and most of the city's housing support targets new development, not existing renters. San Francisco has already piloted innovative direct-payment programs like UBI for specific groups. Expanding this spirit to renters is both reasonable and urgent.

If you're covering this issue or advocating for housing justice, or if you're a public official, I hope you'll consider championing this idea or at least initiating a study on its feasibility.

More of us are being forced to leave and San Francisco cannot continue to rely on renters to **subsidize its dysfunction**.

- Thank you -

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: Illegal Fireworks - 2 letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 2:08:17 PM
Attachments: [2 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters, from a member of the public, regarding fireworks.

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

bos@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: [Jonathan Weisman](#)
To: [Press, DEM \(DEM\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Fireworks epidemic in San Francisco
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 8:09:26 PM

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

To San Francisco leadership:

As a two decade resident of San Francisco, I am immensely disappointed by the city's lack of action in addressing the epidemic of illegal fireworks in San Francisco. [The Civil Grand Jury last year already highlighted the grave health and safety risks](#). Unfortunately, Mayor Breed in her lack of leadership declined to support most of the recommendations in the report.

Not only is the health of the city's veterans, children, and pets at risk but also with climate change **we are at risk of an LA-fire like situation**. Be reminded that the LA fires near Palisades were likely started by New Year's fireworks activities. At least 30 people died and over 16,000 homes were destroyed.

Bernal Hill is one of the most intense locations for illegal firework activity. This also happens to be an open grassland area which turns golden brown and dry after the spring. Right now it is an absolute tinderbox. Given the hill's prominence and ease of access, this is one of the most popular spots to shoot off illegal fireworks. As a nearby resident, I can confirm that we have had TWO WEEKS of daily fireworks - and it's not even July yet.

Mayor Breed's responses to the Grand Jury's report were made public [here](#). I am writing to ask that Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Fielder (as the supervisor representing this area) take action as committed by the Mayor's Office. This includes:

- (Overdue) R5.1: By **December 1, 2024**, the Controller's Office shall instruct its Performance Program Team to identify meaningful illegal fireworks data and require impacted departments in public health and public safety to collect it.
- (Overdue) R3.1: develop and facilitate the publication and distribution of educational materials on the dangers to self, harms to others and the environment, and the laws and penalties associated with illegal fireworks. Such information shall be designed and published by **May 1, 2025**.

Finally, please consider these recommendations for specifically curbing Bernal Hill fireworks:

1. SFPD patrols of Bernal Heights Blvd: a periodic, visible presence by simply circling Bernal Heights Blvd. could deter fireworks.
2. Training for Non-Emergency Responders: frequently when neighbors report illegal firework activity to Non-emergency, they do not know where Bernal Hill is located. They ask as if we know precisely where these fireworks are being deployed. Bernal Hill is several acres and fireworks are deployed everywhere. When filing a report, Bernal Heights should be an easily identified option for callers to report and responding officers should patrol Bernal Heights Blvd as above.
3. Signs and deterrents: signs and fake video cameras could deter firework activities.

4. Implement the Fireworks working group as identified in the Grand Jury's report.
5. Restrict or reduce officially approved fireworks shows from the SF Giants and other official venues. It was absolutely absurd that earlier this year a private party was permitted a massive fireworks show.

I understand there are many people with many needs in this city. However, this issue impacts every single resident in the city for all of the months of June, July, August, December, January and countless nights in between. Almost half of all evenings in the city are unbearable and there is an added tax of renting a hotel room outside the city to avoid. Please help.

Jonathan
District 9

From: [Jonathan Weisman](#)
To: [Press, DEM \(DEM\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: Fireworks epidemic in San Francisco
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 5:51:04 PM

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

As an update, less than 24 hours after this email someone deployed fireworks less than a block from our home. The entire block was rattled. No one slept well.

On Mon, Jun 23, 2025 at 8:08 PM Jonathan Weisman <jonathan.r.weisman@gmail.com> wrote:

To San Francisco leadership:

As a two decade resident of San Francisco, I am immensely disappointed by the city's lack of action in addressing the epidemic of illegal fireworks in San Francisco. [The Civil Grand Jury last year already highlighted the grave health and safety risks](#). Unfortunately, Mayor Breed in her lack of leadership declined to support most of the recommendations in the report.

Not only is the health of the city's veterans, children, and pets at risk but also with climate change **we are at risk of an LA-fire like situation**. Be reminded that the LA fires near Palisades were likely started by New Year's fireworks activities. At least 30 people died and over 16,000 homes were destroyed.

Bernal Hill is one of the most intense locations for illegal firework activity. This also happens to be an open grassland area which turns golden brown and dry after the spring. Right now it is an absolute tinderbox. Given the hill's prominence and ease of access, this is one of the most popular spots to shoot off illegal fireworks. As a nearby resident, I can confirm that we have had TWO WEEKS of daily fireworks - and it's not even July yet.

Mayor Breed's responses to the Grand Jury's report were made public [here](#). I am writing to ask that Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Fielder (as the supervisor representing this area) take action as committed by the Mayor's Office. This includes:

- [\(Overdue\) R5.1](#): By **December 1, 2024**, the Controller's Office shall instruct its Performance Program Team to identify meaningful illegal fireworks data and require impacted departments in public health and public safety to collect it.
- [\(Overdue\) R3.1](#): develop and facilitate the publication and distribution of educational materials on the dangers to self, harms to others and the environment, and the laws and penalties associated with illegal fireworks. Such information shall be designed and published by **May 1, 2025**.

Finally, please consider these recommendations for specifically curbing Bernal Hill fireworks:

1. [SFPD patrols of Bernal Heights Blvd](#): a periodic, visible presence by simply circling Bernal Heights Blvd. could deter fireworks.

2. Training for Non-Emergency Responders: frequently when neighbors report illegal firework activity to Non-emergency, they do not know where Bernal Hill is located. They ask as if we know precisely where these fireworks are being deployed. Bernal Hill is several acres and fireworks are deployed everywhere. When filing a report, Bernal Heights should be an easily identified option for callers to report and responding officers should patrol Bernal Heights Blvd as above.
3. Signs and deterrents: signs and fake video cameras could deter firework activities.
4. Implement the Fireworks working group as identified in the Grand Jury's report.
5. Restrict or reduce officially approved fireworks shows from the SF Giants and other official venues. It was absolutely absurd that earlier this year a private party was permitted a massive fireworks show.

I understand there are many people with many needs in this city. However, this issue impacts every single resident in the city for all of the months of June, July, August, December, January and countless nights in between. Almost half of all evenings in the city are unbearable and there is an added tax of renting a hotel room outside the city to avoid. Please help.

Jonathan
District 9

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: Case Study: SF Government Waste
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 2:17:26 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Edward Volk regarding the Embarcadero SAFE Navigation Center.

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
bos@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: Edward Volk <edward.volk@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 2:09 PM
To: daniel.laurie@sfgov.org
Cc: stefanistaff@sfgov.org; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; megarstaff@sfgov.org; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; sharmann.walton@sfgov.org
Subject: Case Study: SF Government Waste

Good day Mr. Laurie,

3 years ago a Navigation Center was installed @ Brannan Street & Embarcadero. We were told it would only exist for 3 years. It is now 5 years. How many millions of dollars wasted?

- 200 beds. ONLY 10% OCCUPIED PER NIGHT.
- We have testimony from employees at center

The Navigation Center has been a CANCER for our neighborhood.

- Increased crime. Personal and commercial
- Local long term grocery store (> 40 years) has closed
- Restaurants have closed
- Police protection was part of the deal. Police??

In my opinion you are doing an excellent job. I'm pleased I voted for you, As my first mentor said many years ago, "watch the pennies and the dollars will take care of themselves."

Thank you,

Edward Volk
219 Brannan Street
SF

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: STOP 2700 SLOAT BLVD.
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 2:24:34 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Stephen J. Gorski, regarding a proposed construction project located at 2700 Sloat Boulevard.

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
bos@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: Stephen Gorski <sjgorskilaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:40 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>
Subject: STOP 2700 SLOAT BLVD.

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

To: DEAR SAN FRANCISCO: MAYORS OFFICE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SUPERVISOR JOEL ENGARDIO, BOS PRESIDENT RAFAEL MANDELMAN, JONATHAN GOLDBERG (D4 CHIEF-OF-STAFF)

From: Stephen J. Gorski

To: DEAR SAN FRANCISCO: MAYORS OFFICE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SUPERVISOR JOEL ENGARDIO, BOS PRESIDENT RAFAEL MANDELMAN, JONATHAN GOLDBERG (D4 CHIEF-OF-STAFF)

From: Stephen J. Gorski

STOP 2700 SLOAT BLVD

Help to Preserve the Nature & Character of San Francisco Neighborhoods

I vehemently OPPOSE to this high-density, high-rise project. It is NOT an appropriate project for our Neighborhood.

It will NOT serve the Community or Neighborhood.

2700 Sloat Blvd. Project is a poorly planned development that will:

- * Stress the already taxed Infrastructure. Current water and power lines are already old & dilapidated
- * Block natural light creating a huge imposing shadow, disrupting surrounding Eco-Systems, & impacting our open skyline, visible from miles away
- * Increase Environmental & Light pollution from the towering 446+ units, that will interfere with livelihood of ZOO animals as well as surrounding resident
- * Directly on/in a Tsunami Zone
- * In a Seismic Hazard - Liquefaction Zone
- * In the Coastal Zone
- * On the Maher & Cortese lists (CEQA). Former site of gas stations & auto repair shops

In an Archeological Sensitive area. Within 1/2 mile was a recorded Native American Civilization

- * Create intense glare from sunlight reflection on hundreds of glass windows and walls, impacting skyline, views, and areas in all directions
- * Adversely alter or destroy the rare & healthy Soundscapes & Acoustic Environments

- * Increase traffic & create road safety risks for children and elderly. There are no plans for Muni to add more trains or buses to existing routes. With the closure of Great Highway, due to Prop K, traffic already has been vastly increased on the avenues/streets near the project
 - * Adversely impact residential neighborhood parking, creating congestion on residential streets. Project only provides 52 designated & 3 car share parking spaces for 446 units NOT resident quantity
 - * Allows Short Term Rentals (e.g. Airbnb, Corporate)
 - * Adversely impact the local Eco-Systems which is home to protected species in the Coastal Zone
 - * Increase unoccupied residential & commercial space resulting in derelict structures. EXAMPLE: Since 2018, The Westerly complex at 2800 Sloat has been 1/3-1/2 vacant & has NO retailers in the commercial space. The new building plans include commercial space that will be unoccupied too
 - * New plans include a Roof Top POOL open to the elements (e.g. fog, cold, wind, sand, rain)
 - * Have a negative psychological impact on the community
 - * Put Sloat Garden Center staff out of work & potentially other local small businesses
 - * Become a blight on the Neighborhood
 - * Become Urban Renewal / Development 2.0 aka Geneva Towers.
- Unsuccessful: past & future
- * Condo Sales & the Population of San Francisco have declined
 - * Lower & Devalue Property & Neighborhoods (e.g. existing SFR's) for all

Regards,

Stephen J. Gorski, Esq., D4 resident & Voter for over 43 years
and a Concerned Resident.

Sent from my iPad

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: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman - various subjects - 5 letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:09:04 PM
Attachments: [5 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 5 letters from Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman regarding various subjects.

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

bos@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: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman
To: SFPDAIert. (POL); SFPD_Chief (POL); SFSO Complaints (SHF); foipaquestions@fbi.gov; openjustice@doj.ca.gov; Board of Supervisors (BOS); MYR-Appointments; City Librarian_City Librarian (LIB); District Attorney (DAT); SFPD Park Station. (POL); mcu@justice.gc.ca; info@sfchamber.com; info@sfarch.org; info@chinatowncdc.org; rob.bonta@doj.ca.gov; Assembly.Ethics@asm.ca.gov; BART Board; CommunityEngagement@hq.dhs.gov; ICEOPRIIntake@ice.dhs.gov; AsmBudget @asm.ca.gov; AskOCR@usdoj.gov; press.office@theguardian.com; Jenkins, Brooke (DAT); DPW-CodeEnforcement; Commission_Fire (FIR); ICCvisits@icc-cpi.int; SecretaryInvites@hud.gov; applications@icc-cpi.int; OHCHR-media@un.org; media@nida.nih.gov; Press Office, Mayor (MYR); comments@whitehouse.gov; comments@foxnews.com; SM.FS.R2FOIA@usda.gov; Alison.Merrilees@asm.ca.gov; andrew.ironside@asm.ca.gov; elizabeth.potter@asm.ca.gov; caaspp@cde.ca.gov; contact@cmuasf.org; DFracassa@sfchronicle.com; gregory.pagan@asm.ca.gov; dem. UASIMT (DEM); mscardenas@berkeley.edu; letters@washpost.com; samarpreet.kaur@asm.ca.gov; ilan.zur@asm.ca.gov; Corky.Siemaszko@nbcuni.com; kimberly.horiuchi@asm.ca.gov; CRT.SpeakerRequests@usdoj.gov; Jonathan Mahler; Jessica.Roy@sfchronicle.com; InternalProjects@caloes.ca.gov; jhooper@cde.ca.gov; manohar.raju@sf.gov; patricia.guerrero@courts.ca.gov; info@cccsf.us; info@chinatownalleywaytours.org; info@icofsf.org; info@sfcta.org; MSNBCTVinfo@nbcuni.com; Information@stpatricksf.org; info@sherithisrael.org; info@sfp.org; InfoDesk@ohchr.org; SFPD CISU (POL); megan.russell@parks.ca.gov; contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov; Engagement, Civic (ADM); Ethics Commission. (ETH); 401_PIO@CHP.CA.GOV; SM.FS.WOFOIA@usda.gov; misconduct@dea.gov
Subject: Don't Get Fooled. Looks like More Divisive Anti Religious Unity Propaganda, Fear Mongering, and Orchestrated Theatrics, in the Benefit of the Globalist (Nazi 2.0) Organized Crime Security State as Reported in a Guardian Article Seemingly Placed in My Se...
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 3:29:29 PM

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

Looks like More Propaganda, Fear Mongering, and Orchestrated Theatrics, in the Benefit of the Jim/Sam Crow National Socialist (Nazi 2.0) Organized Crime Security State as Reported in a Guardian Article Seemingly Placed in My Search Results...

By: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman, Investigative Journalist and Attorney Per Se at SF Liberator New

<https://sfliberatornews.weebly.com/>, A Liberal Free Market Constitutionalist Print News Source for Intelligent Empathic Human Brains.

Credentials: *Mass Comm./Journalism Major (Excelling in all High School and College Level Writing /Journalism Courses), *Former AmeriCorps Civil Service Agent of the Government, *Certified First Responder, *Certified Business Technology Market Expert Writer by Business Dot Com, *Non-Profit Management Experience and Certified Volunteer Manager by Points of Light Foundation, and, *Held Director Level Titles in the Business Tech Space. Founder (2021) of the Religious Non-profit Start Up "O.R. News Network" (theoregonpublicnews@gmail.com) and Reporting Under Federal EIN#86-3597094. I am A Grandnephew of a Jewish Holocaust Survivor on my Father's Side and a third Generation Sicilian/Irish Catholic Immigrant on my Mother's Side. My Journalism exposing corruption is of the same religious conviction and intent as Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. had for his Civil Rights Movement, "Liberty for the Captives". "Doesn't matter what color, race, ethnicity, sexual identity you are, if you are cooperating with organized crime you are an enemy to Civil Rights and Freedom for the Oppressed!" My articles are available as a thank you to the intelligent people who help me continue this inspired work, **Articles Valued at \$5 Dollars each and \$20 Dollars per Booklet. Your Donations are applied towards maintaining my health, hygiene, and Professional Appearance** as I continue this inspired work reporting from the street level similar to how I was trained as an AmeriCorps Agent except now I expose as a Journalist the Corruption and Exploitation involved in Government Funded Human Management and other Contracts/Partnerships designed in the Benefit of Organized Crime as well as the Tools, Tactics, Technology and Psychology of the Illegal targeted Ops Involved in Protecting and Perpetuating this Illegality and Unconstitutional Activity. **Please note** I have been reporting attacks to my internet, spelling and grammar, copy and clip board, and seemingly remote access to my cursor with the intent to discredit my articles with mistakes or sometimes plagiarize them by copying and pasting them before I hit send. I have no dyslexia and have excelled at all of my Highschool and College Journalism/English Writing Courses and am meticulous in my own grammar checks using the available tools and features of which many of these typos which are being maliciously added into my articles by these attacks would be impossible to overlook. It Appears, similar to the way Organized Crime cheats at Gambling, they are not just using remote access to the Library Computer's I use but also it appears they

may be using AI to record my keystrokes and then broadcast those keystrokes using Voice Protocols through Non-Visible Communication Devices to Operatives who then transcribe and type a version of my articles and because that dictated version has typos they then switch the file in my email after I hit send and walk away and go to the printer as the printer prints out the switched typo copy. All of their operatives are incredibly ignorant and would not be able to extrapolate or Debate me on these topics in any meaningful coherent way consistent with my liberating religiously inspired ideology and philosophy. Every day I am in this Library, like every other scene I may be, they have trapped me in Psy Op conditions with operational Actors deployed, it is like watching brainwashed low I.Q. Government Puppets Dancing around me all day long as if they are trying to optimize their choreographed targeted activities and psychological warfare using me as the target to optimize against. None of their activities seem consistent with the reality of the environment, my actual profile, image, or Self Identity so it appears that some really ignorant people are ignoring reality and coordinating these brainwashed automatons like Avatars from a remote Dashboard and Panel with nothing but prejudice and stereotypes to command their activities, it is like a Military/Intelligence OP whose intel got corrupted but operational actors still deployed and pushed inconsistently into the Theater of War just looking obvious and confused against the backdrop. I am a Prisoner in this Environment Until I can Get the funds to Safely Hike Out.

Thank You and God Bless to all Empathic Liberal Intellectuals, Religions, and Religious People's seeking the True Freedom!

San Francisco 06/20/2025. As Religions around the world are figuring out the hard way that the World is being taken over by a National Socialist Anti-Religious Crime Syndicate that grew powerful in the Stock Markets creating displaced victims to get Government Contracts to house manage and treat those victims, the mentally ill, addicted, homeless, refugees, any disease and human weakness really, can be manufactured, and the conditions forced onto a human subject or group of subjects in controlled environments to force symptoms on those targeted and contained people and like the old Mob littering our streets with trash to get Government Waste Management Contracts, they have been inundating the public with so many victims that we practically gave them our permission to raid the public purses of the World's Democracies and take over our Governments with a fake humanitarianism that pushed for universal housing and healthcare which turned human beings into a valuable commodity and the housed subjects became sitting ducks for targeted ops that included narcotic distribution, biological and chemical warfare, psychological warfare, and the use of military grade NLW's that create symptoms to be treated, including criminality to profit the criminal justice partners who were "rubberstamping" Ref. Professor Michael Lipsky's famous work "[Street Level Bureaucracy-Dilemmas of the individual in Service Delivery](https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/Lipsky_Preface.pdf)", https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/Lipsky_Preface.pdf, people were being guided into the criminal justice system just to get navigated as a condition of release in a plea deal into human management programs such as drug court and mental and behavioral health court, and the more symptoms the more money got transferred to those housing and healthcare related corporations and government agency partners involved, and all of this was predictable growth and expansion activity as they controlled the faucet of incoming patients, inmates, and clients. There is nothing wrong with mental health and drug courts trying to keep people out of jails as an ideal, the problem was that as soon as practically zero accountability Tax-Funding got attached to these programs the printing presses were opened wide for Organized Crime Activities and this turned human beings into a valuable commodity worth more than all the drug money because the were now profiting off of Big Pharma Stocks and creating Ponzi Schemes getting, IRA's, Public Employee and Unions Organizations involved making it too big to fail, and everyone got corrupted and turned a blind eye as their policies. like the Criminal Justice System, just helped process the victims through with no real investigation into possible foul play involved in engineering the conditions that caused the behavior and symptoms, these are the tactics of a Nazi 2.0 Organization that is tech savvy and understands behavioral psychology in ways that they are experts at human manipulation, now armed with AI and Automation and

Non-visible Communication devices that can remotely and satellite coordinated through dashboards and control panels and choreograph the activities that perpetuate and protect their now global dominance like playing a video game using brainwashed human avatars, like High Tech Pirates using Military Style Tech and Coordination, including (C.I.) "Cinema Intelligence" and Operational Actors to create fake news and content, orchestrate and fabricate evidence, radicalize targets and film the acts of aggression and violence that happens as a result to push an agenda, they have no value for life and will sacrifice their own team members to be killed by a target they radicalize just to push more security state social control mechanisms that restricts everyone's civil liberties and essentially forces society into their predetermined social and industry roles to be profited off of, the rest, those who aren't turned into antagonistic street operatives or actors themselves who engage in public nuisance and other crimes and disturbances to the public just to maintain the negative stereotypes that have been placed on their victims as a stigmata causing social isolation and justify the rubberstamping without any real advocacy or pathways out otherwise, get cleansed (murdered covertly in ways connected to their profile information to make it look drug, criminal, genetic, criminal (gang), mental/behavioral or health related, as they maintain strict population control as their only means to adjust for overhead costs and determine a value only in relation to the cost/benefit analysis of their network of connected organizations and corporations, this Psychopathic Nazi-Type Organized Crime Syndicate does not value human life and is completely governed by profiling, Data and AI and has centralized every industry now, making those policies in every industry, including federal law Enforcement, uniform globally in its benefit, not to discredit our Good Law Enforcement and Agents out there who we need now more than ever, but these people are choreographing around their moves easily because they created those policies for that reason and run the technology involved with an enormous amount of street operatives, even middle class soccer mom "Stepford Wives" types and their children, who run surveillance activities and try and entrap targets into negative situations that can be recorded and misconstrued. You can't trust any media information anymore that Eastern Europe could during the Nazi Invasion and that is why I try and report through the propaganda being supplied in my search results so that my readers can be self aware and take necessary and realistic precautions because they love to fear monger and divide us to move our behavior in predictable ways or create public support for an element of their agenda or even cover up for their targeted ops and I write this as a Pro-Democracy Journalist who has been investigating them for over 20 years and undercover from the street level for over 8 years as a target of their Multi-Agency Ops. This latest report in my search results from the Guardian,<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/jun/20/zohran-mamdani-death-threats-max-miller>, claims in its title, "US elected officials face wave of violent threats prompting calls for security" and that a Jewish U.S. Congressperson, "contacted the US Capitol Police after being "run off the road" by a man displaying a Palestinian flag who allegedly yelled "death to Israel". and they went on to say in another incident where a suspect reportedly "was captured after a large manhunt and faces murder charges, amid reports that he is an extremist and was pro-Trump and anti-abortion.". Don't believe the lies. I am an unaffiliated Liberal Constitutionalist, I am a light skinned Multi-Racial son of a Jew on my Father's side and third generation Sicilian/Irish Catholic on my Mother's side, as a Sicilian i share North African Bloodlines with our

Muslim brother's and sisters who are part of the Abrahamic Religions which include Judaism and Christianity, we all share the same God, the Christians grafted in by their faith as evidenced by good works apparent in God's eyes not humans, but the point is when the World Religions Unite for a cause, and we all should be united when a National Socialist anti-religious threat rises like in Hitler's Germany, it makes us powerful actors on the world stages, this power is derived from Constitutional and International Protection of Religious Freedoms and other protected civil liberties, these Organized Crime members seek to keep the Religions divided, Keep all of the world's citizens divided, and they attack any form of Constitutionalism both Liberal or Republican and Free Markets that allow competition to the Hegemony and Control their Organization has created over society right now. First, in this article it is being reported that because of these incidents. "The Capitol Police requested nearly \$1bn in funding for next year", the Capitol Police are very well funded since 9/11 and attached to every Intelligence and Law Enforcement Agency on the planet, even State Capitol Police, A Billion dollars is enough to start a whole new industry and while I want our Law Enforcement to be equipped in ever possible way, a Billion dollars is hard to justify as anything but a bribe unless policies get adjusted so that individual rights are protected from violations this Organized Crime Syndicate. I recently submitted a Case to our Federal Government and International Criminal Court by email called, "A Bi-Partisan Case to Make Civil Rights Violations Criminal and Federal Offenses as an Anti-Organized Crime Tactic and to Protect the Economic Interests of the Tax-Payers." to urge legislation to this point as an Anti-Organized Crime Tactic. We also see here being reported by the Guardian that, "Capitol Police investigated 9,474 threats to lawmakers and their families last year, an increase of nearly 1,500 compared with 2023, which have escalated over the last five years but peaked in 2021. *Only eight convictions were made* over the threats in 2024, according to a bipartisan letter". This Almost 10,000 threats and only 8 convictions means a lot of arbitrary nonsense got misreported as a "threat", what seems to happen as I have reported in other articles is that certain events, like a threatening call or email, causes behavioral triggers in Law Enforcement Activities in ways that their responding behavior is predictable and this predictability to their automated response to the event is how Organized Crime Operatives can choreograph their activities like a break in or to steal data off a computer or hard drive, I reported this last year based on a different article strategically placed in my search results at that time in a California State Building. This is why I support SMART Law Enforcement not militarized or automated, we need Officer's and Agent's with highly developed intuitive abilities and investigative skills not biological robots putting down a person from a policy procedure guideline like an orderly does to mental patients in a Behavioral health unit, mostly because this Crime Syndicate uses mental patients who are disposable to them usually just as a diversion or scapegoat. Whether this Guardian article is a complete fabrication or not, I do not have the resources to confirm, but you can be sure that the suspects arrested were just brainwashed automatons themselves used for the agenda of suspiciously injecting a Billion more dollars into an already well funded Agency, and as a target myself who has been trying to escape my current false imprisonment in this jurisdiction and make my way to D.C. for a peaceful redress of differences to me Government and hope to make a full report to Congress, I wouldn't put it past these Organized Crime Operatives or the politicians on their payroll or misinformed and manipulated by their so called experts to

orchestrate these events just to place extra restriction at Capitols all over the country to block citizen participation and testimony, just to block people like me from testifying because testimony given with a logical argument of reason spelled out in the language of Constitutional Law, like how Rev. King Jr. spoke, makes it hard for Congress to turn a blind eye, so now they just target people profiled as Rev King Jr. types on both sides of the fence to try and discredit them socially and orchestrate events like being reported here to justify blocking legitimate public testimony from getting on the record. In my Career trying to expose this Crime Syndicate and hold the Governments accountable I have literally seen surprise construction projects show up as much as fabricated security events just to keep me from testifying at City Halls and State Capitols, so I wouldn't be surprised if this was correlated and they are just adding this divisive rhetoric between Muslims and Jews who most I talk to are united against these puppet governments not divided against each other and the suspects themselves involved are designed to cause more divisions in our society between left and right that is unhealthy for our Democracy because it makes people who believe this non-sense reactionary and politically prejudice, and reactionary humans, like animals, like the example of automated Law Enforcement, are predictable and can easily be manipulated by the people who know how to antagonize that prejudice in you, most people do not understand how weak and vulnerable the untrained and unenlightened human brain is to psychological manipulation, especially when those humans have been trapped inside intellectual blockades and the misinformation is socially reinforced with nothing being allowed into the environment to contradict it Ref. "Plato's Allegory of the Cave", a famous concept of philosophy I often evoke as an illustration. One thing is for sure, things aren't what they seem in this Guardian Article and you can see clearly, I hope after this explanation, the divisive agenda being promoted between the lines and the potential to use security events both to cause fiscal expenditure to be allocated as a bribe and to restrict civil liberties, that is a corruption of Government that we cannot allow and all of us citizens like the Religions should be United against this Tyranny and their invasive and damaging effects to the human psyche as much as our Democracy. There are no right or left Political Boogey Men, we have nothing but political theater and propaganda being projected at us just like during the Nazi takeover of Eastern Europe just with upgraded technology, just trust if the media content elicits an angry emotion or makes you divisive instead of informed with the knowledge that leads to government accountability and fiscal responsibility or allows for violations to civil rights or protected liberties you can trust it is propaganda.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

From: [Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman](#)
To: [SFSO Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [City Librarian, City Librarian \(LIB\)](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [SFPDAler, \(POL\)](#); [openjustice@doj.ca.gov](#); [mcu@justice.gc.ca](#); [misconduct@dea.gov](#); [CommunityEngagement@hq.dhs.gov](#); [Commission, Fire \(FIR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#)
Subject: SF Liberator News asks, "Dear Law Enforcement Why do let them deploy these Junkies Next to me at the Library computer when I am clearly identified as a Journalists who frequents here often and they have never been seen on video here at the library? Ple...
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 12:15:15 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

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

SF Liberator News asks, "Dear Law Enforcement Why do let them deploy these Junkies Next to me at the Library computer and other places I frequent when I am clearly identified as a Journalists who frequents here often and they have never been seen on video here at the library? Please Stop the targeted Harassment using Justice Department Operatives! Thank you Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman, Investigative Journalist and Attorney Per Se....Please Keep all drug addicts in your databases away from me otherwise your agency will be liable for any negative activity that happens as a result of these operatives being deployed in the places IO frequent whether it is a direct threat to my life like psychological warfare or liberty such as using them in illegally collected surveillance to make false implications, your qualified immunity will be removed for making "an unreasonable mistake of fact or judgment" and violating our sanctuary protections in this city as well as illegally surveilling a journalist, (you would have to be to know where I am to deploy these operational actors) and other rights violations, I support local P.D., our mission objectives are closely aligned, I am fighting against Global Organized Crime as a Journalist exposing the High Level mechanics of their operations trying to get public awareness to the issues that benefit this corrupt and illegal network, it doesn't make sense for any Law Enforcement to be involved in these activities against me unless they are corrupted and being directed by Organized Crime, is strange drug addicts never seen before are entering the library I expect Law Enforcement to be suspicious of all of them and investigate but I am a frequent patron with over 12 months here publishing articles in San Francisco with a good relations with local patrol officers, but I am tired of being harassed by low level criminals and junkies every where I go. The fact they are being human trafficked into your jurisdiction and placed here I suggest local P.D. open a sting operation on Civic Center, Market Street, and along the Bay towards the Fire Department with facial recognition software, all of these people were released from some facility and should be easy to track and send them back to that facility in that jurisdiction.

PRESS I.D./Credentials

Federal EIN # 86-359-7094



Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

From: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman
To: SFPDAIert. (POL); SFPD_Chief (POL); SFPD Park Station. (POL); SFPD CISU (POL); SFPD Central Station. (POL); SFPDMediaRelations. (POL); SFSO Complaints (SHE); ICEOPRIntake@ice.dhs.gov; press@amnesty.org; Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); openjustice@doj.ca.gov; mcu@justice.gc.ca; foipaquestions@fbi.gov; ICCvisits@icc-cpi.int; applications@icc-cpi.int; City Librarian, City Librarian (LIB); Madeline.coggins@fox.com; comments@foxnews.com; CommunityEngagement@hq.dhs.gov; misconduct@dea.gov; Commission, Fire (FIR); AskOCR@usdoj.gov; MSNBCTVinfo@nbcuni.com; MYR-Appointments; SecretaryInvites@hud.gov; Assembly.Ethics@asm.ca.gov; OMBFOIA@omb.eop.gov; comments@whitehouse.gov; caaspp@cde.ca.gov; media@nida.nih.gov; megan.russell@parks.ca.gov; SFDA-Victim Services; Engagement, Civic (ADM); contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov; patricia.guerrero@courts.ca.gov; Administrator, City (ADM); rob.bonta@doj.ca.gov; District Attorney, (DAT); Jenkins, Brooke (DAT); madcap@cnbc.com; Corky.Siemaszko@nbcuni.com; OHCHR-media@un.org; media@omb.eop.gov; mscardenas@berkeley.edu; editorial@sfsfstandard.com; forum@kqed.org; carrillo@law.berkeley.edu; tattwa@svedanta.org; MYR - Scheduling; info@cccsf.us; info@sfarch.org; info@sherithisrael.org; Information@stpatricksf.org; morning@npr.org; InfoDesk@ohchr.org; info@chinatowncdc.org; info@icofsf.org; info@sfchamber.com; info@sfcta.org; info@sfp.org
Subject: Predicting My Movements as a Prisoner In a Controlled Environment is Evidence of Sabotage and Acts that are Cruel and Unusual Not real Intel or Intelligence Reporting...By: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman, Investigative Journalist and Attorney Per Se at SF Lib...
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:55:27 PM

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

"Predicting My Movements as a Prisoner in a Controlled Environment is Evidence of Sabotage and Acts that are Cruel and Unusual Not real Intel or Intelligence Reporting..."

By: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman, Investigative Journalist and Attorney Per Se at SF Liberator News
<https://sfliberatornews.weebly.com/>, **A Liberal Free Market Constitutionalist Print News Source for Intelligent Empathic Human Brains.**

Credentials: *Mass Comm./Journalism Major (Excelling in all High School and College Level Writing /Journalism Courses), *Former AmeriCorps Civil Service Agent of the Government, *Certified First Responder, *Certified Business Technology Market Expert Writer by Business Dot Com, *Non-Profit Management Experience and Certified Volunteer Manager by Points of Light Foundation, and, *Held Director Level Titles in the Business Tech Space. Founder (2021) of the Religious Non-profit Start Up "O.R. News Network" (theoregonrepublicnews@gmail.com) and Reporting Under Federal EIN#86-3597094. I am A Grandnephew of a Jewish Holocaust Survivor on my Father's Side and a third Generation Sicilian/Irish Catholic Immigrant on my Mother's Side. My Journalism exposing corruption is of the same religious conviction and intent as Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. had for his Civil Rights Movement, "Liberty for the Captives". "Doesn't matter what color, race, ethnicity, sexual identity you are, if you are cooperating with organized crime you are an enemy to Civil Rights and Freedom for the Oppressed!" My articles are available as a thank you to the intelligent people who help me continue this inspired work, **Articles Valued at \$5 Dollars each and \$20 Dollars per Booklet. Your Donations are applied towards maintaining my health, hygiene, and Professional Appearance** as I continue this inspired work reporting from the street level similar to how I was trained as an AmeriCorps Agent except now I expose as a Journalist the Corruption and Exploitation involved in Government Funded Human Management and other Contracts/Partnerships designed in the Benefit of Organized Crime as well as the Tools, Tactics, Technology and Psychology of the Illegal targeted Ops Involved in Protecting and Perpetuating this Illegality and Unconstitutional Activity. **Please note**. I have been reporting attacks to my internet, spelling and grammar, copy and clip board, and seemingly remote access to my cursor with the intent to discredit my articles with mistakes or sometimes plagiarize them by copying and pasting them before I hit send. I have no dyslexia and have excelled at all of my Highschool and College Journalism/English Writing Courses and am meticulous in my own grammar checks using the available tools and features of which many of these typos which are being maliciously added into my articles by these attacks would be impossible to overlook. It Appears, similar to the way Organized Crime cheats at Gambling, they are not just using remote access to the Library Computer's I use but also it appears they may be using AI to record my keystrokes and then broadcast those keystrokes using Voice Protocols through Non-Visible Communication Devices to Operatives who then transcribe and type a version of my articles and because that dictated version has typos they then switch the file in my email after I hit send and walk away and go

to the printer as the printer prints out the switched typo copy. All of their operatives are incredibly ignorant and would not be able to extrapolate or Debate me on these topics in any meaningful coherent way consistent with my liberating religiously inspired ideology and philosophy. Every day I am in this Library, like every other scene I may be, they have trapped me in Psy Op conditions with operational Actors deployed, it is like watching brainwashed low I.Q. Government Puppets Dancing around me all day long as if they are trying to optimize their choreographed targeted activities and psychological warfare using me as the target to optimize against. None of their activities seem consistent with the reality of the environment, my actual profile, image, or Self Identity so it appears that some really ignorant people are ignoring reality and coordinating these brainwashed automatons like Avatars from a remote Dashboard and Panel with nothing but prejudice and stereotypes to command their activities, it is like a Military/Intelligence OP whose intel got corrupted but operational actors still deployed and pushed inconsistently into the Theater of War just looking obvious and confused against the backdrop. I am a Prisoner in this Environment Until I can Get the funds to Safely Hike Out.

Thank You and God Bless to all Empathic Liberal Intellectuals, Religions, and Religious People's seeking the True Freedom!

San Francisco (Psy Op) 06/24/2025. First of all you have to understand that when dumb Neanderthals, like the Nazis for instance, Automate a system either through technological means or by strict obedience to policies and procedures and commands of superiors, that system becomes fixed and determined, and those who become the object of subjugation to that system are done so only by a compliance that gets manufactured as willing consent, such as welfare recipients who have no choice for survival except for that meager assistance, or enlisted soldiers whose limited socio-economic conditions forced on them gave them little option but the military for the socio-economic security promised as a sociological advantage by an expensive College Degree, the choices in these instances were limited on both the welfare recipient and the prospective soldier, who became complacent, surrendered their own wills, in order to get the promised reward, like the proverbial donkey who chases a carrot to turn the mill wheel. It is then not difficult to predict the life choices and behavior of either the prospective soldier or the welfare recipient because they were essentially both contained in controllable socio-economic environments with limited options, their desires, one a biological necessity for the welfare recipient and the other an intrinsic desire to gain more socio-economic status and comfort, were then capitalized on by the Government Agencies who dangled the appropriate "carrot" to lure them into complacency and obedience to those respective systems, should they have been offered opportunity to satisfy those desires by expressing their own wills freely and independent of any system we can say with confidence that they would have chosen the free exercise of their wills over willing subordination for a promised reward and further, we can state affirmatively, that the lack of opportunities to exercise their own wills freely to acquire the satisfaction of those intrinsic and biological desires is a manufactured and intentional design of a larger system that requires a certain percentage of the population chooses those presented options so that those agencies can be justified in their operations and expansions, these smaller systems, or agencies, like the larger system, being fixed and determined themselves, rely then on omitting and limiting choices and options and manufacturing conditions to make the presented available options more attractive but only because of the removal of anything contrary or in competition. This is a systemic design element foundational with most Government programs. Criminality, is, in this system, also viewed as a potential option of the subjects monitored but this option leads to a forced submission of the subjects will into subordination however the processing, conditioning, and management still basically is of the same method, a negation of the individual's will and rights over themselves and instead subjugated as an object to be directed through the system with a deliverable as an outcome that has no relation to the advancement of the will of that individual, the individual is absent, removed from its characteristics of individuality, and, for all intensive purposes to the system, reduced to its role in relation to the system by the subordination whether a forced surrendering of the will because of criminality detected and expressed or a coerced surrendering of the will by limiting other available options. We can no doubt claim that the existence of the agencies involved who value continuity over mission and so need to maintain subjects continuously entered into their respective systems to perpetuate that continuity must engage or

have third party partners engage in the activities needed against subjects to manufacture the conditions that guide their behavior into the benefit of those smaller systems, agencies, so that the larger system itself has continuity, uninterrupted continuity being the only measured outcome of that system, just keep the cows moving with the herd they have been branded for without causing a stampede, this is measured as a success so to speak without questions of morality tied to the development of the species of cattle outside the benefit they bring to the system, the Government Manages human beings in its system the same way. This is a psychopathology by design when applied to human beings and a root cause of developmental disorders and mental illness in both the employees and clients involved and especially the Elites who have knowledge of the Architecture of the system from above it begin to experience Megalomaniacal behavior commonly associated to Cannibalism and Bestiality due to a Psychosis of Superiority dependent on the continued underdevelopment of the people contained and therefore being manipulated into subjugation in the system that those Elites have the job of monitoring and adjusting so that continuity gets perpetuated and optimized for efficiency. In this system, people like me, like Ghandi, like Rev Martin Luther King Jr., are detected as perceived threats because we are the anti-thesis to the monitors and adjustors of society, we see the system from above like them, but from a Devine perspective, we see the continued underdevelopment that is necessary to gain subjugation and the surrendering of wills as a threat to the consciousness and the development of our species in ways that threatens human progression as a whole towards realizing our fullest potential. So, I find myself a targeted and contained victim, not one who can be forced by any criminality because my moral faculties have been strengthened outside of the system in ways I abhor the symptom of criminality as a manufactured condition capitalized on by the system to forfeit personal rights, I also cannot be coerced as my mental faculties of mind have been developed as well outside of the system to include the concept of integrity against subjugation armed with the knowledge of the rights I am allowed in a free society to hold over myself. The system, which has increased its social control mechanisms and Centralized all Industry into itself by creating dependency similar to the conditions forced/coerced onto individuals, is continuously trying to impose the conditions that can coerce/force me into the system either by manufacturing justification to remove my liberty (Entrapment) or manufacture the conditions, limit options, for biological necessity to drive my behavior seemingly willing into it. The First is not hard to circumnavigate as I have advanced knowledge of the law and the constitution and hold Power of Attorney over myself in all civil and criminal matters and their attempts often using avatars, operatives, with choregraphed and directed movements and behavior against me is easy to spot as well as most false and unsubstantiated claims can be dismissed away as motivated by prejudice and to engage in any law enforcement operation against me would mean they need to submit reasonable suspicion of a crime but again, I am against criminality and impervious to it after years of investigating it undercover as a journalist exposing it as a manufactured condition on contained subjects attached to desire that benefits the system, it is behavior modification and social manipulation, they make a man hungry by removing any options, including social conditioning the community to lack empathic response, or filling the area of the contained victim with operational actors directed not to have an empathic response and then stake out the nearest bread stand waiting for him to steal out of the hunger forced on him or watch as he submits and surrenders his will to the welfare agencies, often disguised as religious organizations, either way the system acquires the victim. Now, to avoid scenarios like these as a contained victim unconstitutionally targeted in this way I have resourcefully been passing out my articles and essays in exchange for charity thereby offering a public service and something of unique value only I can produce and protecting myself under multiple First Amendment Protections, both giver and receiver of charity are protected as Freedom of Expression and Free Speech and as a qualified Journalist (see my Credentials above this article), My Freedom of Press Protects me because, "No Government Agency, Partner, Employee, Operative, or member of the public, not even Law Enforcement, can intentionally assault, interfere with, or obstruct a duly authorized media representative from gathering, receiving, or processing information for communication to the public", this would be a criminal violation in California. But yet, my captors and enemies who

are related to the Global Organized Crime Syndicate I have been reporting against as negatively influencing our Government and eroding our Democracies world wide, many just automatons being blindly obedient to commands, even sometimes the good Law Enforcement community who I support have had their policies and procedures designed so that they can be triggered to respond in negative ways, but each day I fight unconstitutional operations and activities designed and activated against me. A key strategy for them is to provide false intel which they try to portray as real by predicting my movements but this too is just manufactured against a contained victim similar to the welfare recipient and the enlisted soldier. During my investigations, I am left exposed to the elements and sleep unsheltered in this Jurisdiction until I can raise up enough funds to hike out towards Washington D.C. as inspired by God as my next destination. I am monitored 24/7, all my speech and activity, except when they want to call into question my whereabouts like by removing the security cameras from the Library computer floors, or make a false implication by having a suspicious operative walk towards me and having a service vehicle block the available camera angles, or while on cameras exercising my protected rights they violate them by sending antagonistic actors like junkies and homeless people incentivized to approach me, linger near me, or walk away from me suspiciously as if a hand off or criminal transaction occurred, all while by taking advantage of my desire to be free of this jurisdiction and obtain the donation I need to hike out safely but even my donations they monitor and are timing small amounts of cash donations and choreographing them with my immediate needs. To predict where I will go with the cash they give me they will monitor my cigarettes, that's an easy guess and because of the amount or past purchase history they can guess which brand I buy, other times they will Sabotage me like tearing a small rip in one of my jackets knowing I sew my own clothes they will predict the only place I can go to buy cheap needle and thread. Recently they stole my two blankets and threw them in the bay so I am left freezing at night tossing and turning, this sleeplessness they will record falsely as much as use it to predict my movements looking for a sleeping bag of quality that is water resistant and provide this prediction to local P.D. or other agencies as Intel and then have operatives staged in that area either where I buy a sewing kit or looking for a sleeping bag. They will also steal things and disrupt my clothing and gear in my sleep or when I walk into a restroom. When they suspect I will receive a large donation, I have received as much as a \$300 dollar donation before but they will deplete my resources, sabotage my gear, to make sure I do not use those funds to hike out and to predict my movements to stage operatives for surveillance. Often they will keep me starved with no food until I am anguished and essentially crying out to the automatons they strategically plant and guide as operatives just to record that anguish and expressed torment as aggression but if it is it is a manufactured symptom created by them as an operational tactic just to record something negative against me. They have no control over me and these psychopathic people have severe control issues so they have to manipulate the environment I am contained in (Psy Op), they have to sabotage my clothing and what little gear I have, they have to starve me and freeze me, they have to limit my donations. They have no real intelligence, Predicting My Movements as a Monitored Prisoner in a Controlled Environment is Evidence of Sabotage and Acts that are Cruel and Unusual Not real Intel or Intelligence Reporting, these people have to minimize my available funding by staging their operatives and automatons around me to fake human activity because I have real Intelligence and my resourcefulness with resources, but the human activity they are faking is so inauthentic and unnatural it is obvious and inconsistent with the intellectual curiosity and empathic response my professional presentation would illicit behaviorally in normally functioning adult brains instead these people deployed against me have obvious suppressed brain functioning like soldiers so obedient that they will kill innocent villagers on command making their lack of charity to me is the clearest evidence of a Government Controlled Operation and because so many can be matched to Canadian databases, the Socialist nature of the operations is as obvious as the Nazi P.O.W. camp my Jewish Granduncle survived as a captured WWII soldier during the holocaust. I have been here for over 12 months now, I have right now \$7 dollars to my name, they are not letting me make more than enough to get a pack of smokes, one meal and a couple cups of coffee, they are trying to maintain me with the minimum amount of donations to keep me from looking

destitute, but I am low on health and hygiene items now and my clothes need washed, not to mention now I need a quality sleeping bag and other gear to make the hike which is increasingly looking like I might have to make on faith without any money to travel with because I cannot just spend my life a contained victim on a sidewalk surrounded by non-responsive brainwashed automatons while they just keep trying to produce media content linking me to low level criminal types and addicts to protect the false narrative they have engineered intentionally confusing my undercover work into narcotics and human exploitation for profit in the systems of human management described at the beginning of this article. I am a prisoner in an op designed to fabricate false evidence against me but the only thing being evidenced is that these are Psychopaths trapped themselves in a "Psychosis of Superiority" trying to protect their egos rather than any real investigation against me, they literally have to tear a sleeping man's clothing, and stave him to death to make predictions to substantiate their false claims, these are not Intelligence Ops when Neanderthals run them. But I am grateful for the few good people here who are Pro-Democracy supporters who help me, I was making \$60 dollars in three hours and should be if normally functioning adult brains are in front of me as pedestrians but they will surround any reputable area I go with their mentally ill and criminal stereotypes just to make justification for my lack of resources link me in recording by associations with those stereotypes despite my professional appearance and demeanor, one thing is for sure, if I must hike out to find freedom from these tortures searching for a functioning democracy of government accountability and a place of a real economy, everyone who has recorded anything negative against me and anyone on cameras who could have helped but didn't and any Government handlers of the automaton passerby's brought in like extras in a movie set, will be responsible for my death or injuries, it is so easy to help me get the funds to leave, why keep me prisoner here unless it is for a sick psychopathic fulfillment?

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email

From: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman
To: SFPDAAlert, (POL); mcu@justice.gc.ca; openjustice@doj.ca.gov; foipaquestions@fbi.gov; SFSO Complaints (SHF); 401_PIO@CHP.CA.GOV; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Press Office, Mayor (MYR); info@cccsf.us; info@sfarch.org; info@icofsf.org; info@sfp.org; info@sherithisrael.org; info@sfcta.org; info@sfchamber.com; info@chinatowncdc.org; Information@stpatricksf.org
Subject: More San Fran Psy Op Propaganda Delivered Into My Search Results-Helping Residents See through the Layers of Misinformation and the Agenda in this "Restrictions to Traffic Calming" article Published by SF Chronicle...By: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman, Invest...
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 12:10:26 PM

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

San Francisco (Psy Op) 06/25/2025. Found seemingly hand delivered into my search results as propaganda today is an article entitled, "S.F. to end program that allows residents to request 'traffic calming' tactics on city streets" at: <https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/traffic-calming-program-ending-20390293.php>, the (.php) in the URL is a clue that this content is editable and placed in my search results with certain details that can be changed should I report on them, if a URL in a link found on-line has a different ending than .com, .us, .gov, .org. etc. and has HTML or PHP instead this means it is a developers type web page and is not published as static content, a clear indication that those who published this content intend to change or alter it and it is most likely fake news but I will do my best to help my readers see through this obvious attempt at propaganda to help them recognize fake news themselves. First, as an unconstitutionally targeted journalist trapped in this Psy op and Beautified Concentration Camp the first thing I look for is elements from my past that might be strategically planted in the article, the Government now controlled by Nazi-type Global (Canadian) Organized Crime Syndicate has access to all of our data, our social media, our work history and health data, everything that gets typed into a computer gets placed into a profile and when they target you illegally they use control over the target's internet (Intellectual Blockade) to try and "produce" responses and behavior in ways to discredit things in that profile that give the target credibility or to get the target to record a detail placed in the propaganda from your past so that they can delete that record and replace it as if that detail just occurred in this instance. For instance, in this article they have used the name of a Former Employer who I had worked under as a Director of Digital Marketing making \$65,000 dollars per year in Sarasota, FL and used that name for one of the characters in this article, this is designed so that if I bring up that employment as credibility they will try and claim I just read that name in an article and must be making it up, as if I am Kevin Spacey's Character Virgil Kemp in the movie "The Usual Suspects", great movie of how a high level organized crime syndicate manufactured arrests of specific criminals and placed them in a holding cell together so that they would form a crew to pull off a heist but the whole thing was engineered taking advantage of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to set those criminals up to take the fall for a larger agenda manipulated by a man posing as a simple disabled crook who operated unassumingly with a limp and was actually the mastermind, brilliant performance by Spacey! But anyways, this is really what these idiots will plant in my search results and the reason, they want to manufacture evidence that I am delusional and making things up, but I think these idiots themselves watch too many movies and must be taking notes on films instead of learning how to do real investigations against real criminals. Anyways, I am reporting as a Journalist contained in a Psy Op and that I am in an intellectual blockade, a tactic Law Enforcement and Domestic Security Globalized as Legislated Policy to fight terrorism after the War on Terror, they now have just got drunk on this power and technological capabilities so their inebriation is causing them to have severe cognitive disorders, not that National Socialist Law Enforcement were ever that smart especially the Canadians, the fact that these tactics were Legislated means they have the potential for abuse and I can call anything into question in a court of law because I have the benefit of the "preponderance of innocence", in other words we are considered innocent until proven guilty and

if the Justice Department gets caught using fabricated or manipulated evidence, especially collected by an abuse of Legislated Authority, not and will charges get dropped and the Arresting Agency Liable but it open the prosecutors and agents who collected that fabricated evidence liable for criminal charges and civil litigation, their "qualitative immunity" gets removed when they make an "unreasonable mistake of fact or judgement" so the Justice Department will often use a third party partner like a Federally Sponsored and Managed Organized Crime Network or Private Security Company, or even a company with Movie Production Capabilities, Organized Crime actually includes all of the above, but the Justice Departments will coordinated their investigations to the activities of this third party partner who plants and fabricates evidence for the purpose of giving the investigators this manufactured reasonable suspicion based on false and manufactured evidence against a target, I am surrounded by Canadians every day who belong to this third party Justice Department Partner (Organized Crime Bad Actors) making attempts to frame me in this way and force my behavior under surveillance to match a false profile loaded with unsubstantiated claims made about me to substantiate those false claims and my past professional like in the Tech Space and as an AmeriCorps Civil Service Agent as well as my religious and racial identity as a grandnephew of a Jewish Holocaust Survivor and a practicing third generation Italian/Irish multi-racial (light skinned) American makes their use of minority operatives against me as difficult for them as trying to claim my anti-socialism stance as right wing, the Nazis were socialists and these Canadians do a wonder in brainwashing their minority populations into believing those same Nazi lies perpetrated in pre-war Germany against the free markets, Religion, and us Jews and project it onto anyone not socialist and use those minorities as virtual attack dogs in this Crime Syndicate that is run like a crew of Tech Savvy Pirates who sell their own oppressed people to the Slavocracy, I am reporting as a prisoner of these Pirates who get proven because their masters won't allow them access to real knowledge and instead confine them to the same tactics of intellectual blockades so that they do not develop the faculties of mind to rebel, these tactics are well documented throughout history and can be used as case examples in my defense in a court of law as well. This is my point, nothing these Nazi Type Pirates do will ever produce a prosecution against me, all they can hope to do is flood the records with so much misinformation that the truth will be hard to decipher and that they can discredit me socially with propaganda that dismisses away my murder inside this containment op for fabricated reasons that appear legitimate but only because some social stigmata will be attempted to be produced by the propaganda and misinformation they produce as I am contained in their little psychopathic movie production set as a prisoner, but like all of us Christians know, Victory comes after death, I am the bait, I recorded over 10 years ago a video testimonial predicting this end along with data and video collected from around the world on this Organization and their connections in Governments from around the World and the Stock portfolios connected to their Ponzi Schemes, the whole world wide Global Organized Crime Syndicate and Everyone who profits, the data and video evidence and my personal testimonial will all get released after my death by a team of gifted autodidactics I covertly put together to retaliate against them for targeting the religions of the world and Eugenically Cleansing the Irish and Italian American Catholics, my death will mark the end of National Socialist Terror forever but to make this Justified I am offering myself, while patiently enduring their tortures as a victim/witness, to help them transition the world back on track towards enlightenment and world wide prosperity and full human development, I can be the salvation or Justification for the Wrath, it is between them and God, but their current trajectory just leads to death, mine as a Martyr, theirs as Ignorant Cowards and Despots. But there is more to this strategically placed propaganda then even the use of former employer names against me here, because when the propagandists start talking about [ending a program for "traffic calming"](#), the obvious intent is to cause or make justification for traffic congestion. This is a Large scale Government Psy Op happening here, we can see Government because they are unintelligent and cannot change tactics or strategy and all have limited intelligence so they just increase personnel as a tactic thinking the activities they plan work better if you add more people, like that seen from the movie Idiocracy where the idiots think adding electrolytes to water is good because Gatorade advertised it as such and then can't figure out why

when they water their crops with it they don't grow lol!, it is the same type of Idiocracy engaged in these targeted ops and Psy Op theatrics, every move they make they try and justify it, and so they need more traffic into the area to add more operational actors for the illegal ops and they need to move around on the back roads more quickly, they keep a team of idiots circulating around in the city who can be activated depending on their profile and appearance to disrupt the target or engage him in negative recordable ways, that's literally their operational tactic to just add more idiots driving around endlessly in vehicles or walking around the city waiting to be activated and so to help them this propaganda about removing "traffic calming" in neighborhoods being blamed on budget cuts is released to remove suspicion for the increased traffic and activities of these operatives which is sure to cause reckless accidents as they are just blind automatons, teams of them, driving in circles and certain patterns endlessly for hours until activated and then they respond so obediently they ignore reality and pedestrians and other traffic to be complaint to the command, we already have our city being invaded every day with these operational actors, their children, their pets, of all races and socio-economic classes, running surveillance and coordinating multi-agency ops against targets, its like Jim Crow Incorporated and then Automated to include minority subordinates in their activities, even the homeless, criminals, and junkies get trafficked in to be antagonistic actors, it is literally like an insane movie production crew invades the city but only to produce propaganda and false evidence and radicalize the people, like Vikings but with advanced Technology and resources and our own police departments get monitored and controlled, diversions get created, false reports, or intentional crimes get committed just as a diversion so they can operate in choreographed ways around Local Law Enforcement against targets like myself. You have to remember the Nazis were both Conservative Nationalists and Socialists, they both compliment the Nazi Agenda, when restrictions are necessary to carry out targeted ops and cleansing the population they use Conservatism economics claiming budget issues to restrict resources available to the public (Concentrate a target or targeted people and force desperation) and when expansion activities are a priority they use Socialism and Deterministic Human Management theories using a promise to alleviate those conditions to guide those concentrated victims into the designed pathways for management, the politics and media propaganda involved is all as theatrically produced as the Psy Op theatrics and Actors deployed, because Security Protocols always take precedence and because they are abusing Legislated Authorities, they can list anyone as a perceived threat until the case gets into a court of law or presented to Legislators, that is why in Socialist Societies the Police do not make arrests except for violent acts, because almost all of the activity being produced in society is anti-democratic human manipulation and is in violation of constitutional and international protections, it is also why they are making it difficult to provide public testimony at State Capitols, they are manufacturing data on everyone to keep us all contained in their giant experiments as they socially engineer society into complacency and blind obedience while keeping us away from the democratic systems of Judicial and Legislative Recourse where we can place our testimony and evidence on the record, in otherwords, they are engineering a takeover by forcing the conditions on people in recordable ways in their own databases, while keeping the official records of Law and Legislation, which is Superior to their databases, clear of evidence to the contrary, that justifies the management of the contained victims but it is all falsified and manufactured against those victims as a result of their containment in this controlled environment. Everything happening is in the benefit of this hostile takeover of the Nazi-type National Socialists and their Tech Savvy Brainwashed Pirates, if they are removing traffic calming, then expect unjustified traffic congestion, seriously what is in this area that would justify traffic increases except a Psy Op Government Operation, just ask for a public records search of the Traffic Cameras from around the city, they are just circulating idiots operatives in circles, and now, it looks like this traffic propaganda is trying to justify this dangerous traffic activity and dismiss away any accidents created from this illegal operation as Budget Related, WTF? That means they are so blindly obedient to their activities that they would rather kill innocent pedestrians in our city then adjust to a smarter strategy because it doesn't matter how many idiots you deploy, multiplying personnel using a Domestic Security strategy designed for real perceived threats against terrorists doesn't

work to target Pro-democracy Journalists Illegally, especially not a journalist who is an expert reporting on those tactics, you are placing needless and countless innocent lives at risk when your current strategy has not in over 20 years of targeting me produced any substantial results, you have no real outcome tied to your activities, you have been automated to play out a sequence that does not match reality and using a fabricated, misinterpreted, and false profile of the target, everyone knows forcing a round peg in a square hole doesn't work and you look mentally retarded struggling to do it and refusing to try a different way, I can show you a new and living way if you get tired of wasting all of these lives, lives this leadership will be held accountable for. I am urging all Law Enforcement in the area to monitor the traffic and look for patterns not consistent with real residential traffic, especially suspicious criminal and addict types, use the available License plate readers and technology but double check the faces of the drivers to the registration and ask yourselves if the backstory of the driver makes sense to be in this area, these people will create fake events and parades, they will literally create a fake conference to justify traffic and operational actors for these illegal operations in our Sanctuary City, they are counting on ignorance to operate so lets not let San Francisco look like ignorant fools, our Law Enforcement should be empowered to challenge the presented narratives and theatrics being played out on our streets especially if this Nazi-Type Organized Crime Syndicate wants to start moving so much traffic they are predicting pedestrian accidents and casualties, what good is living in a Sanctuary City if the Nazis can just come in and run us over? I am asking the Mayor and Board to deploy every available first responder to help keep any non-residential and or non-regular business traffic or verified tourist traffic out of our city streets and neighborhoods, why let the Federal Governments Pirates operate in our city, its time we make a stand or get sacked as their slaves forever!

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

From: [Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MYR-Appointments](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#); [SFPDAlert, \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Park Station, \(POL\)](#); [Assembly.Ethics@asm.ca.gov](#); [Alison.Merrilees@asm.ca.gov](#); [AsmBudget@asm.ca.gov](#); [elizabeth.potter@asm.ca.gov](#); [caaspp@cde.ca.gov](#); [AskOCR@usdoj.gov](#); [mscardenas@berkeley.edu](#); [contact@cmuasf.org](#); [andrew.ironside@asm.ca.gov](#); [gregory.pagan@asm.ca.gov](#); [dem_UASIMT \(DEM\)](#); [DFracassa@sfchronicle.com](#); [Corky.Siemaszko@nbcuni.com](#); [ilan.zur@asm.ca.gov](#); [letters@washpost.com](#); [samarpreet.kaur@asm.ca.gov](#); [kimberly.horiuchi@asm.ca.gov](#); [StacyPassmanspassman@gmail.com](#); [401_PIO@CHP.CA.GOV](#); [info@sfarch.org](#); [foipaquestions@fbi.gov](#); [info@chinatowncdc.org](#); [info@sfchamber.com](#); [info@sfcta.org](#); [info@sherithisrael.org](#); [SFSO.Complaints \(SHF\)](#); [openjustice@doj.ca.gov](#); [CommunityEngagement@hq.dhs.gov](#); [Madeline.coggins@fox.com](#); [Commission, Fire \(FIR\)](#); [comments@foxnews.com](#); [comments@whitehouse.gov](#); [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [City Librarian, City Librarian \(LIB\)](#); [Engagement, Civic \(ADM\)](#); [contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov](#); [patricia.guerrero@courts.ca.gov](#)
Subject: "Bridges to nowhere and Housing for No One". Is Everything B.S.? I smell another Housing Ponzi Scheme...San Fran Announces "Family Zoning Plan" to build Affordable Housing for who? As Birth rates in San Francisco are declining and the population is stil...
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 2:14:50 PM

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

By: Daniel Jeremiah Hoffman, Investigative Journalist and Attorney Per Se at SF Liberator News...

San Francisco 06/25/2025. According to <https://www.sf.gov/news-mayor-lurie-introduces-family-zoning-legislation-to-make-city-affordable-for-generations-of-san-franciscans>, and other [on-line sources](#), the Mayor's "Plan Will Create Housing at All Income Levels, Including for Families; Will Bring Half Century-Old Zoning Laws Into 21st Century; Builds on Mayor Lurie's Work to Create Housing Across City, Accelerate San Francisco's Economic Recovery" but who the hell are we building with tax-dollars for as the unemployment rate in the San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City metropolitan division was 3.5% in May 2025 so we don't have much of a demand for homeless or transitional housing and [Birth rates in San Francisco are declining](#). The city's total fertility rate (TFR) is 1.49, which is the lowest among major metropolitan areas, and the [population is still lower than it was in 2020, with an estimated 7.4% decrease compared to April 2020](#), just who exactly are we spending Billions on housing for? Or are you teeing up for another Ponzi Scheme using our Tax-Dollars to funnel wealth connected to Organized Crime's, and the city's, Stock Investment Portfolios while most of San Fran's Population is trapped as working slaves trapped in dead end jobs serving the elites? San Franciscans can use that tax investment in so many way that make a real impact to the development of the San Franciscan Citizens that leads to city wide prosperity but instead of transferring the current residents to wealth you are just importing wealthy people, as reported, "Silicon Valley's AI-boom is making San Francisco a hot spot again for [luxury homes for the ultra-rich](#).", not that these luxury purchases really signal anything accept that the Ultra Wealthy Involved in the Ponzi Schemes got payouts and are storing those funds in the Luxury Real Estate Market as an Investment that is known to appreciate over time and not necessarily using that purchase as a home. And all this Building of affordable housing does is artificially stimulate the mostly Conservative Construction Industry with little if any residual effects to our local economy. I keep catching the city trying to perpetuate these Ponzi Schemes using policy and taxes to assist an Organized Crime Ponzi Scheme that is ultimately attached to a Nazi Type Eugenic Agenda of maintaining racial and religious minorities and immigrants to be managed as slaves with subsidized housing, as most gains in population are due to international migration exploiting desperate immigrants from war torn countries to fill those jobs no body else wants to meet the needs of your wealthy without providing opportunity for those laborers to acquire wealth on their own.

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

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: UC/Blue Shield negotiations
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:15:32 PM
Attachments: [2 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 3 letters from members of the public regarding Blue Shield and the University of California (UC) medical system.

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
bos@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: [Arthur Persyko](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [FEDERICO SANCHEZ](#)
Subject: SF Board of Supervisors: PLEASE INSIST THAT BLUE SHIELD AND THE UC SYSTEM REACH A SETTLEMENT THAT DOES NOT DEGRADE RETIREE HEALTH CARE!
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 8:05:46 PM

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

June 23, 2025

TO: SF Board of Supervisors
FROM: PROTECT OUR BENEFITS (THROUGH CARA)

The Board of Supervisors in last budget cycle approved a three-year contract between with Blue Shield California(BSC) and the Health Services System, for a Preferred Provider Medicare Advantage Plan for retired City and County retirees. This contract was less expensive for the City than United Health Care, previous plan and also a bidder. **The promise was made by HSS to your retirees that the Blue Shield plan would be essentially equivalent.** A major component of BSC insurance (and prior United Health) gives access to UC medical system doctors and medical services. Many of those in the plan, have life threatening illnesses some of which, such as cancer in fire fighters, stem from occupational exposure. There is extreme hardship to those in mid treatment, if they are cut off. The UC System and Blue Shield California are in negotiations and there have been notifications frightening to plan members that UC services will be terminated.

PLEASE INSIST THAT BLUE SHIELD AND THE UC SYSTEM REACH A SETTLEMENT THAT DOES NOT DEGRADE RETIREE HEALTH CARE UNDER A CONTRACT YOU APPROVED BASED ON PROMISES THAT INCLUDED CONTINUED ACCESS TO UC MEDICAL SERVICES.

Supervisors Chan and Matt Dorsey are very familiar with this issue.

Don't leave many vulnerable retirees without needed care.

-Fred Sanchez, President, Protect Our Benefits (925-858-9961); more about Protect Our Benefits: <https://protectourbenefits.org/about/>

From: [Ron Tsujimoto](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: UCSF/Blue Shield negotiations
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 12:46:31 PM

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

June 25, 2025

SF Board of Supervisors ,

Hello, my name is Ron Tsujimoto and I am a retired San Francisco, fire captain, who worked for the city for 36 years. I use the UCSF and other UC healthcare systems regularly. I am outraged that I received a letter saying I won't be able to access healthcare services starting next month, depending on contract negotiations. I depend on my healthcare.

In December 2021 I was diagnosed with stage three colon cancer. Doctor Varma, Chief of colorectal cancer at UCSF immediately arranged a team to design my treatment plan. I believe Dr. Varma and my personal oncologist, Dr. Kidder along with the rest of the UCSF team saved my life. I was offered a treatment plan, including being able to be included in the latest trials and ground breaking treatments. If I was anywhere else other than UCSF, I would not have had those opportunities. I am still receiving treatment at UCSF and have been cancer free since 2022. I feel so fortunate to have been able to have UCSF available to me. Not having that choice will be devastating. This is a matter of life and death!

When I retired, I was promised continued healthcare coverage. Please resolve this intolerable situation as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this matter

Sincerely,

Ron Tsujimoto
2081 Spyglass Ln.
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
510-499-4722
r2gmoto@comcast.net

From: [Lagunte, Richard \(BOS\)](#)
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: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor - 5 letters
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:27:57 PM
Attachments: [5 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 5 letters from Bernard Maya regarding their experience with the Office of the Assessor-Recorder.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte

Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Voice (415) 554-7709 | 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: [BERNARD MAYA](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [San Francisco Sheriff's Office \(SHF\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Assessor, SF \(ASR\)](#); [Asbagh, Claudine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 11:55:31 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

When searching for the owner of 2709 Irving St. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for a condominium at 1534 Irving St. Then when searching for the owner of 1328 28th Ave. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for 2439 28th Ave. That's after searching only three properties. Please reference the attached pictures.

I have business with my neighbors and I need to send them mail. However, the website our local government makes available to the public to look up contact information in supporting documents appears laden with bunk information. If we use 1,000 blocks in this city, more or less, for the sake of simplicity, I estimate that at a minimum there must be at least 2,000 properties with misfiled supporting documents at the SF assessor's office. Consequently, at the rate of 2/3 of all properties with supporting documents being misfiled, as is my experience, we can estimate that misfiled documents stretch to publicly available records on over 60,000 properties.

Once is a mistake. Twice is a pattern. 2,000 is corruption. 60,000 is a really sick community.

I need to contact my neighbors about business we have. When can I expect supporting documents for 2709 Irving St. and 1328 28th Ave. to be corrected and become available?

Regards,

Bernard Maya

From: [BERNARD MAYA](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [San Francisco Sheriff's Office \(SHF\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Assessor, SF \(ASR\)](#); [Asbagh, Claudine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:00:57 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2025-06-16 at 1.00.53 PM.png](#)
[Screenshot 2025-06-17 at 6.01.18 PM.png](#)

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

I attached a few pictures for the search and results that I mentioned before. Thank you.

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Assessor SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 11:55:12 AM PDT
Subject: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

Dear Supervisors,

When searching for the owner of 2709 Irving St. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for a condominium at 1534 Irving St. Then when searching for the owner of 1328 28th Ave. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for 2439 28th Ave. That's after searching only three properties. Please reference the attached pictures.

I have business with my neighbors and I need to send them mail. However, the website our local government makes available to the public to look up contact information in supporting documents appears laden with bunk information. If we use 1,000 blocks in this city, more or less, for the sake of simplicity, I estimate that at a minimum there must be at least 2,000 properties with misfiled supporting documents at the SF assessor's office. Consequently, at the rate of 2/3 of all properties with supporting documents being misfiled, as is my experience, we can estimate that misfiled documents stretch to publicly available records on over 60,000 properties.

Once is a mistake. Twice is a pattern. 2,000 is corruption. 60,000 is a really sick community.

I need to contact my neighbors about business we have. When can I expect supporting documents for 2709 Irving St. and 1328 28th Ave. to be corrected and become available?

Regards,

Bernard Maya

10 / Page

Document Date ↑↑	SearchFilingCode ↑↑	Names	Purchase
12/12/2022	DEED	(R) CLAYTON & MA RILOU JUE 1998 R EVOC TRUST (E) TENIR LLC	

Preview

All Info



ORDER NO. : 0360027213

EXHIBIT A

The land referred to is situated in the County of San Francisco, City of San Francisco, State of California, and is described as follows:

PARCEL A:

Unit No. 101, lot 46, as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of 1534 Irving Street, a Condominium Project, Being a Resubdivision of Lot 19, a Portion of Assessor's Block No. 1734, San Francisco, California," which map was filed for record in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on March 23, 1994 in Book 43 of Condominium Maps, at Pages 67 to 69, inclusive.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM the following:

- (a) Non-exclusive easements through said Units, appurtenant to the Common Area and all other Units, for ingress, egress, support and repair of the Common Area and all Units;
- (b) Non-exclusive easements, appurtenant to the Common Area, for encroachment upon the air space of the Unit by those portions of the Common Area located within the Unit.

PARCEL B:**TOGETHER WITH** the following appurtenant easements:

- (a) A non-exclusive easement for ingress, egress, support and repair through the Common Area, as shown on the Map;
- (b) An exclusive easement to use Parking Area No. P-4, as shown on the Map.



PARCEL C:

AN UNDIVIDED 23.36% interest, as Tenants in Common with all other Unit owners, in and to the Common Area, as shown on the Map.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM, exclusive easements for use of Parking and Deck Areas, other than those shown in Parcel "B", above, in favor of the Units, as shown on the Map.

PARCEL D:

TOGETHER WITH the following easements appurtenant to the Common Area:

Document Date ↑↓	SearchFilingCode ↑↓	Names	Purchase
12/23/2022	DEED	(R) DOYLE LAUREN CE (E) LAURENCE DOY LE & PAULA DINNE LL REVOC TRUST	
12/1/2020	SUBSTITUTION TRUSTEE RECONVEYANCE	(R) GALLAGHER FR ANCIS X (E) J P MORGAN C HASE CUSTODY S VCS INC	

Preview

All Info

City and County of San Francisco
Joaquin Torres, Assessor-Recorder

Doc # 2022113459

12/23/2022 11:19:55 AM

ES MailRoom

Pages 2 Title 001

Customer 002

Recording Requested By
And When Recorded Mail To:Riordan Sykes McFadden, P.C.
381 West Portal Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127Mail Tax Statements To:
Laurence Doyle and
Paula Dinnell
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116Property Location:
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
Block 2397 Lot 006

GRANT DEED

By this instrument dated: November 28, 2022

The undersigned grantors declare documentary transfer tax is none; no consideration is given for the conveyance transferring settlors' interest to a revocable trust and not pursuant to sales tax and Taxation Code 11930).

This document is exempt from the \$75 Building Homes and Jobs Act Fee (per Government Code 66020.1) because: Document is a transfer of real property that is a residential dwelling to an owner-occupied residence.

LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, husband and wife as joint tenants with right of survivorship, do hereby remise, release and forever grant to LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, trust created by deed of November 28, 2022, successor trustee or trustees, of the LAURENCE DOYLE AND PAULA DINNELL REVOCABLE TRUST, or as amended, for the benefit of LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL and their beneficiaries, all their community property right, title and interest in and to the following described real property located in the City and County of San Francisco, California, and legally described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the Westerly line of 28th Avenue, distant therefrom 120 feet Southerly from the Southerly line of Taraval Street; running thence Southerly along said line of 28th Avenue 25 feet; thence at a right angle Westerly 120 feet; thence at a right angle Northerly 25 feet; thence at a right angle Easterly 120 feet to the point of BEGINNING.

BEING a portion of Outside Land Block No. 1169.

From: [BERNARD MAYA](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [San Francisco Sheriff's Office \(SHF\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Asbagh, Claudine \(CPC\)](#); [Assessor, SF \(ASR\)](#)
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:05:04 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2025-06-16 at 1.00.53 PM.png](#)
[Screenshot 2025-06-17 at 6.01.18 PM.png](#)

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

Sorry! It's not 1328 28th Ave., it's 1323 28th Ave. But that should be clear from the pictures.

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Assessor, SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 12:00:29 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

I attached a few pictures for the search and results that I mentioned before. Thank you.

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Assessor SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 11:55:12 AM PDT
Subject: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

Dear Supervisors,

When searching for the owner of 2709 Irving St. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for a condominium at 1534 Irving St. Then when searching for the owner of 1328 28th Ave. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for 2439 28th Ave. That's after searching only three properties. Please reference the attached pictures.

I have business with my neighbors and I need to send them mail. However, the website our local government makes available to the public to look up contact information in supporting documents appears laden with bunk information. If we use 1,000 blocks in this city, more or less, for the sake of simplicity, I estimate that at a minimum there must be at least 2,000 properties with misfiled supporting documents at the SF assessor's office. Consequently, at the rate of 2/3 of all properties with supporting documents being misfiled, as is my experience, we can estimate that misfiled documents stretch to publicly available records on over 60,000 properties.

Once is a mistake. Twice is a pattern. 2,000 is corruption. 60,000 is a really sick community.

I need to contact my neighbors about business we have. When can I expect supporting documents for 2709 Irving St. and 1328 28th Ave. to be corrected and become available?

Regards,

Bernard Maya

10 / Page

Document Date ↑↑	SearchFilingCode ↑↑	Names	Purchase
12/12/2022	DEED	(R) CLAYTON & MA RILOU JUE 1998 R EVOC TRUST (E) TENIR LLC	

Preview

All Info



ORDER NO. : 0360027213

EXHIBIT A

The land referred to is situated in the County of San Francisco, City of San Francisco, State of California, and is described as follows:

PARCEL A:

Unit No. 101, lot 46, as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of 1534 Irving Street, a Condominium Project, Being a Resubdivision of Lot 19, a Portion of Assessor's Block No. 1734, San Francisco, California," which map was filed for record in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on March 23, 1994 in Book 43 of Condominium Maps, at Pages 67 to 69, inclusive.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM the following:

- (a) Non-exclusive easements through said Units, appurtenant to the Common Area and all other Units, for ingress, egress, support and repair of the Common Area and all Units;
- (b) Non-exclusive easements, appurtenant to the Common Area, for encroachment upon the air space of the Unit by those portions of the Common Area located within the Unit.

PARCEL B:**TOGETHER WITH** the following appurtenant easements:

- (a) A non-exclusive easement for ingress, egress, support and repair through the Common Area, as shown on the Map;
- (b) An exclusive easement to use Parking Area No. P-4, as shown on the Map.



PARCEL C:

AN UNDIVIDED 23.36% interest, as Tenants in Common with all other Unit owners, in and to the Common Area, as shown on the Map.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM, exclusive easements for use of Parking and Deck Areas, other than those shown in Parcel "B", above, in favor of the Units, as shown on the Map.

PARCEL D:

TOGETHER WITH the following easements appurtenant to the Common Area:

Document Date ↑↓	SearchFilingCode ↑↓	Names	Purchase
12/23/2022	DEED	(R) DOYLE LAUREN CE (E) LAURENCE DOY LE & PAULA DINNE LL REVOC TRUST	
12/1/2020	SUBSTITUTION TRUSTEE RECONVEYANCE	(R) GALLAGHER FR ANCIS X (E) J P MORGAN C HASE CUSTODY S VCS INC	

Preview

All Info

City and County of San Francisco
Joaquin Torres, Assessor-Recorder

Doc # 2022113459

12/23/2022 11:19:55 AM

ES MailRoom

Pages 2 Title 001

Customer 002

Recording Requested By
And When Recorded Mail To:Riordan Sykes McFadden, P.C.
381 West Portal Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127Mail Tax Statements To:
Laurence Doyle and
Paula Dinnell
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116Property Location:
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
Block 2397 Lot 006

GRANT DEED

By this instrument dated: November 28, 2022

The undersigned grantors declare documentary transfer tax is none; no consideration is being paid for the conveyance transferring settlors' interest to a revocable trust and not pursuant to sales and Taxation Code 11930).

This document is exempt from the \$75 Building Homes and Jobs Act Fee (per Government Code 66020.1) because: Document is a transfer of real property that is a residential dwelling to an owner-occupied residence.

LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, husband and wife as joint tenants with right of survivorship, do hereby remise, release and forever grant to LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, trust created by deed of November 28, 2022, successor trustee or trustees, of the LAURENCE DOYLE AND PAULA DINNELL REVOCABLE TRUST, or as amended, for the benefit of LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL and their beneficiaries, all their community property right, title and interest in and to the following described real property located in the City and County of San Francisco, California, and legally described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the Westerly line of 28th Avenue, distant therefrom 120 feet Southerly from the Southerly line of Taraval Street; running thence Southerly along said line of 28th Avenue 25 feet; thence at a right angle Westerly 120 feet; thence at a right angle Northerly 25 feet; thence at a right angle Easterly 120 feet to the point of BEGINNING.

BEING a portion of Outside Land Block No. 1169.

From: [BERNARD MAYA](#)
To: oard.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [San Francisco Sheriff's Office \(SHF\)](#)
Cc: [Asbagh, Claudine \(CPC\)](#); [Assessor, SF \(ASR\)](#)
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:10:14 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2025-06-16 at 1.00.53 PM.png](#)
[Screenshot 2025-06-17 at 6.01.18 PM.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

When searching for the owner of 2709 Irving St. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for a condominium at 1534 Irving St. Then when searching for the owner of **1323** 28th Ave. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for 2439 28th Ave. That's after searching only three properties. Please reference the attached pictures.

I have business with my neighbors and I need to send them mail. However, the website our local government makes available to the public to look up contact information in supporting documents appears laden with bunk information. If we use 1,000 blocks in this city, more or less, for the sake of simplicity, I estimate that at a minimum there must be at least 2,000 properties with misfiled supporting documents at the SF assessor's office. Consequently, at the rate of 2/3 of all properties with supporting documents being misfiled, as is my experience, we can estimate that misfiled documents stretch to publicly available records on over 60,000 properties.

Once is a mistake. Twice is a pattern. 2,000 is corruption. 60,000 is a really sick community.

I need to contact my neighbors about business we have. When can I expect supporting documents for 2709 Irving St. and 1328 28th Ave. to be corrected and become available?

Regards,

Bernard Maya

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>; Assessor SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 12:04:18 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

Sorry! It's not 1328 28th Ave., it's 1323 28th Ave. But that should be clear from the pictures.

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Assessor, SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 12:00:29 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

I attached a few pictures for the search and results that I mentioned before. Thank you.

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: Assessor SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 11:55:12 AM PDT
Subject: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

Dear Supervisors,

When searching for the owner of 2709 Irving St. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for a condominium at 1534 Irving St. Then when searching for the owner of 1328 28th Ave. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for 2439 28th Ave. That's after searching only three properties. Please reference the attached pictures.

I have business with my neighbors and I need to send them mail. However, the website our local government makes available to the public to look up contact information in supporting documents appears laden with bunk information. If we use 1,000 blocks in this city, more or less, for the sake of simplicity, I estimate that at a minimum there must be at least 2,000 properties with misfiled supporting documents at the SF assessor's office. Consequently, at the rate of 2/3 of all properties with supporting documents being misfiled, as is my experience, we can estimate that misfiled documents stretch to publicly available records on over 60,000 properties.

Once is a mistake. Twice is a pattern. 2,000 is corruption. 60,000 is a really sick community.

I need to contact my neighbors about business we have. When can I expect supporting documents for 2709 Irving St. and 1328 28th Ave. to be corrected and become available?

Regards,

Bernard Maya

10 / Page

Document Date ↑↑	SearchFilingCode ↑↑	Names	Purchase
12/12/2022	DEED	(R) CLAYTON & MA RILOU JUE 1998 R EVOC TRUST (E) TENIR LLC	

Preview

All Info



ORDER NO. : 0360027213

EXHIBIT A

The land referred to is situated in the County of San Francisco, City of San Francisco, State of California, and is described as follows:

PARCEL A:

Unit No. 101, lot 46, as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of 1534 Irving Street, a Condominium Project, Being a Resubdivision of Lot 19, a Portion of Assessor's Block No. 1734, San Francisco, California," which map was filed for record in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on March 23, 1994 in Book 43 of Condominium Maps, at Pages 67 to 69, inclusive.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM the following:

- (a) Non-exclusive easements through said Units, appurtenant to the Common Area and all other Units, for ingress, egress, support and repair of the Common Area and all Units;
- (b) Non-exclusive easements, appurtenant to the Common Area, for encroachment upon the air space of the Unit by those portions of the Common Area located within the Unit.

PARCEL B:**TOGETHER WITH** the following appurtenant easements:

- (a) A non-exclusive easement for ingress, egress, support and repair through the Common Area, as shown on the Map;
- (b) An exclusive easement to use Parking Area No. P-4, as shown on the Map.



PARCEL C:

AN UNDIVIDED 23.36% interest, as Tenants in Common with all other Unit owners, in and to the Common Area, as shown on the Map.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM, exclusive easements for use of Parking and Deck Areas, other than those shown in Parcel "B", above, in favor of the Units, as shown on the Map.

PARCEL D:

TOGETHER WITH the following easements appurtenant to the Common Area:

Document Date ↑↓	SearchFilingCode ↑↓	Names	Purchase
12/23/2022	DEED	(R) DOYLE LAUREN CE (E) LAURENCE DOY LE & PAULA DINNE LL REVOC TRUST	
12/1/2020	SUBSTITUTION TRUSTEE RECONVEYANCE	(R) GALLAGHER FR ANCIS X (E) J P MORGAN C HASE CUSTODY S VCS INC	

Preview

All Info

City and County of San Francisco
Joaquin Torres, Assessor-Recorder

Doc # 2022113459

12/23/2022 11:19:55 AM

ES MailRoom

Pages 2 Title 001

Customer 002

Recording Requested By
And When Recorded Mail To:Riordan Sykes McFadden, P.C.
381 West Portal Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127Mail Tax Statements To:
Laurence Doyle and
Paula Dinnell
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116Property Location:
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
Block 2397 Lot 006

GRANT DEED

By this instrument dated: November 28, 2022

The undersigned grantors declare documentary transfer tax is none; no consideration is being paid for the conveyance transferring settlors' interest to a revocable trust and not pursuant to sales and Taxation Code 11930).

This document is exempt from the \$75 Building Homes and Jobs Act Fee (per Government Code 66020.1) because: Document is a transfer of real property that is a residential dwelling to an owner-occupied residence.

LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, husband and wife as joint tenants with right of survivorship, do hereby remise, release and forever grant to LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, trust created by deed of November 28, 2022, successor trustee or trustees, of the LAURENCE DOYLE AND PAULA DINNELL REVOCABLE TRUST, or as amended, for the benefit of LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL and their beneficiaries, all their community property right, title and interest in and to the following described real property located in the City and County of San Francisco, California, and legally described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the Westerly line of 28th Avenue, distant therefrom 120 feet Southerly from the Southerly line of Taraval Street; running thence Southerly along said line of 28th Avenue 25 feet; thence at a right angle Westerly 120 feet; thence at a right angle Northerly 25 feet; thence at a right angle Easterly 120 feet to the point of BEGINNING.

BEING a portion of Outside Land Block No. 1169.

From: [BERNARD MAYA](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [San Francisco Sheriff's Office \(SHF\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Asbagh, Claudine \(CPC\)](#); [Assessor, SF \(ASR\)](#)
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:41:03 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2025-06-16 at 1.00.53 PM.png](#)
[Screenshot 2025-06-17 at 6.01.18 PM.png](#)

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

But why should the assessors office be any different?

When San Francisco schools falsify attendance data, when the SFDA falsifies truancy letters, when CPS and SFPD harass families and falsify reports, why should the SF assessor's office be any different?

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>
To: oard.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <oard.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>; Assessor SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 12:09:39 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

Dear Supervisors,

When searching for the owner of 2709 Irving St. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for a condominium at 1534 Irving St. Then when searching for the owner of **1323** 28th Ave. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for 2439 28th Ave. That's after searching only three properties. Please reference the attached pictures.

I have business with my neighbors and I need to send them mail. However, the website our local government makes available to the public to look up contact information in supporting documents appears laden with bunk information. If we use 1,000 blocks in this city, more or less, for the sake of simplicity, I estimate that at a minimum there must be at least 2,000 properties with misfiled supporting documents at the SF assessor's office. Consequently, at the rate of 2/3 of all properties with supporting documents being misfiled, as is my experience, we can estimate that misfiled documents stretch to publicly available records on over 60,000 properties.

Once is a mistake. Twice is a pattern. 2,000 is corruption. 60,000 is a really sick community.

I need to contact my neighbors about business we have. When can I expect supporting documents for 2709 Irving St. and 1328 28th Ave. to be corrected and become available?

Regards,

Bernard Maya

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>

Cc: Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>; Assessor SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 12:04:18 PM PDT

Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

Sorry! It's not 1328 28th Ave., it's 1323 28th Ave. But that should be clear from the pictures.

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>

Cc: Assessor, SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 12:00:29 PM PDT

Subject: Fw: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

I attached a few pictures for the search and results that I mentioned before. Thank you.

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

From: BERNARD MAYA <bernard.maya@sbcglobal.net>

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; sheriff@sfgov.org <sheriff@sfgov.org>; daniel.lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>

Cc: Assessor SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; Asbagh Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 at 11:55:12 AM PDT

Subject: Misfiled Documentation at SF Assessor

Dear Supervisors,

When searching for the owner of 2709 Irving St. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for a condominium at 1534 Irving St. Then when searching for the owner of 1328 28th Ave. on the SF assessor's website, supporting documents were for 2439 28th Ave. That's after searching only three properties. Please reference the attached pictures.

I have business with my neighbors and I need to send them mail. However, the website our local government makes available to the public to look up contact information in supporting documents appears laden with bunk information. If we use 1,000 blocks in this city, more or less, for the sake of simplicity, I estimate that at a minimum there must be at least 2,000 properties with misfiled supporting documents at the SF assessor's office. Consequently, at the rate of 2/3 of all properties with supporting documents being misfiled, as is my experience, we can estimate that misfiled documents stretch to publicly available records on over 60,000 properties.

Once is a mistake. Twice is a pattern. 2,000 is corruption. 60,000 is a really sick community.

I need to contact my neighbors about business we have. When can I expect supporting documents for 2709 Irving St. and 1328 28th Ave. to be corrected and become available?

Regards,

Bernard Maya

10 / Page

Document Date ↑↑	SearchFilingCode ↑↑	Names	Purchase
12/12/2022	DEED	(R) CLAYTON & MA RILOU JUE 1998 R EVOC TRUST (E) TENIR LLC	

Preview

All Info



ORDER NO. : 0360027213

EXHIBIT A

The land referred to is situated in the County of San Francisco, City of San Francisco, State of California, and is described as follows:

PARCEL A:

Unit No. 101, lot 46, as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of 1534 Irving Street, a Condominium Project, Being a Resubdivision of Lot 19, a Portion of Assessor's Block No. 1734, San Francisco, California," which map was filed for record in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on March 23, 1994 in Book 43 of Condominium Maps, at Pages 67 to 69, inclusive.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM the following:

- (a) Non-exclusive easements through said Units, appurtenant to the Common Area and all other Units, for ingress, egress, support and repair of the Common Area and all Units;
- (b) Non-exclusive easements, appurtenant to the Common Area, for encroachment upon the air space of the Unit by those portions of the Common Area located within the Unit.

PARCEL B:**TOGETHER WITH** the following appurtenant easements:

- (a) A non-exclusive easement for ingress, egress, support and repair through the Common Area, as shown on the Map;
- (b) An exclusive easement to use Parking Area No. P-4, as shown on the Map.



PARCEL C:

AN UNDIVIDED 23.36% interest, as Tenants in Common with all other Unit owners, in and to the Common Area, as shown on the Map.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM, exclusive easements for use of Parking and Deck Areas, other than those shown in Parcel "B", above, in favor of the Units, as shown on the Map.

PARCEL D:

TOGETHER WITH the following easements appurtenant to the Common Area:

Document Date ↑↓	SearchFilingCode ↑↓	Names	Purchase
12/23/2022	DEED	(R) DOYLE LAUREN CE (E) LAURENCE DOY LE & PAULA DINNE LL REVOC TRUST	
12/1/2020	SUBSTITUTION TRUSTEE RECONVEYANCE	(R) GALLAGHER FR ANCIS X (E) J P MORGAN C HASE CUSTODY S VCS INC	

Preview

All Info

City and County of San Francisco
Joaquin Torres, Assessor-Recorder

Doc # 2022113459

12/23/2022 11:19:55 AM

ES MailRoom

Pages 2 Title 001

Customer 002

Recording Requested By
And When Recorded Mail To:Riordan Sykes McFadden, P.C.
381 West Portal Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127Mail Tax Statements To:
Laurence Doyle and
Paula Dinnell
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116Property Location:
2439 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
Block 2397 Lot 006

GRANT DEED

By this instrument dated: November 28, 2022

The undersigned grantors declare documentary transfer tax is none; no consideration is being paid for the conveyance transferring settlors' interest to a revocable trust and not pursuant to sale and Taxation Code 11930).

This document is exempt from the \$75 Building Homes and Jobs Act Fee (per Government Code 66020.1) because: Document is a transfer of real property that is a residential dwelling to an owner-occupied residence.

LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, husband and wife as joint tenants with right of survivorship, do hereby remise, release and forever grant to LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL, trust created by deed of November 28, 2022, successor trustee or trustees, of the LAURENCE DOYLE AND PAULA DINNELL REVOCABLE TRUST, or as amended, for the benefit of LAURENCE DOYLE and PAULA DINNELL and their beneficiaries, all their community property right, title and interest in and to the following described real property located in the City and County of San Francisco, California, and legally described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the Westerly line of 28th Avenue, distant therefrom 120 feet Southerly from the Southerly line of Taraval Street; running thence Southerly along said line of 28th Avenue 25 feet; thence at a right angle Westerly 120 feet; thence at a right angle Northerly 25 feet; thence at a right angle Easterly 120 feet to the point of BEGINNING.

BEING a portion of Outside Land Block No. 1169.

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: Say No to Amazon!
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:33:05 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from a member of the public regarding a proposed Amazon delivery center at 900 7th Street.

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
bos@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: Jon Wu <jonbalive@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:01 AM
To: CPC.900-7thStreet <CPC.900-7thStreet@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Say No to Amazon!

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

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am a nearby resident of the former Recology site on 7th Street where Amazon is proposing to build a major shipping depot. I am concerned about the impacts of this project on my health and safety, and on our neighborhood. Please vote NO on the authorization of this project.

HERE ARE MY CONCERNS:

- Pollution — 20 freight trucks, 175 delivery vans, and 395 worker cars (x 3 shifts) every day
- Noise — the facility will operate 24 hours a day across the street from homes occupied by families, seniors, children, and students
- Safety — the amount of traffic will make the area unsafe for pedestrians, bicyclists, seniors, and children
- Property values — who wants to buy a home next to a giant warehouse operating 24 hours a day?
- Quality of jobs — Amazon has a bad reputation for working conditions and pay. They oppose unions and worker rights. Pay for entry-level jobs barely meets San Francisco's minimum wage.
- Accountability — Amazon delivery vehicles are driven by contractors not employees. If they drive in dangerous ways, park on sidewalks, or cause accidents who will hold them accountable?
- We need transit, not more cars — A parking lot for 395 cars makes a mockery of the City's policy for encouraging transit, bicycles, and walking
- Keep the promise — The City's plans for the neighborhood promises a vibrant community for residents and small businesses that "supports walking and sustains a diverse, active and safe public realm."

Jon

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: Urgent: Investigate 478 Tehama's Use and Oppose ISAP/GEO Group Operations in Our Sanctuary City
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:36:00 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Claire Gillooly Dempsey regarding Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) activity at 478 Tehama Street.

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
bos@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: Claire Dempsey <clairegdempsey@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2025 6:05 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Urgent: Investigate 478 Tehama's Use and Oppose ISAP/GEO Group Operations in Our Sanctuary City

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing as a concerned San Francisco resident to urge you to investigate the current use of the building at **478 Tehama Street**, which is being operated as an **ISAP (Intensive Supervision Appearance Program) office** under contract with **GEO Group**, a private prison company with a troubling human rights record.

The presence of this facility, operated by GEO Group, is in direct conflict with San Francisco's values as a **sanctuary city**. ISAP, under the guise of "alternatives to detention," subjects immigrants and asylum seekers—many of whom are already vulnerable—to invasive surveillance and control, including ankle monitors, facial recognition check-ins, and constant phone tracking. These practices cause lasting psychological harm and contribute to the criminalization of immigrant communities.

I respectfully request that the Board:

1. **Investigate the zoning, permitting, and contractual use of 478 Tehama Street**, including how the ISAP office came to operate in this location without public transparency or community input.
2. **Introduce and pass a resolution formally opposing the operation of ISAP and any GEO Group-affiliated entities in San Francisco**, in alignment with our sanctuary city status and commitment to protecting immigrant communities.

San Francisco must take a principled stand against the privatization and expansion of immigration enforcement within our city limits. We should be investing in community-based, trauma-informed support for immigrants—not enabling the surveillance and dehumanization of our neighbors.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope you will take swift action on this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

Claire Gillooly Dempsey

202.510.2162

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Ebadi, Mahanaz \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Distribution to the SF Board of Supervisors
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 10:45:00 AM
Attachments: [Chan Letter \(MEA\) June 2025.v4.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached memo from Criss Romero.

Thank you,

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

From: Criss Romero <criss@sfmea.com>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 5:37 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Isen, Carol (HRD) <carol.isen@sfgov.org>; Christina Fong <christina@sfmea.com>; Gregg Adam <gregg@majlabor.com>
Subject: Distribution to the SF Board of Supervisors

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

Good evening, Ms. Calvillo.

I would like your assistance in distributing the attached memo to you, Supervisor Chan, and the Board of Supervisors. Please let me know if you have any questions, or if I need to help with this. Thank you.

Criss Romero
Executive Director



870 Market Street, Suite 490 ~ San Francisco, CA 94102

415.989.7244 voice | 415.971.7701 cell | 415.989.7077 fax

Criss@SFMEA.com

sfmea.com

“Hope will never be silent.”

- Harvey Milk



June 23, 2025

Connie Chan
Supervisor, District 1
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Managerial Impacts in FY25 Budget Descriptions

Dear Supervisor Chan:

On June 18, 2024, you passed the Ordinance adopting and implementing the decision and award of the Arbitration Board under Charter Section A8.409-4, as required by law. This action established the successor Memorandum of Understanding between the City and County of San Francisco (“The City”) and the Municipal Executives’ Association (“MEA”), effective July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2027.

On June 21, 2024, you followed with a motion that Department Heads place 10% of their salaries on reserve after approving those same salaries only three (3) days earlier. MEA protested the motion and informed you and the rest of the Board about the impropriety of your request.

This June, as a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, you have continued your opposition to MEA-represented employees by making statements suggesting that the City should “chop from the top,” without clarifying who the “top” refers to. Although MEA is not specifically mentioned in your comments, it is evident that your budget proposals include many positions that implicate or fall directly within the MEA bargaining unit, particularly mid- to senior-level management roles.

Managerial Classifications Under Pressure

A recurring theme of the Budget and Legislative Analyst (BLA) is the proposed elimination, downgrading of management roles, and denial of upward substitutions, often justified by prolonged vacancies or a narrower-than-expected span of control. A few examples:

- **Digital Services (Manager VI):** Although the position oversees six staff members, the recommendation is to eliminate this vacant position. The BLA notes a broader concern about the proliferation of upper-level managers, arguing that growth at the manager/director level has “far outpaced” total city staffing (20% vs. 6%). The takeaway is that these jobs are perceived as high-cost and low-touch in terms of direct service delivery.
- **Bureau of Street Environmental Services (Manager V):** This position has been vacant since June 2020 and is now slated for deletion.



- **Policy & Communications Manager:** Potential downward substitution is on the table due to the division's "low span of control"—just 34 FTEs compared to 50–100 elsewhere.
- **Manager I Reclassification (Real Property):** An attempt to upgrade a Principal Administrative Analyst to Manager I was denied. The stated reason? "Inadequate justification." However, the subtext is that there is heightened scrutiny of upward moves into management classifications.

Beyond these specific roles, there are numerous vacant Manager II through VI positions, some dating back to 2020, that are now flagged either for elimination or to be held open for cost savings.

A pattern emerges across the board; there is a clear narrative from the BLA: managerial positions are costly and do not provide direct services. This argument resurfaces consistently and seems to be shaping a skeptical policy direction—if not outright hostile—toward managerial growth.

Rise of the Span-of-Control Metric

One trend that stands out is the use of span of control as justification for either retaining or eliminating roles. The implication is that, unless a manager supervises a large number of FTEs, the position may not be deemed necessary. That is a significant shift—one that pressures MEA to provide more robust, evidence-based arguments for maintaining or upgrading MEA-represented positions. The narrative you continue to push is that you're only focusing on headcount, compelling departments to justify MEA's position based on headcount rather than savings to the City.

The message sent to City employees is that they should not strive for promotive classifications within MEA, as your continued animus puts them in the crosshairs of being cynically viewed as City employees who do not provide direct services to City constituents. The broader trend is troubling: long-vacant positions are being cut, there is skepticism about moving people into higher-level roles, and a cost-focused lens is being applied across the board. I would expect that your colleagues on the Board of Supervisors recognize that managerial roles may cost more, but they also do more without the benefit of premium pay. In a tight budget environment, that fact alone should not make our Association members targets.

Bottom Line for MEA

The broader trend is that long-vacant positions are being eliminated, there is skepticism about promoting individuals to higher-level roles, and a cost-centered approach is being applied universally. That said, we must acknowledge that managerial roles may be more expensive, and in a tight budget environment, that fact alone makes them targets; however, there is a reason why MEA salaries may be viewed skeptically.

MEA challenges the narrative that our members do not deliver value, particularly in areas such as coordination, oversight, and policy leadership. The work they do involves complexity, risk, and collaboration across multiple departments. Excessive cutting of management undermines accountability and the strategic capacity essential for City operations to run smoothly.

Connie Chan, Supervisor
Managerial Impacts in FY25 Budget Descriptions
June 23, 2025

MEA is submitting our appeal to City Supervisors, requesting that they explore creative solutions to address the City's budget cuts. MEA hopes that the Board takes this opportunity to reset its relationship with the City's managers. The "chop from the top" solution you offer will not be beneficial to the City or its constituents. The Association stands ready to collaborate with you towards the worthy goal of viewing our membership as vital contributors to the City.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 971-7701, or criss@sfmea.com.

Sincerely,



CRISS ROMERO
Executive Director

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Stephen Sherrill, District 2
Danny Sauter, District 3
Joel Engardio, District 4
Bilal Mahmood, District 5
Matt Dorsey, District 6
Myna Melgar, District 7
Rafael Mandelman, District 8
Jackie Fielder, District 9
Shaman Walton, District 10
Chyanne Chen, District 11
Daniel Lurie, Mayor
Staci Slaughter, Chief of Staff
Carol Isen, DHR Director
Christine Fong, MEA Deputy Director
Gregg Adam, Messing, Adam & Jasmine, LLP
MEA Board of Directors, and Membership

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 250589 - Budget and Appropriation Ordinance
Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:49:19 PM
Attachments: [235 letters.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 235 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 250589 - Budget and Appropriation Ordinance appropriating all estimated receipts and all estimated expenditures for Departments of the City and County of San Francisco as of May 30, 2025, for the Fiscal Years (FYs) ending June 30, 2026, and June 30, 2027.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-7709 | 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.*

305-11
C 1967

Cafe Nm 1:25-CV-01926

31

James Conner Green (DOB 04/04/1994)

Reports these Violations. To this Office:

Board of Supervisors

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 JUN 25 PM 12:09

- (A) JCG is ongoing violated from: Life, Liberty and Property (Justice & Equality)
- (B) United States Code Title 42 section 1981
- (C) The Constitution of the United States of America
- (D) The Constitution of the State of California Article I - Declaration of Rights Section 1.
- (E) San Francisco Municipal Code SEC. 12A.2. DECLARATION OF POLICE

Sir I have been followed by persons of my past. And with a letter to the United States District Attorney, for Kansas City, MO. Which stated and listed all known person's and previous location's, but finally stating that I wished for no-contact and to take legal-action for No-Contact Court Order: I will emphasize the following sections of United States Code.

This is for any and all persons whom are from my past and who come to your city to seek me out.

United States Code Title 18 section 2261, 2261a, 3771 (Inter-State Stalking, Domestic Violence and Victim's Rights)

JCG has no former ties to his past, except for Legal Action to resolve and to make former Grievances bonded to Expo Facto. However still people from his past continue Stalk and harass him and to do him harm. JCG has a history of being shot in the back with an Air-Pistol's (3x) even once while Protesting on a Court House lawn (By A Former Public-School Teacher of JCG)

JCG Requests'

Restitution of JCG's Rights that have gone on without Declaration or Reason. And have threatened his Life several times.

A: Please Declare Resolution and Release to JCG from COVID-19 Software.

B: Please inform him of how he may pursue release from COVID-19 software

C: Inform JCG of his right to speak to legal-council over this matter

D: Inform him of the current expiration date of COVID-19 as it stands (06/25/2025)

E: Why must JCG restore his own constitutional Rights? And why won't anyone help him?

F: San Francisco Municipal Code, SEC. 12A.2. DECLARATION OF POLICY

G: Inform JCG if COVID-19 is forever and he is never being released from it.

H: Is there Private-Person's JCG should consider asking for charity and housing?

I: Has the City of San Francisco and its County gone over the Criminal-Complaint's JCG has made in the past. To the United States District Attorney of Kansas City, MO.

J: Is there and What behavior does JCG need to correct? Viz: Release from COVID-19.