FILE NO. 260436

Petitions and Communications received from April 16, 2026, through April 23, 2026, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on April 28, 2026.

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), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100, submitting an Acting Mayor Notice designating Supervisor Stephen Sherrill as Acting Mayor effective Friday, April 17, 2026, at 1:00 PM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Matt Dorsey as Acting Mayor effective Saturday, April 18, 2026, at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and Supervisor Alan Wong as Acting Mayor effective Sunday, April 19, 2026, at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Bilal Mahmood as Acting Mayor effective Monday, April 20, 2026, at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Chyanne Chen as Acting Mayor effective Tuesday, April 21, 2025, at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Board President Rafael Mandelman as Acting Mayor effective Wednesday, April 22, 2026, at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Danny Sauter as Acting Mayor effective Thursday, April 23, 2026, at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Connie Chan as Acting Mayor effective Friday, April 24, 2026, at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and Board President Rafael Mandelman as Acting Mayor effective Saturday, April 25, 2026, at 12:00AM until 7:30 PM. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the Office of Supervisor Connie Chan, submitting an excusal notice from the Board of Supervisors, Budget and Finance Committee, and Budget and Appropriations Committee meetings of April 21-22, 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Ordinance No. 207-24, submitting a Green Infrastructure Grant Program Quarterly Report for the period of January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026. File No. 240555. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of Board President Rafael Mandelamn, submitting an excusal notice from the Budget and Appropriations Committee meeting of April 22, 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 3.21, submitting a Memorandum regarding the approval of the Port of San Francisco updated capital improvement plan and Fiscal Years FY27 & FY28 Capital Budgets by the Capital Planning Committee; approval of the allocation of partially accrued interest funds from the clean and safe neighborhood parks 2008 & 2012 bonds in an amount not to exceed $1,518,812 by the Capital Planning Committee. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.105 and Appendix F, submitting a report on its audit of the Free City College Program Fund. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting an agenda for the May 5-6, 2026, meeting; notice of location for May 6, 2026, Commission meeting. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard. 23 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; and eliminating exceptions allowing indoor smoking in bars with no employees, bars with historically compliant semi-enclosed smoking rooms, and hotel rooms, to conform to provisions of California law. File No. 260361. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From members of the public, regarding the Balboa Skate Park. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco budget. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Adriane Khan, regarding the Great Highway/Sunset Dunes. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), submitting a notice of PG&E's rate increase request for its Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) 2027 cost recovery application to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) A.26-03-031. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council to evaluate and advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Fire Department, on the criteria and types of evidence the Fire Marshal should consider in determining whether to waive, modify, or delay certain compliance requirements under the Fire Code that certain existing high-rise residential buildings have sprinkler systems; and to set forth the membership and duties of the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council. File No. 260216. 6 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing ("PSH") that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among

residents (“Drug-Free PSH”) to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone (“Drug-Tolerant PSH”), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH’s strategies to meet PSH residents’ demands. File No. 251003. 190 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to, for transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2026: halve the real property transfer tax rate from 5.5% to 2.75% when the consideration or value of the property conveyed equals or exceeds $10,000,000 but is less than $25,000,000, and from 6% to 3% when the consideration or value equals or exceeds $25,000,000; exempt from these reductions the transfer of single-family residences; and reduce the penalties for delinquent real property transfer taxes. File No. 260178. 17 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Barklee Sanders, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to authorize the Public Utilities Commission to purchase utility infrastructure from customers that the Public Utilities Commission would otherwise be required to install, subject to specified conditions. File No. 260302. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed renovation of the Crocker Amazon Park baseball and softball fields. 16 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19).

From members of the public, regarding the demolition of 659 Union Street. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding E-Bike traffic safety. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Hayes Valley Safe (HVS), regarding the proposed Hayes Street Farmers Market. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21-A)

From Hargobind Khalsa, regarding various subjects. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Lamia Elkhatib, regarding Police Code, Section 154. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Trey Suddaby, regarding pedestrian traffic safety. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From the San Francisco Asian Women’s Shelter (SFAWS), regarding the proposed Resolution recognizing the month of April 2026, as “National Sexual Assault Awareness

and Prevention Month" in the City and County of San Francisco. File No. 260407. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Health, Planning, Police, and Business and Tax Regulations Codes to establish a new permit type for cannabis cafés to be administered by the Office of Cannabis that will authorize the permittee to sell cannabis and cannabis products only for consumption on the premises of the café; exempt cannabis cafés from the prohibition on smoking in business establishments; eliminate the prohibition on establishments with a cannabis consumption permit requiring employees to enter a designated smoking room as a condition of employment; exempt cannabis cafés in certain circumstances from the 600-foot buffer rule that applies to cannabis retail establishments; restrict eligibility for cannabis café permits for one year to businesses that currently hold a cannabis storefront retailer permit or that have the same owners as such a business; require Equity Applicants that apply for a cannabis café permit to pay the $2,000 application fee, any permit amendment processing costs, and the $3,000 license fee for the first year of operation, associated with the cannabis café permit; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. File No. 260281. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Tracey Simmons, regarding the flying of the Israeli Flag at City Hall. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Darius Banks, regarding the Hearing to examine workforce programming across City departments, including any potential cuts to workforce training and employment programs that help San Francisco residents get to work, including programming for youth through adults, as well as ambassador programs; and requesting the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, Human Services Agency, Human Rights Commission, and the People's Budget Coalition to report. File No. 260385. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From the San Francisco Tree Campaign, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Public Works Code to allow development projects to satisfy street tree planting requirements through payment of an in lieu fee or providing alternative landscaping; exempt accessory dwelling units from street tree planting requirements; eliminate appeals to the Board of Appeals for tree removals undertaken by City departments and commissions; and update in lieu fee reporting requirements; amending the Administrative Code to create a separate account within the Adopt-A-Tree Fund to receive in lieu fees for street tree requirements; and amending the Planning Code to update street tree applicability requirements. File No. 251211. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From Daniel Abrams, regarding Adrienne Pacheco Valera. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

Item 1

From:	Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Legislative Services
Subject:	FW: Acting-Mayor Memo | April 17-25, 2026
Date:	Friday, April 17, 2026 12:13:23 PM
Attachments:	0948_001.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached Acting-Mayor Memo.

Thank you,

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

From: Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2026 12:00 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>
Cc: Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (MYR) <han.zou@sfgov.org>; Lutvak, Charles (MYR) <charles.lutvak@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; PRADHAN, MANU (CAT) <Manu.Pradhan@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Acting-Mayor Memo | April 17-25, 2026

Dear Clerk Calvillo:

Please see the attached memo designating the following Supervisors as Acting Mayor from April 17-25, 2026.

- Supervisor Stephen Sherrill effective Friday, April 17, 2026, from 1:00 PM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Matt Dorsey effective Saturday, April 18, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;

- Supervisor Alan Wong effective Sunday, April 19, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Bilal Mahmood effective Monday, April 20, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Chyanne Chen effective Tuesday, April 21, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Rafael Mandelman effective Wednesday, April 22, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Danny Sauter effective Thursday, April 23, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Connie Chan effective Friday, April 24, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and
- Supervisor Rafael Mandelman effective Saturday, April 25, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 7:30 PM.

In the event the Mayor is delayed, Board President Mandelman shall continue serving as Acting Mayor until the Mayor's return to California.

Please reach out if you have any questions — thank you.

Adam

Adam Thongsavat
Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

April 17, 2026

Ms. Angela Calvillo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate the following Supervisors to serve as Acting Mayor:

- Supervisor Stephen Sherrill effective Friday, April 17, 2026, from 1:00 PM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Matt Dorsey effective Saturday, April 18, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Alan Wong effective Sunday, April 19, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Bilal Mahmood effective Monday, April 20, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Chyanne Chen effective Tuesday, April 21, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Rafael Mandelman effective Wednesday, April 22, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Danny Sauter effective Thursday, April 23, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM;
- Supervisor Connie Chan effective Friday, April 24, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and
- Supervisor Rafael Mandelman effective Saturday, April 25, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 7:30 PM.

In the event I am delayed, I designate Board President Mandelman to continue to serve as Acting Mayor until my return to California.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

cc: Mr. David Chiu, City Attorney

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

Item 2

From: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS)
Subject: Excusal Memo
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 12:41:18 PM
Attachments: BFC BAC excusal request 4.22.26.docx (1).pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached excusal memo from Supervisor Chan for today's Board Meeting and both the B&F and BAC meetings tomorrow.

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

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 1

City and County of San Francisco

CONNIE CHAN
陳詩敏
第一區市參事

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 20, 2026

TO: Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk, Board of Supervisors

FROM: Supervisor Connie Chan

RE: Notice of Absence

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.6, I write to notify you that I will be absent at the Tuesday, April 21, 2026 meeting of the Board of Supervisors and the April 22, 2026 meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee and Budget and Appropriations Committee meetings. Accordingly, I request to be excused.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

cc: Brent Jalipa, Clerk, Budget and Finance and Budget and Appropriations Committees

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Green Infrastructure Grant Program Quarterly Report FY25-26 Q3
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:32:33 AM
Attachments:	image001.png GIGP BOS Update_FY25-26_Q3.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, submitting a Green Infrastructure Grant Program Quarterly Report for the period of January 1, 2026 through March 31, 2026, pursuant to Ordinance No. 207-24.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2026 2:42 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Logsdon, Willis (PUC) <WLogsdon@sfwater.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>; Halliday, Kylie (PUC) <KHalliday@sfwater.org>
Subject: Green Infrastructure Grant Program Quarterly Report FY25-26 Q3

Hello BOS team,

Pursuant to Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 207-24, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission hereby provides the following written report summarizing the SFPUC's Green Infrastructure Grant Program quarterly activities from January 1, 2026 to March 31, 2026.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Willis Logsdon at WLogsdon@sfwater.org.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Oliveros Reyes (she/her/ella)
Policy & Government Affairs

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Cellphone: 628-249-8600
joliverosreyes@sfwater.org

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

Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45

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

525 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-3155
sfpuc.gov

Date: April 21, 2026

To: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Through: Dennis J. Herrera, General Manager DS DH
Joel Prather, Assistant General Manager, Wastewater Enterprise DS JP

From: Willis Logsdon, Urban Watershed Planning Division, Wastewater Enterprise

Re: Green Infrastructure Grant Program Quarterly Report, FY25-26 Q3

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 207-24, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) hereby provides the following written report summarizing the SFPUC's Green Infrastructure Grant Program quarterly activities from January 1, 2026 to March 31, 2026.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Willis Logsdon at WLogsdon@sfwater.org.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45

Green Infrastructure Grant Program: Board of Supervisors Quarterly Update

January – March 2026

Program Summary

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Green Infrastructure Grant Program funds the design and construction of green stormwater infrastructure on large properties and in the public right-of-way, with the goal of reducing stormwater runoff while delivering public benefits that enhance the quality of life for all SFPUC rate payers. Project types can include permeable pavement, bioretention, rainwater harvesting, rain gardens, and vegetated roofs.

To receive funding under the Grant Program each project must:

1. Be located on a parcel and/or in public right-of-way that discharges to an SFPUC-owned and operated sewer system service area.
2. Manage stormwater runoff from a minimum impervious area of 0.5 acres.
3. Capture the 90th percentile storm (0.75-inch depth) with the proposed green infrastructure features.
4. Provide at least two (2) of the identified co-benefits from the program list, which can be found in the Grantee Guidebook.
5. Have a grant team that collectively demonstrates a history of successful project implementation and has previous experience designing, constructing, and/or maintaining green infrastructure, and be in good standing in all currently active Green Infrastructure Grant Program projects.

More information on the Grant Program can be found at http://www.sfpuc.gov/gigrants.

Quarterly Highlights

During the reporting period, SFPUC announced its awards for the Fall 2025 application cycle. Four applications were received during the Fall 2025 cycle and four applications were awarded grants (Cesar Chavez Elementary School, Roosevelt Middle School, Yerba Buena Gardens, and Marina Improvement and Remediation Project), totaling just under $3.4M in total funding.

During the reporting period, three projects completed construction (Project Artaud, Jefferson Elementary School, St Thomas More), six projects continued construction (Buchanan Street Mall, Buena Vista Horace Mann K-8, Visitacion Valley Middle School, Thurgood Marshall High School, Flynn Elementary School, and Cornerstone Silver Campus), and six projects (Mariners Village, Cornerstone Cambridge Campus, Visitacion Valley Elementary School, El Dorado Elementary School, Church of the Visitacion, and Panorama Elementary School) continued design and community engagement.

Additionally, this quarter the SFPUC amended the grant agreement for the project at Cornerstone Silver to increase the grant funding by $94,869 for additional stormwater management.

Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45

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

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

Program Statistics (February 2019 – March 2026)

Since the launch of the Green Infrastructure Grant Program in February 2019, the SFPUC has awarded grants to 33 projects with a total of approximately $32.6M in funding. The following program summary statistics are as of March 31, 2026:

- Applications Received: **33**
- Applications Awarded: **33**
- Active Projects: **20**
- Projects Completed: **12**
- Total Funding Awarded: **$32.60M**
- Potential Stormwater Captured by Awarded Projects: **19.25 million gallons per year**
- Property Site Visits Conducted by Technical Team: **69**
- Site Opportunities Assessments Completed: **42**

Co-Benefit Summary

Each project is required to select a minimum of two (2) of the following community and environmental benefits. Definitions for each co-benefit can be found in the Grantee Guidebook.

- Total Estimated Student Population Reached by School Projects: **>6,000 students**
- Number of Public Schools Awarded Grants: **13**
- Number of Public Parks Awarded Grants: **7**
- Projects in High or Moderately Burdened Environmental Justice Communities: **23**

Co-Benefit Achieved	Number of Projects
Environmental Justice	25
Public Access, Open Space, and Recreation	11
Community Engagement, Collaboration, and Placemaking	16
Education and Watershed Stewardship	27
Green Infrastructure Job Training	5
Water Supply	10
Climate Resilience	18
Biodiversity	16

Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45

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

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

Green Infrastructure Grant Program Awarded Projects to Date

Project Name	Status	Supervisor District	EJ Communities*	Grant Amount	Impervious Area Managed (acres)	Estimated Stormwater Volume Managed (gallons/year)
Cesar Chavez Elementary	Awarded	9	Moderate	$853,405	0.8	411,000
Yerba Buena Gardens	Awarded	6	High	$695,416	0.7	310,000
Roosevelt Middle School	Awarded	2	Low	$1,129,549	1.1	535,000
Marina Improvement Project	Awarded	2	Low	$679,654	1.0	454,000
Bernal Heights Recreation Center	Awarded	9	Low	$580,222	0.6	351,000
Innes Avenue Rebuild	Awarded	10	High	$991,898	1.0	513,000
Jackson Playground	Awarded	10	Moderate	$599,924	0.6	440,000
Everett Middle School	Close Out	8	Low	$1,874,496	1.9	980,000
Jefferson Elementary School	Close Out	7	Low	$796,670	0.9	445,000
Project Artaud	Close Out	9	Moderate	$756,030	0.8	377,000
Lafayette Elementary School	Complete	1	Low	$487,891	0.6	462,000
Bessie Carmichael Middle School	Complete	6	High	$521,427	0.6	341,000
Lycee Francais de San Francisco	Complete	4	Moderate	$480,958	0.6	233,000
Crocker Amazon Parking Lot	Complete	11	Moderate	$850,812	1.1	358,000
St Thomas the Apostle Church and School	Complete	1	Low	$744,512	0.8	566,000
St Monica Catholic Church and School	Complete	1	Moderate	$773,313	0.8	480,000
St Anne of the Sunset Church and School	Complete	7	Low	$1,522,995	1.7	390,000
St Emydius Church and School	Complete	11	Moderate	$858,136	0.9	1,089,000
St Thomas More Church and School	Complete	7	Moderate	$704,554	0.7	305,000
Buena Vista Horace Mann K-8	Construction	9	Moderate	$629,423	0.7	318,000
Buchanan Street Mall	Construction	5	Moderate	$750,475	0.8	365,000
Visitacion Valley Middle School	Construction	10	Moderate	$1,999,967	4.4	2,250,000
Cornerstone Academy Silver	Construction	9	Moderate	$958,405	1.0	554,000
Thurgood Marshall High School	Construction	10	High	$1,999,465	2.2	1,166,000
Flynn Elementary School	Construction	9	Moderate	$642,714	0.6	322,000
Church of the Visitacion Church and School	Design	10	High	$1,727,103	1.9	925,000
Visitacion Valley Elementary School	Design	10	High	$883,092	1.0	489,000
El Dorado Elementary School	Design	10	High	$1,412,016	1.7	913,000
Mariners Village	Design	10	High	$1,154,174	1.2	672,000
Cornerstone Academy Cambridge	Design	9	Moderate	$1,509,857	1.6	792,000
Panorama Elementary School	Design	NA	NA	$1,955,686	1.9	955,000
Louis Sutter Playground	Design	9	Moderate	$945,299	0.9	486,000
Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church	Withdrawn	7	Moderate	$127,041	-	-
Total				**$32,596,579**	**37.1**	**19,247,000**

*Environmental Justice Communities based on SF Environmental Justice Framework.

Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45

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

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM



Please visit the program web map for an Environmental Justice map overlay and further details on each project.

Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45


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


GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

Image Gallery of Projects in Progress

Project Artaud

Completed construction of new rain gardens and rainwater harvesting cistern.









Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45

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

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

Jefferson Elementary School

Completed construction of new rain gardens.






Docusign Envelope ID: 4BA0C550-4B1A-4218-A7FB-4C329BAB9B45

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

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM

St. Thomas More School

Completed construction of new rain gardens.





Item 4

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Excusal Memo
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:52:40 AM
Attachments:	President Mandelman BAC Excusal 042226.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached excusal memo from President Rafael Mandelman for today's Budget and Appropriations Committee meeting.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

President, Board of Supervisors
District 8

City and County of San Francisco

RAFAEL MANDELMAN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Supervisor Connie Chan, Chair of the Budget and Appropriations Committee

FROM: President Rafael Mandelman, District 8 Supervisor

DATE: April 22, 2026

SUBJECT: Request for Excusal from Budget and Appropriations Committee Meeting, April 22, 2026

Dear Madam Clerk,

I will be absent from the Budget and Appropriations Committee meeting on April 22, 2026. I respectfully request to be excused from the meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.



Item 5

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: CPC Memo for 4/20/26 Meeting
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:44:41 PM
Attachments:	image001.png CPC BOS MEMO 2026-04-20.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below from the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), submitting a Memorandum regarding the approval of the Port of San Francisco updated capital improvement plan and Fiscal Years FY27 & FY28 Capital Budgets by the Capital Planning Committee, and the approval of the allocation of partially accrued interest funds from the clean and safe neighborhood parks 2008 & 2012 bonds in an amount not to exceed $1,518,812 by the Capital Planning Committee.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 12:19 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Strong, Brian (ADM) <brian.strong@sfgov.org>; Joshi, Nishad (ADM) <nishad.joshi@sfgov.org>; Vontsolos, Reid (ADM) <reid.vontsolos@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: CPC Memo for 4/20/26 Meeting

Hello Board of Supervisors Team,

Please see attached CPC meeting memo for 4/20. Please stamp the date and reply back to everyone on this email.

Thank you. Have a good afternoon.

Kay Phan | Pronouns: She/Her
Executive Assistant to City Administrator Carmen Chu
City and County of San Francisco
kay.phan@sfgov.org

628.652.1295

Sign up here to receive the City Administrator's newsletter

From: Vontsolos, Reid (ADM) <reid.vontsolos@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 11:43
To: Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Strong, Brian (ADM) <brian.strong@sfgov.org>; Joshi, Nishad (ADM) <nishad.joshi@sfgov.org>
Subject: CPC Memo for 4/20/26 Meeting

Hi Kay,

Attached is the BOS Memo from Monday's CPC meeting for Carmen's review and signature, as well as filing with the Board. As always, we need a stamped / signed copy for our website.

Thank you!
Reid

Reid Vontsolos
Capital Planning Analyst
Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
Office of the City Administrator
Phone: +1-628-652-1267
Pronouns: they/her

ONESF
Building Our Future

City & County of San Francisco
Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
Brian Strong, Chief Resilience Officer
Office of Resilience & Capital Planning

MEMORANDUM

April 22, 2026

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Carmen Chu, City Administrator & Capital Planning Committee Chair

Copy: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Capital Planning Committee

Regarding: (1) The Port of San Francisco Updated Capital Improvement Plan and FY27 & FY28 Capital Budget

(2) Allocation of Interest Funds from the Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks 2008 and 2012 Bonds

---

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on April 20, 2026, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) approved the following action items to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The CPC's recommendation is set forth below.

1. Board File Number:	**APPROVAL OF THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO UPDATED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND FY27 & FY28 CAPITAL BUDGET**
CPC Recommendation:	The CPC recommends approval of the Port of San Francisco's Updated Capital Improvement Plan and FY27 & FY28 Capital Budget.
Comments:	The CPC approves this item by a vote of 11-0.
	Committee members or representatives in favor:
	Rachel Cukierman, Office of the City Administrator; Carla Short, Director, Public Works; Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors; Greg Wagner, Controller; Sophia Kittler, Director, Mayor's Budget Office; Julie Kirschbaum, Director, SFMTA; Josh Switzky, Planning Department; Mike Martin, Acting Executive Director, Port of San Francisco; Stephen Robinson, Public Utilities

	Commission; Stacy Bradley, Recreation and Parks Department; Ronda Chu, San Francisco International Airport.
2. Board File Number:	**APPROVAL OF THE ALLOCATION OF PARTIALLY ACCRUED INTEREST FUNDS FROM THE CLEAN AND SAFE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS 2008 & 2012 BONDS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $1,518,812**
CPC Recommendation:	The CPC recommends approval of the Port of San Francisco's allocation of accrued interest funds from the 2008 and 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bonds to bond-eligible improvements to the South Beach Harbor Playground in an amount not to exceed $1,518,812.
Comments:	The CPC approves this item by a vote of 11-0.
	Committee members or representatives in favor:
	Rachel Cukierman, Office of the City Administrator; Carla Short, Director, Public Works; Rafael Mandelman, President, Board of Supervisors; Greg Wagner, Controller; Sophia Kittler, Director, Mayor's Budget Office; Julie Kirschbaum, Director, SFMTA; Josh Switzky, Planning Department; Mike Martin, Acting Executive Director, Port of San Francisco; Stephen Robinson, Public Utilities Commission; Stacy Bradley, Recreation and Parks Department; Ronda Chu, San Francisco International Airport.

Item 6

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)
Subject: FW: Issued – Annual Audit of the Free City College Program Fund: August 1, 2023, Through July 31, 2024
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:16:00 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below report on the audit of the Free City College Fund.

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.sf.gov/bos

From: Reports, Controller (CON) <controller.reports@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 11:00 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: delaRosa, Mark (CON) <mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org>; Woo, Winnie (CON) <winnie.woo@sfgov.org>; Vo, Helen (CON) <helen.vo@sfgov.org>; Tam, Kristen (CON) <kristen.tam@sfgov.org>
Subject: Issued – Annual Audit of the Free City College Program Fund: August 1, 2023, Through July 31, 2024

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to San Francisco Charter, Section 3.105 and Appendix F, which requires that the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) conduct periodic, comprehensive financial and performance audits of city departments, services and activities, CSA today issued a report on its audit of the Free City College Program Fund, which the City and County of San Francisco established to provide financial assistance for San Francisco residents to attend City College of San Francisco.

Please refer to the distribution e-mail below.

Office of the Controller

City & County of San Francisco



The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a report on its audit of the Free City College Program Fund, which the City and County of San Francisco (City) established to provide financial assistance for San Francisco residents to attend City College of San Francisco (City College). The Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) administers the program for the City. CSA engaged Crowe LLP (Crowe) to conduct the audit, which had as its objectives to determine whether money in the program fund was spent in accordance with the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the City and City College. The audit also assessed whether City College's controls over financial and operational activities related to the program fund are adequate.

The audit found that City College charged indirect costs to the Free City College Program, but Crowe could not conclude whether the allocation of indirect costs complies with the MOU because it does not address indirect costs and its language related to administrative costs is ambiguous and open-ended.

View the full report

Image







This is a send-only email address.

For questions about the report, please contact Director of Audits Mark de la Rosa at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or (628) 652-9924.

For press queries, please contact the Controller's Office at controller@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.

Annual Audit of the Free City College Program Fund: August 1, 2023, Through July 31, 2024

Department of Children, Youth and Their Families





Prepared by

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY SERVICES AUDITOR

April 22, 2026

About the Controller's Office

The Controller is the chief financial officer and auditor of the City and County of San Francisco (City). We produce regular reports on the City's financial condition, economic condition, and the performance of city government. We strive to be a model for good government and to make the City a better place to live and work.

About the Audits Division

The City Services Auditor (CSA) was created in the Controller's Office through an amendment to the San Francisco Charter that voters approved in 2003. Within CSA, the Audits Division ensures the City's financial integrity and promotes efficient, effective, and accountable government by:

- Conducting performance audits of city departments, contractors, and functions to assess efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery and business processes.
- Investigating reports received through its whistleblower hotline of fraud, waste, and abuse of city resources.
- Providing actionable recommendations to city leaders to promote and enhance accountability and improve the overall performance and efficiency of city government.

Team:
Winnie Woo, *Audit Manager*

Consultant:
Crowe LLP

For more information, please contact:
Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
Office of the Controller
City and County of San Francisco
(628) 652-9924

Media inquiries:
con.media@sfgov.org

sf.gov/controller
@sfcontroller
Controller's Office LinkedIn

OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller

ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

April 22, 2026

Sherrice Dorsey-Smith
Executive Director
Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
1455 Market Street, Suite 17B
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Executive Director Dorsey-Smith:

The Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor (CSA), Audits Division, presents the report on Year 5 of the Free City College Program fund, which the City and County of San Francisco (City) established to provide financial assistance for San Francisco residents to attend City College of San Francisco (City College). The Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) is charged with administering the Free City College Program (the Program).

CSA engaged Crowe LLP (Crowe) to conduct the audit, which had as its objectives to determine whether money in the Program fund was spent in accordance with the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the City and City College. The audit also assessed the adequacy of City College's controls over financial and operational activities related to the Program fund.

The audit found that City College charged indirect costs to the Program, but Crowe could not conclude whether the allocation of indirect costs complies with the MOU because it does not address indirect costs and its language related to administrative costs is ambiguous and open-ended.

The report includes 2 recommendations for DCYF to improve its monitoring of the program fund. The responses of DCYF and City College are attached. CSA will work with DCYF to follow up every 6 months on the status of the open recommendations made in this report.

CSA and Crowe appreciate the assistance and cooperation of DCYF and City College staff involved in this audit. For questions about the report, please contact me at mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org or 628-652-9924.

Respectfully,

Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits

cc: Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Citizens Audit Review Board
City Attorney
Civil Grand Jury
Mayor
Public Library

Crowe

Smart decisions. Lasting value.™

Performance Audit of the Free City College Program
Performed on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco

April 15, 2026



Table of Contents

Cover Letter **1**

Executive Summary **2**

Background **3**

Objectives, Scope, Methodology and Conclusion **5**

Finding and Recommendations **7**

Finding 01: Indirect Costs Charged to the Free City College Program 8

Appendix A – Views of Responsible Officials and Corrective Action **11**

Crowe LLP
Independent Member Crowe Global

Cover Letter

Mark de la Rosa, Director of Audits
Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 476
San Francisco, CA 94102

Crowe conducted a performance audit of the Free City College Program (Program) administered by City College of San Francisco (City College) for the period of August 1, 2023, through July 31, 2024, to determine whether Program funds were used in accordance with the stated purposes and permissible uses as agreed upon in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-288.

Crowe conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The audit found that the City and County of San Francisco's (City) Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) approved an indirect cost methodology that was used by City College to claim $3,229,702 of indirect costs during the audit period. The Free City College Program MOU does not address indirect costs and language in the agreement related to charging administrative costs is ambiguous and open ended. Therefore, Crowe could not conclude whether the indirect costs charged to the Free City College Program were compliant with the MOU. As a result, Crowe relied on the interpretation and approval of DCYF for these charges. However, Crowe was able to assess certain components of the indirect cost allocation, and the results of that assessment are noted in this report.

Our audit was limited to the objectives listed in the Objectives, Scope, Methodology and Conclusion section of this report. DCYF and City College management are responsible for compliance with those requirements.

Solely to assist us in planning and performing our performance audit, we obtained an understanding of internal controls to determine the audit procedures that were appropriate for the purpose of providing a conclusion on the audit objectives, as specified, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control. Accordingly, we do not express any assurance on the internal control.

The results of our audit procedures indicate that City College met the Audit Objectives in all significant respects.

DCYF and City College's written responses, Views of Responsible Officials and Corrective Action, included in the Findings and Recommendations Section of this report were not subjected to the performance auditing procedures of the *Government Auditing Standards.*

Executive Summary

The objectives of this performance audit are to:

1. Determine whether Free City College Program (Program) funds were used in accordance with the stated purposes and permissible uses as agreed upon in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between City College of San Francisco (City College) and the City and County of San Francisco (City), and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-288.
2. Determine whether unspent funds were returned to the Program fund in accordance with the MOU and Administrative code.
3. Determine whether City College has reasonable controls for determining that financial and operational activities over the Program fund are properly performed.

The audit covered the period of August 1, 2023, through July 31, 2024. The audit objectives were developed based on city law, requirements set forth in the MOU, and goals outlined by the City's Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF). Significant findings are defined as those that are deemed to be "significant" to the audit objectives. In performance audits, a deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect and correct (1) impairments of effectiveness or efficiency of operations, (2) misstatements in financial or performance information, or (3) noncompliance with provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, or grant agreements on a timely basis.

As part of the audit, Crowe identified one (1) finding, which is presented in **Exhibit 1**. Further details of the finding are presented in the Finding and Recommendations section of this report.

Exhibit 1
Finding and Control Evaluation

Finding Summary	Classification	Audit Objective Significantly Impacted
1. Indirect Costs Charged to the Free City College Program	*Deficiency in Internal Control*	N/A

As part of our audit procedures, we assessed whether the finding identified during the audit period from August 1, 2022, to July 31, 2023, had been remediated. Crowe observed that this finding was repeated for the audit period of August 1, 2023, through July 31, 2024. **Exhibit 2** shows the status of the remediation for the prior-year audit finding.

Exhibit 2
Status of Year 4 Audit Finding

Finding	Status	Comments
1. Indirect Costs Charged to the Free City College Program	Repeat Finding	Crowe completed the audit for August 1, 2022, through July 31, 2023, (Year 4) and the audit for August 1, 2023, through July 31, 2024, (Year 5) concurrently. Both audits were conducted after the conclusion of the current audit period, so DCYF and CCSF did not have sufficient opportunity to address the findings from the prior audit report before the issuance of this report.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Background

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors established the San Francisco City College Financial Assistance Fund (Fund) to provide funds to implement the Program. On August 22, 2019, the City entered into an MOU with City College to operate the Program. The MOU covers a period of ten academic years, defined as "encompass[ing] Fall, Spring, and Summer, including intercessions, if any." DCYF is the monitoring agency of the Program. The MOU provided a total of $16.9 million for Year 5. **Exhibit 3** provides the annual base funding amounts for the term of Year 1 through 5.

Exhibit 3
Free City College Program Fund Annual Base Funding Amounts

Cost Category	Reported Funding
Year 1	$15,000,000
Year 2	$15,700,000
Year 3	$16,400,000
Year 4	$16,944,480
Year 5 (current audit year)	**$16,862,480**

The Program provides free tuition for credit courses at City College to eligible students, which include California residents living in San Francisco who do not receive grants or financial aid that would cover similar fees. The Program also provides for education-related expenses other than enrollment fees for students who are eligible for the Program and receive grants or financial aid that cover enrollment fees. In fiscal year 2023-24, approximately 19,000 students received either enrollment fees or grants from the Program. Program funding is disbursed to students in the following two ways:

- **Tuition:** Students must complete the Program application form upon class registration. If the student is eligible, the enrollment fees "tuition" will appear as waived charges for payment during registration.
- **Grants:** Eligible students receive the first 50 percent of the disbursement after the last day to drop without a withdrawal and receive the second 50 percent after midterms.

As stated above, the Program received $16.9 million in funds for Academic Year 5. Of the $16.9 million received, City College reported spending a total of $8,624,200 on funding for enrollment fees and grants for eligible students. **Exhibit 4** provides a breakdown of payments to students in the form of tuition, grants and repayments.[1]

Exhibit 4
Free City College Program Fund Payments to Students

Free City Payment Type	Total
Tuition	$6,200,110
Grants	3,487,541
Repayment	(1,063,451)[1]
Total	**$8,624,200**

[1] Students who receive enrollment fees or grant payments from the Program must repay all funds received if they withdraw from a class after the deadline to withdraw as set for each course for the specific semester.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Appendix B of the MOU states that City College may use excess funds remaining after fully funding enrollment fees and grants to cover administrative costs associated with the Free City College Program with DCYF's approval. Functions or staff positions may include but are not limited to: Program manager, financial aid counselors, AB 540 Dream coordinator/counselor, piloting evidence-based interventions to improve student equity outcomes, data analyst, information technology (IT) system upgrades, increased staff hours for financial aid counselors or data analysts, incorporation of evidence-based methods to improve state and federal applications uptake. City College reported spending an additional $311,601 in administrative salaries and benefits and $3,229,702 in indirect costs for Year 5 as outlined in **Exhibit 5.** In total, City College reported $12,165,503 in Program expenditures for Year 5 and excess funds of $4,696,977, which shall be returned to the City.

Exhibit 5
Free City College Program Fund Total Reported Expenditures, Year 5

Cost Category	Reported
Payments to Students	$8,624,200
Direct Salaries and Benefits	311,601
Indirect Costs	3,229,702
Total Year 5 Expenditures	**$12,165,503**
Total Allocated	$16,862,480
Excess Funds	**$4,696,977**

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Objectives, Scope, Methodology and Conclusion

The goal of the audit is to determine whether Program funds were used in accordance with the stated purposes and permissible uses as agreed upon in the MOU between the City and City College. The audit covered the period from August 1, 2023, through July 31, 2024. The audit objectives for this performance audit were developed based on MOU requirements, city law, and goals outlined by DCYF. Specific objectives of the performance audit, methodology and summary conclusions are listed below:

1. ***Determine whether Program funds were used in accordance with the stated purposes and permissible uses as agreed upon in the Memorandum of Understanding and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-288.***

   Methodology: Crowe obtained financial records from City College related to the Free City College Program and a list of students who were granted funding through the Free City College Program. Crowe confirmed funds disbursed did not exceed $16,862,480. Crowe selected a sample of 60 of 28,792 students enrolled in the Program and tested the following:

   - Whether eligible students were required to complete a questionnaire to determine eligibility for the Free City College Program at the time of registration.
   - Whether eligible California College Promise Grant Eligible Students received grants equal in value to $46 for each enrolled credit unit.
   - Whether all other eligible students received free enrollment, with enrollment fees paid for through the Free City College Program.
   - Whether each student was encouraged to complete a FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) and apply for financial aid.

   Testing involved reviewing screen shots from the information technology system used to facilitate enrollment in the Program for each student in the sample. Crowe reviewed the initial application questionnaire, residency information, approval screens, enrollment status and payment information, as applicable.

   Crowe also reviewed administrative expenses against the allowable costs listed in the MOU. We received a list of staff and the percentage of time allocated to the Program. We recalculated administrative expenses allocated to the Program for each staff member based on the stated allocation to confirm it was correct. We inquired about the allocation methodology and requested City College provide policies and procedures and an approved methodology for allocating administrative expenses to the Program.

   Crowe reviewed the indirect costs reported by City College. Crowe requested documentation supporting the indirect cost rate used including the federally approved indirect cost rate application, documentation of costs included in the indirect cost rate application, evidence that indirect cost rate was reasonable, allocable and directly related to the Free City College Program.

   Crowe sampled 19 students who withdrew from their course(s) after the deadline to receive a full refund and tested the following:

   - Whether a student who withdrew from a course or courses after the deadline to receive a full refund, repaid City College for all applicable enrollment fees or the value of the fees paid by grant for the course or courses, and/or grants paid for other educational expenses.
   - Whether City College returned repayments to the Program fund from students that withdrew after the deadline to receive a full refund to the Free City College Program.
   - Whether all Program funds were recovered from those students that withdrew post-deadline.

   Conclusion: City College met this objective in all significant respects. However, Crowe did include a non-significant control finding in Finding 1.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

2. ***Determine whether unspent funds were returned to the Program fund in accordance with the MOU and Administrative code.***

   Methodology: Crowe identified unspent funds for the audit period and tested whether those funds were returned to the Program fund in accordance with the MOU and Administrative code. Crowe obtained financial records from City College and compared the amount of Program funds allocated to the total grants and eligible expenditures to determine if Program funds are required to be returned and determined if student repayments were deposited back to Program funds and these Program funds are returned to City.

   Conclusion: City College met this objective in all significant respects.

3. ***Determine whether City College has reasonable controls for determining that financial and operational activities over the Program fund are properly performed.***

   Methodology: Crowe obtained policies and procedures related to oversight and administration of the Free City College Program including verification of eligibility, disbursement of grants and reimbursements owed to the City College for student drops and withdrawals. Crowe interviewed Free City College Program staff to understand internal controls over the administration of the Program and tested internal controls over eligibility determinations and eligible expenses in Objective 1. Crowe obtained a list of oversight committee members and the appointing body and determined if members were appointed by the appropriate body in compliance with requirements in Attachment B of the MOU. Crowe obtained oversight committee agendas and meeting minutes for academic year 2023/24 and determined whether frequency of meetings complied with requirement in Attachment B of MOU.

   Conclusion: City College met this objective in all significant respects.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Finding and Recommendations

This section of the report provides the finding and recommendations that resulted from the procedures conducted during our Performance Audit. The finding presented was prepared in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards requirements for reporting findings, which are outlined below.

This performance audit resulted in one (1) finding. Findings include a recommendation to correct the issue, and are organized into the following six (6) components:

- *Condition* – includes the error observed based on facts revealed from the examination.
- *Criteria* – the basis for our evaluation; in this case a specific policy, procedure, or leading practice.
- *Cause* – the underlying reason for why the non-compliance or error occurred.
- *Effect* – the impact on the organization and/or the ratepayer from the error.
- *Recommendation* – a suggested action to correct the deficiency; or what can be done to address both the cause and condition.
- *Management Response* – an opportunity for the company to provide its response to the finding and/or recommendation.

The finding and recommendations from this performance audit are provided beginning on the next page.

The finding and questioned costs are summarized below:

Finding Number	Finding Description	Questioned Costs
01	Indirect Costs Charged to the Free City College Program	**Undeterminable, if any**

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Finding 01: Indirect Costs Charged to the Free City College Program

Deficiency in Internal Control

Condition

The Free City College Program MOU does not address indirect costs and the language related to administrative costs is ambiguous and open-ended. Therefore, Crowe could not conclude whether the indirect costs charged to the Free City College Program were compliant with the MOU. Crowe relied on the interpretation of DCYF and on their approval of the indirect cost methodology utilized by City College for the Free City College Program. However, Crowe did test the reasonableness of certain components of the indirect cost allocation and noted the following.

City College has a federally approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (ICRA) of 37.5 percent. The base for approved federal indirect cost rate was direct salaries and wages expenses including all fringe benefits. Total direct salaries and wages charged to the Free City College Program for the audit period were $311,601. However, City College applied the 37.5% indirect cost rate to tuition reimbursements and student grants (recorded as revenue in the City College's financial statements), totaling $3,229,702 of indirect costs being charged to the Program.

Key points noted for consideration for the Free City College Program are as follows:

- Appropriateness of indirect cost rate base – The federally approved rate uses salaries and wages as the allocation base, while City College applied the rate to tuition and grant payments to students.
- Appropriateness of indirect cost rate percentage for the Program – The 37.5% used was a federally approved rate based on direct salaries and wages. Since City College did not use direct salaries and wages as the allocation base for the Program, is 37.5% an appropriate rate to apply?
- The 37.5% rate was applied to student grants – The student grants are funds paid directly to students and function primarily as pass-through financial assistance, involving substantially less administrative effort and limited institutional support once eligibility and disbursement are processed. By applying administrative costs to grant payments that function as pass-through financial aid, City College effectively used Free City College Program funds to subsidize the administration of other tuition assistance programs, including the Board of Governors (BOG) Fee Waiver[2], rather than costs directly attributable to the Free City College Program.
- Are the costs underlying the indirect cost allocation already being reimbursed by another program? The State of California has programs to pay for instructional costs of students and help cover the costs in excess of the tuition rate. Since City College could not produce a ledger tying indirect cost expenses to revenues, we could not test or otherwise determine whether the costs covered by the Free City College Program's indirect cost allocation were also funded by another revenue source.

In addition to the items noted above, City College did not have documentation to support the indirect cost charge readily available for the audit. City College did subsequently provide an analysis of direct costs associated with the Free City College Program, the analysis relied on assumptions that resulted in the use of the full indirect cost rate and did not sufficiently demonstrate that the resulting indirect costs were reasonable, allocable, or reflective of the actual administrative effort required.

Criteria

The MOU states that CCSF may use excess funds remaining in the annual allocation after fully funding enrollment fees and grants to cover administrative costs associated with the Free City College Program with the DCYF's approval. Functions or staff positions may include but are not limited to: Program

[2] The California Promise Grant, formerly Board of Governors Fee Waiver (BOGW), waives the enrollment fees and tuition for eligible California residents attending California Community College.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

manager, financial aid counselors, AB 540 Dream coordinator/counselor, piloting evidence-based interventions to improve student equity outcomes, data analyst, IT system upgrades, increased staff hours for financial aid counselors or data analysts, incorporation of evidence-based methods to improve state and federal applications uptake.

Furthermore, the Free City College Program MOU does not explicitly address the allowability of instructional or educational costs and instead specifically identifies administrative functions and positions as eligible expenses. The MOU language emphasizes administrative costs necessary to operate and manage the Program and does not address covering the full cost of instruction or all educational costs attributable to each student. Additionally, City College did not apply or claim indirect costs under the 37.5 percent rate during Years 1 through 3 of the Program.

Cause

In response to ongoing budgetary shortfalls and financial pressures, City College developed a methodology intended to maximize recovery of available Free City College Program funds. In doing so, City College adopted an approach to applying indirect costs that was designed to maximize recovery of Program funds under its interpretation of allowability but was not sufficiently aligned with the provisions of the Free City College Program MOU. City College did not adequately evaluate or document whether the selected methodology was appropriate for the nature of the Program activities or whether its application accurately reflected those activities. City College explained that the indirect rate applied was the federally approved Indirect Cost Rate, however as noted above this rate was approved for application to salaries and wages. Also, City College did not maintain sufficient supporting documentation to substantiate the composition indirect costs. Lastly, DCYF approved the use of the application.

Effect

City College claimed indirect costs to the Free City College Program. Because City College could not substantiate the composition or applicability of the 37.5 percent rate, there is a risk of overstated Program expenditures and duplicate reimbursement from other funding sources. The lack of documentation and justification for the rate's application diminishes the reliability of reported Program costs and undermines assurance that public funds were used efficiently and in accordance with applicable regulations.

Recommendations

1. DCYF should require City College to provide comprehensive supporting documentation detailing the costs included in the 37.5 percent indirect cost rate, clearly demonstrating that these costs are reasonable, allocable, and directly related to the Free City College Program. Additionally, City College should justify the application of the 37.5 percent rate to both tuition and student grant payments; if such justification cannot be substantiated, the City College should discontinue applying this rate to these cost categories and limit its use to direct salaries and wages in alignment with the approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. Furthermore, City College should recalculate and determine any indirect costs determined to be unallowable or not allocable to the Program.
2. DCYF should re-evaluate the intent of the MOU, specifically whether the agreement was intended to fund administrative costs required to run the Free City College Program or to subsidize all educational costs associated with participating students. This determination is critical to assessing the appropriateness of applying indirect costs to tuition and student grant payments. DCYF should also update the MOU to explicitly identify allowable expenses and approved methodologies to support claimed expenses.

Views of Responsible Officials and Corrective Action

DCYF:

1. Since Year 4 and Year 5 audits ran concurrently, DCYF has not had time to address the findings identified in the Year 4 audit report. Same as the responses to Year 4 recommendations, DCYF agrees that City College should provide comprehensive supporting documentation detailing the costs. Since January 2025, DCYF has switched to a reimbursement basis distribution method for this program. However, DCYF does not agree with some of the statements made in the Condition and Criteria of Finding 01. First, the majority of the Payments to Students were for the $46 per credit unit

© 2026 Crowe LLP

enrollment fees. For students who were eligible for California College Promise Grant, grants equal in value to $46 per enrolled credit unit were given for books, college fees other than enrollment fees, supplies and transportation costs related to their enrollment at City College. Neither of these were the simple pass-through financial assistance. The $46 per credit unit enrollment fees subsequently fund a portion of the instructional activities and student services at City College, the majority of which were direct staff salaries and benefits. For this reason, DCYF thinks it is appropriate to apply the Federally approved indirect cost rate to the Payments to Students. Second, the change in the method for indirect costs claim was due to one of the findings in the audit report for Year 1 (FY19-20), issued in October 2021, which was during Year 3 (FY21-22). In November 2021, DCYF worked with City College and the Controller's Office and approved City College to use the Federally approved indirect cost rate for claiming indirect costs. Due to staffing changes, City College was not able to implement the new methodology until Year 4 (FY22-23). Moving forward, DCYF will request supporting documentation to substantiate the indirect cost charges in City College's invoices.

2. DCYF agrees that the language in the MOU related to administrative costs is ambiguous and open-ended. However, DCYF does not agree with the implication that this program was reimbursing the indirect costs already being reimbursed by another program. The Federally approved indirect cost rate of 37.5% was only applied to the Free City College portion of the student enrollment fees, not the State funded portion of apportionment funding based on enrollment. DCYF strongly believes it is the City's intention to support a reasonable and healthy infrastructure to provide the quality instructional activities and students services at City College. Regarding the language in the MOU related to administrative costs, the Mayor's Office is leading a MOU re-negotiation effort. DCYF will make the recommendation to include very clear language related to administrative costs in the new MOU.

City College:
City College of San Francisco (CCSF) recognizes that the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) requires refinement to establish clearer parameters. Moving forward, CCSF will seek explicit and unambiguous language regarding administrative and indirect costs to ensure greater clarity and mutual understanding.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Appendix A – Views of Responsible Officials and Corrective Action

Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families:

Docusign Envelope ID: C9E41F3B-03A1-496D-95F0-0658384FAA87

DCYF

Sherrice Dorsey-Smith
Executive Director

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

April 15, 2026

Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Department of Children, Youth & Their Families' Management Response to Performance Audit of Free City College Program Fund Performed on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco

Dear Mr. de la Rosa,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the results of the Performance Audit of Free City College Program Fund Performed on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco.

DCYF agrees or partially agrees with the recommendations provided by Crowe. Please refer to the attached Audit Recommendation and Response Form for our detailed responses.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at sherrice.dorsey@dcyf.org.

Sincerely,

Signed by:
BF6B4628BB054C2...

Sherrice Dorsey-Smith
Executive Director
Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
1455 Market Street, Suite 17B, San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 652-7146

cc: Heidi Burbage, Chief Financial Officer
Jasmine Dawson, Deputy Director, City & Community Partnerships

Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
1455 Market Street, Suite 17B | San Francisco, CA 94103 | 628-652-7100 | www.dcyf.org

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Recommendation and Response

For each recommendation, the responsible agency should indicate in the column labeled ***Agency Response*** whether it concurs, does not concur, or partially concurs and provide a brief explanation. If it concurs with the recommendation, it should indicate the expected implementation date and implementation plan. If the responsible agency does not concur or partially concurs, it should provide an explanation and an alternate plan of action to address the identified issue.

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
The Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) should:		
1. Require City College to provide comprehensive supporting documentation detailing the costs included in the 37.5 percent indirect cost rate, clearly demonstrating that these costs are reasonable, allocable, and directly related to the Free City College Program. Additionally, City College should justify the application of the 37.5 percent rate to both tuition and student grant payments; if such justification cannot be substantiated, the City College should discontinue applying this rate to these cost categories and limit its use to direct salaries and wages in alignment with the approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. Furthermore, City College should recalculate and determine any indirect costs determined to be unallowable or not allocable to the Program.	☐ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☒ Partially Concur Since Year 4 and Year 5 audits ran concurrently, DCYF has not had time to address the findings identified in the Year 4 audit report. Same as the responses to Year 4 recommendations, DCYF agrees that City College should provide comprehensive supporting documentation detailing the costs. Since January 2025, DCYF has switched to a reimbursement basis distribution method for this program. However, DCYF does not agree with some of the statements made in the Condition and Criteria of Finding 01. First, the majority of the Payments to Students were for the $46 per credit unit enrollment fees. For students who were eligible for California College Promise Grant, grants equal in value to $46 per enrolled credit unit were given for books, college fees other than enrollment fees, supplies and transportation costs related to their enrollment at City College. Neither of these were the simple pass-through financial assistance. The $46 per credit unit enrollment fees subsequently fund a portion of the instructional activities and student services at City College, the majority of which were direct staff salaries and benefits. For this reason, DCYF thinks it is appropriate to apply the Federally approved indirect cost rate to the Payments to Students.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

* Status Determination based on audit team's review of the agency's response and proposed corrective action.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

Recommendation	Agency Response	CSA Use Only Status Determination*
	Second, the change in the method for indirect costs claim was due to one of the findings in the audit report for Year 1 (FY19-20), issued in October 2021, which was during Year 3 (FY21-22). In November 2021, DCYF worked with City College and the Controller's Office and approved City College to use the Federally approved indirect cost rate for claiming indirect costs. Due to staffing changes, City College was not able to implement the new methodology until Year 4 (FY22-23). Moving forward, DCYF will request supporting documentation to substantiate the indirect cost charges in City College's invoices.	
2. Re-evaluate the intent of the MOU, specifically whether the agreement was intended to fund administrative costs required to run the Free City College Program or to subsidize all educational costs associated with participating students. This determination is critical to assessing the appropriateness of applying indirect costs to tuition and student grant payments. DCYF should also update the MOU to explicitly identify allowable expenses and approved methodologies to support claimed expenses.	☐ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur ☒ Partially Concur DCYF agrees that the language in the MOU related to administrative costs is ambiguous and open-ended. However, DCYF does not agree with the implication that this program was reimbursing the indirect costs already being reimbursed by another program. The Federally approved indirect cost rate of 37.5% was only applied to the Free City College portion of the student enrollment fees, not the State funded portion of apportionment funding based on enrollment. DCYF strongly believes it is the City's intention to support a reasonable and healthy infrastructure to provide the quality instructional activities and students services at City College. Regarding the language in the MOU related to administrative costs, the Mayor's Office is leading a MOU re-negotiation effort. DCYF will make the recommendation to include very clear language related to administrative costs in the new MOU.	☒ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Contested

* Status Determination based on audit team's review of the agency's response and proposed corrective action.

© 2026 Crowe LLP

City College of San Francisco:

City College of San Francisco
50 FRIDA KAHLO WAY • SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112 • (415) 239-3000

April 15, 2026

Mark de la Rosa
Director of Audits
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Annual Audit of the Free City College Progrom Fund: August 1, 2023, Through July 31, 2024.

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) recognizes that the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) requires refinement to establish clearer parameters. Moving forward, CCSF will seek explicit and unambiguous language regarding administrative and indirect costs to ensure greater clarity and mutual understanding.

Adil Ahmed

City College Representative

© 2026 Crowe LLP

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: California Fish and Game Commission meeting agenda
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 3:37:59 PM
Attachments:	CFGC_Mtg_2026_05_5-6_Agenda_041726_Final.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting an agenda for the May 5-6, 2026 meeting.

Sincerely,

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

From: California Fish and Game Commission <fgc@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2026 4:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: California Fish and Game Commission meeting agenda

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

View as a webpage / share

Reef

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

May 5-6, 2026 Meeting Agenda

Topics:

May 5: Regional Marine Protected Area (MPA) Petitions (alongshore San Luis Obispo through Santa Barbara counties petitions)

May 6: Central Valley Sport Fishing and Klamath River Basin *and MPA petitions* (northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Island petitions)

Greetings,

The California Fish and Game Commission will meet in person in Goleta on May 5-6, 2026.

In this second of three regional MPA meetings the Commission will hear directly from petitioners, and receive input from individuals, tribes, and organizations. This meeting focuses on MPA petitions affecting San Luis Obispo through Santa Barbara counties, as well as the northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Island.

On May 6, the Commission will also consider adopting two regulatory change packages related to sport fishing in the Central Valley and

Klamath River Basin.

Members of the public are welcome to attend in person to observe or provide public comment. The Commission also plans to offer Zoom webinar and phone options. Instructions on how to join using these options will be posted to the Commission website prior to the meeting. While the Commission will make a reasonable effort to ensure remote access is available, it cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of these options.

The final regional MPA meeting is scheduled for May 19. A table showing how all petitions are distributed across the three regional meetings is posted on the Commission meetings page, and is available at this link.

Please refer to the agenda for important meeting information and deadlines, including detailed meeting goals, expectations, and speaking guidelines, and format.

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
California Fish and Game Commission

Click Here for Meeting Agenda

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

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena
Darius Anderson, Vice President
Kenwood
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Samantha Murray, Member
La Jolla
Erika Zavaleta, Member
Santa Cruz

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa A. Miller-Henson
Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

www.fgc.ca.gov

Klamath River Basin and Central Valley Sport Fishing *and* Regional Marine Protected Area Petitions (San Luis Obispo through Santa Barbara Counties, including Northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Island)

Meeting Agenda
May 5-6, 2026

Hilton Garden Inn Santa Barbara/Goleta
6878 Hollister Avenue
Goleta, CA 93117

- **May 5** will focus on *Regional MPA Petitions (San Luis Obispo through Santa Barbara counties)*
- **May 6** will focus on *Klamath River Basin* and *Central Valley Sport Fishing and Regional MPA Petitions (Northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Island)*

Join us in person in Goleta to provide public comment or observe the meeting.

Options for Remote Public Comment via Zoom or Phone

To join the meeting remotely via Zoom (video and audio), click directly on the meeting link at https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89046108064. You can access detailed instructions for joining by phone or Zoom by clicking here or visit the Commission meetings page at fgc.ca.gov/meetings; for instructions on how to join by phone (audio only), refer to Option 3.

The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom webinar platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or webinar quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them; however, the meeting will continue with in-person attendees.

Option for Remote Observation Without Public Comment

To watch or listen only on the day of the meeting visit http://www.fgc.ca.gov (link is on the right side of the page). The Commission will make a reasonable effort to live-stream the meeting to allow the public to observe the meeting from a remote location without providing comments. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the webcast.

Meeting Goals, Expectations, and Format

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) is holding this meeting as one of three regional meetings (April 21, May 5-6, and May 19) to consider recently evaluated marine protected area (MPA) petitions. We expect to hear comments from people with varied perspectives and deeply held values about California's ocean and coastal places. In these meetings, the Commission is committed to supporting an environment where everyone can safely participate, while also protecting free speech. Meeting goals, expectations, and format information have been created to support a respectful, constructive environment where all voices are heard; we share them here to enhance transparency for regional meeting participants.

Regional Meeting Goals

- Provide a safe and inclusive environment for sharing knowledge, experiences, and perspectives.
- Uphold the Commission's Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) Policy and goals, including centering principles of environmental justice and access for underserved communities; recognizing and honoring the perspectives and traditional knowledge and practices of California tribes and tribal communities; and working from a shared understanding of key JEDI-related definitions and terms.
- Ensure all commissioners can hear and participate in petition dialogue in real time.
- Receive overview of petitions, ask questions, and discuss petitions and evaluations.
- Daylight areas of agreement or disagreement, as well as potential modifications and compromises.
- Gather input to inform Commission recommendations or make requests for additional information for future consideration.
- Deliberate on petition content without making final decisions, which will occur at later publicly noticed Commission meetings; real-time negotiation or resolution may not be possible within the meeting time.

Regional Meeting Expectations: Commitment to a Respectful Environment and Free Speech

We acknowledge that regional meeting participants care deeply about California's marine and coastal places and public trust resources. These meetings are intended to provide space to openly and respectfully share relevant information and perspectives on MPA petitions. The following content is intended to set expectations and tone for these meetings.

The Commission is committed to creating and maintaining an environment where all participants feel safe, respected, and able to contribute meaningfully. It therefore strongly discourages personal attacks, intimidation, harassment, hateful expressions (including racial or other identity-based comments), or other conduct that targets individuals rather than issues. These comments can diminish the quality of public dialogue, discourage community participation, and potentially reduce the likelihood that commissioners will give weight to comments delivered in this manner.

The Commission upholds the right to free speech. All individuals possess this right and are entitled to use their full speaking time to express their views, including critiques, alternative perspectives, and disagreement. However, disruptions to the meeting will not be tolerated. Profanity, obscenity, personal threats or attacks on members, staff or other commenters, references to protected characteristics, offensive speech, yelling, interruptions, audible and disruptive reactions, or disputing another speaker during their speaking time may constitute a disruption to the meeting, depending on the circumstances.

The Commission may restrict an individual's right to speak when necessary to avoid disrupting the orderly conduct of the meeting. In these cases, the presiding commissioner may gavel or mute a speaker's microphone. If the disruptive behavior continues, after a call for decorum and a warning, the person or people disrupting the orderly conduct of the meeting may be removed from the meeting, the meeting may be suspended, and the room may be cleared.

Regional Meeting Participation Logistics: Day of Engagement and Written Comments

Participating in Person, on Zoom, or by Phone

All meetings are subject to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and open to the public. Participation and comment are available in person, via Zoom webinar, or by phone; meetings are also live streamed for listening or viewing only. The presiding commissioner will explain how to indicate your interest in speaking and time limits. Staff are available to answer logistical questions. Audio and video archives are posted to the Commission website after each meeting.

To speak on an agenda item in-person*,* please complete a "speaker card" and provide it to the designated staff member before the agenda item is announced. Please complete one speaker card per agenda item. Cards will be available near the entrance of the meeting room. In-person speakers will be identified in groups; please line up when your name is called.

To speak on an agenda item via Zoom or phone*,* please "raise" your hand either through the Zoom function or by pressing *9 once on your phone when prompted at the beginning of the agenda item. Speakers on Zoom or phone will be identified by your display name or the last three digits of your phone number; listen closely for when your name or number is called.

Visual Presentations: Slides, Videos, and Graphics

All electronic presentations must be submitted by the Supplemental Comment Deadline and approved by the Commission executive director before the meeting.

- Electronic presentations must be provided by email to fgc@fgc.ca.gov. If the file is too large to send via email, contact staff to identify an alternative method for submitting the file.

- Specify to which meeting date and petition/geography it pertains.
- All electronic formats must be Windows PC compatible.
- If presenting at the in-person meeting location, it is recommended that you bring a print copy of your presentation in case of technical difficulties.
- Approval is at the discretion of the presiding commissioner and is not guaranteed.

Persons with Disabilities or Accommodation Needs

Individuals with disabilities and/or needing reasonable accommodation to participate in Commission meetings may contact the Civil Rights Office (CRO) of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife at civilrights@wildlife.ca.gov. Requests for facility or meeting accessibility and requests for American Sign Language interpreters should be submitted at least 72 hours before the meeting to help ensure that the requested accommodation can be met. If an accommodation is no longer needed, please notify CRO immediately.

Individuals relying on an interpreter are entitled to at least twice the allotted speaking time pursuant to Government Code Section 11125.7(c), and are asked to provide at least 72 hours' notice. Additional time for other accommodation needs may be granted at the presiding commissioner's discretion to ensure equal opportunity to address the Commission.

Written Public Comments and Submission Deadlines

The public is encouraged to submit written comments on any agenda item. Written comments can be more detailed than what you may have the opportunity to share with commissioners in verbal comments made during the meeting. If written comments are received before the deadline, they will be shared with Commissioners before the meeting; you may wish to refer to your full written comments during your verbal testimony at the meeting.

Submit written comments by one of three methods:

- E-mail to fgc@fgc.ca.gov
- Mail to California Fish and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
- Deliver to California Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, 16th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814 (call at least one business day in advance to arrange delivery)

Meeting Date	*Comment Deadline**	*Supplemental Comment Deadline***
May 5-6, 2026	April 22, 5:00 PM	April 30, 12:00 PM
May 19, 2026	May 6, 5:00 PM	May 14, 12:00 PM

* Written comments received at the Commission office by the ***Comment Deadline*** will be made available to the Commissioners prior to the meeting, made available to the public, and may be posted online with meeting materials.

** Written comments received at the Commission office by the ***Supplemental Comment Deadline*** will be made available to Commissioners at the meeting but not posted online.

After these deadlines, written comments may be delivered in person to the meeting. Please bring twelve (12) copies of written comments and hand them to the designated staff member just prior to speaking.

Regional Meeting Expectations: Agenda and Format

Meeting Agenda

The meeting agenda outlines the planned sequence of items, during which presentations, discussion, and public comment will occur. Each meeting includes a designated public comment period for each agenda item, as well as a "general public comment" agenda item for topics not on the agenda.

Meeting Format

For each regional meeting, the Commission will discuss from four to seven MPA petitions (with eight to fifteen proposed actions). Information on which petitions will be heard at which regional meetings is available in the petition distribution tables.

During regional meetings, each MPA petition agenda item will follow the same general format:

- Petitioner presentation for 10-12 minutes, depending on whether a petition is tribally led or co-led and on the number of nested actions within the petition, covering:
    - Regulatory actions requested
    - Purpose of requested action
    - Updates since petition was submitted in November 2023 or since amended in March 2025
    - A focus on regionally or locally relevant components, especially if a petition spans multiple regions
- Commission staff re-cap of evaluation recommendations
- Commissioner questions
- Ceded speaker time
- Public comment and Commission discussion

Regional Meeting Expectations: Guidelines on Speaker Time

Under Commission procedures, the presiding commissioner allocates a maximum speaking time (typically one to three minutes, with exceptions) for each agenda item. For the regional MPA petition meetings, the Commission aims to support a more flexible, conversational dialogue, whenever possible, to reflect the spirit of Marine Resources Committee meetings. The Commission understands that many participants travel long distances or rearrange commitments to attend, whether in person or remotely.

The Commission expects the regional meetings to be well attended, potentially with large numbers of speakers. The Commission is committed to hearing all scheduled petitions, while also maximizing the amount of information and number of viewpoints shared by attendees.

To balance these goals, the presiding commissioner will seek to ensure discussions are focused, respectful, and efficient, and that as many voices as possible can be heard. In that spirit, the presiding commissioner will specify a target maximum speaking time for those wishing to speak on a petition.

Tools the Presiding Commissioner May Use to Maximize Viewpoints Shared

To help participants prepare for regional meetings, we share here proposed speaker time guidelines, as well as other tools the presiding commissioner may use to manage large numbers of speakers on any given petition. Note that at any time, the presiding commissioner may choose to use these or other tools to focus comments and/or maximize participation. Please keep these guidelines in mind as you prepare your public comments.

- **If there are 25 or fewer speakers:** Speakers may be asked to speak for no more than **two to three minutes** each.
- **If there are more than 25 speakers*:*** Speakers may be asked to speak for no more than **one minute** each.

If there are large numbers of speakers for any petition: The presiding commissioner may also choose to rely on group sentiment tools to allow participants to indicate their views, when there is not enough time for all individuals to speak. These tools are strategies to broaden participation, not to limit viewpoints.

- **Levels-of-Support Checks:** Quick indicators such as "I like it," "I can live with it," or "I cannot support it"
- **Group Sentiment Capture:** Hand-raising or digital reactions when not everyone can speak individually
- **Time Management Adjustments:** Modifying pacing, structure, or feedback tools so all petitions can be addressed during the meeting

Additional Time for Speakers with Ceded Time

A speaker may be approved to speak for up to **three minutes if five or more** participants cede their time to them. This allows a group to designate spokespeople to provide comment on a specified MPA petition agenda item. Participants ceding their time:

- Must be present (in person or on Zoom) when the agenda item is called; and
- forego their own opportunity to speak on that agenda item.

If you plan to cede time:

- **In-person:** the five participants ceding their time must complete speaker cards and approach the staff table with the spokesperson before the agenda item begins so staff can confirm the presence of those ceding time.
- **Remote (via Zoom or phone):** participants who wish to cede their time must notify the Commission at fgc@fgc.ca.gov by the Supplemental Comment Deadline and include the name of the individual to whom they are ceding time. All individuals ceding time must also be present on Zoom or phone during the agenda item.

Considerations for Giving Effective Public Comment

When addressing the Commission, please give your name and the name of any organization you represent. To facilitate a positive meeting experience for all, please remember to:

- Respect the meeting environment, other speakers, staff, and commissioners, as outlined above.

- Treat all participants with courtesy and recognize diverse experiences.
- Listen respectfully; one person speaks at a time.
- Avoid personal accusations, stereotyping, or deliberate misinformation.
- Come prepared and keep comments centered on the topic.
- Focus on clear, concise contributions that support productive dialogue.
- If there are several speakers with the same concerns, you are encouraged to appoint a spokesperson and avoid repetitive comments.
- Treat disagreements as shared problems to solve.
- When offering critique, propose alternative ideas when appropriate.
- To help first-time participants organize comments, it may be helpful to focus on:
    - Do you support or oppose the petition and why?
    - Why is it important to you, your community, or your work?
    - What action(s) would you like the Commission to consider?

May 5, 2026; 8:00 AM

Call to Order and Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

1. Consider Approving Agenda and Order of Items

Discussion and Action Items: Marine Protected Areas

Marine Protected Area (MPA) Petitions *(San Luis Obispo County through mainland Santa Barbara County)*

For each MPA petition, receive presentations from the petitioner(s), followed by public comment and discussion. The Commission may develop recommendations for consideration at a future meeting. *No formal action will be taken today.*
(Pursuant to Section 662, Title 14, California Code of Regulations)

Viewing petitions and public comments:

- *MPA petitions and compiled public comments to date are available to view through the Commission's website at California Marine Protected Areas - Initial Webpage or Status of MPA Petitions for Reg Change.*

Viewing petition evaluations:

- *Department petition evaluations with recommendations are available to view through the Department's Bin 2 MPA Petition Evaluations StoryMap.*
- *A recording of the Department's presentation of MPA petition evaluations and recommendations, given during the April 15-16, 2026 Commission meeting, can be viewed by visiting the CAL-SPAN Network for April 15.*
- *California Ocean Protection Council petition policy letter (see Latest News dated March 20, 2026) and evaluations (date TBD) are available to view through OPC's website at California Ocean Protection Council.*

2. ***Petition 2023-28MPA (Tribally co-led):*** Request to designate a new MPA at Point Sal State Marine Reserve (SMR)

3. ***Petition 2023-29 MPA (Tribally co-led):*** Request to designate a new MPA at Mishopshno State Marine Conservation Area (SMCA)

4. ***Petition 2023-19MPA (Tribally led):*** Request to designate a new MPA at Chitqawi SMCA

5. ***Petition 2023-20MPA (Tribally led):*** Request to expand a boundary, change the SMCA name, establish co-management, and add take and tribal exemptions in Point Buchon SMCA

6. ***Petition 2023-34MPA*****:** Request to change the classification of Point Buchon SMCA

7. ***Petition 2023-33MPA*****:** Request to expand a boundary at Point Conception SMR

8. ***Petition 2023-18MPA*****:** Request to change the classification of a portion of Vandenberg SMR (nearshore ribbon only), to allow shore fishing; make non-regulatory changes at Point Conception SMR and Campus Point no-take SMCA; and change take regulations at Kashtayit SMCA

Recess

May 6, 2026; 8:00 AM

Call to Order and Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

Discussion and Action Items – Sport Fishing

9. **Central Valley Sport Fishing**
   Consider adopting proposed amendments to Central Valley sport fishing regulations and taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Amend subsections 7.40(b)(4), (43), (66) and (80), Title 14, California Code of Regulations)

10. **Klamath River Basin Sport Fishing**
    Consider adopting proposed amendments to Klamath River Basin sport fishing regulations and taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act. (Amend subsection 7.40(b)(50), Title 14, California Code of Regulations)

Discussion and Action Items - MPAs

MPA Petitions (northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Island)
For each MPA petition, receive presentations from the petitioner(s), followed by public comment and discussion. The Commission may develop recommendations for consideration at a future meeting. *No formal action will be taken today*.
(Pursuant to Section 662, Title 14, California Code of Regulations)

Viewing petitions and public comments:

- *MPA petitions and compiled public comments to date are available to view through the Commission's website at California Marine Protected Areas - Initial Webpage or Status of MPA Petitions for Reg Change.*

Viewing petition evaluations:

- *Department petition evaluations with recommendations are available to view through the Department's Bin 2 MPA Petition Evaluations StoryMap.*
- *A recording of the Department's presentation of MPA petition evaluations and recommendations, given during the April 15-16, 2026 Commission meeting, can be viewed by visiting the CAL-SPAN Network for April 15.*
- *California Ocean Protection Council petition policy letter (see Latest News dated March 20, 2026) and evaluations (date TBD) are available to view through OPC's website at California Ocean Protection Council.*

11. ***Petition 2023-18MPA*:** Request to remove or change boundaries in San Miguel Island Special Closure and Anacapa Island Special Closure

12. ***Petition 2023-27MPA*:** Request a take allowance change in Anacapa Island SMCA

13. ***Petition 2023-14MPA*:** Request take allowance changes in Naples SMCA and Anacapa Island SMCA

14. ***Petition 2023-15MPA*:** Request classification take allowance changes in Footprint SMR, Santa Barbara Island SMR, and Gull Island SMR

15. ***Petition 2023-33MPA***: Request to expand boundaries in Gull Island SMR and South Point SMR

16. **Future Meetings and New Business**
Review logistics and agenda items for the next Commission meeting (May 19). Consider any changes to previously approved meeting dates or locations and introduce any new business for inclusion on a future meeting agenda.

General Public Comment

17. **General Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**
Receive public comment regarding topics within the Commission's authority that are not included on the agenda.
Note: The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this item, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (sections 11125 and 11125.7(a), Government Code).

Adjourn

California Fish and Game Commission
Meeting Schedule

Note: As meeting dates and locations can change, please visit www.fgc.ca.gov for the most current list of meeting dates and locations. All Commission meetings will include a webinar/teleconference option for attendance, and every effort will be made to ensure that committee meetings include the same.

Meeting Date	Commission Meeting	Committee Meeting
May 14, 2026		**Wildlife Resources** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
May 19, 2026	**Marine Protected Area Petitions** (Los Angeles through San Diego counties, including Santa Catalina Island) Holiday Inn Express 35 Via Pico Plaza San Clemente, CA	
June 17-18, 2026	Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	
July16, 2026		**Marine Resources** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
August 11, 2026		**Tribal** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
August 12-13, 2026	Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	
September 10, 2026		**Wildlife Resources** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
October 14-15, 2026	Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	

Meeting Date	Commission Meeting	Committee Meeting
November 12, 2026		**Marine Resources** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
December 15, 2026		**Tribal** Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
December 16-17, 2026	Natural Resources Headquarters Building 715 P Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	

Other Meetings of Interest

Meetings listed here are organizations for which the Commission: (1) is a member, or (2) takes action based upon regulations developed by that organization.

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

- September 13-16, 2026 – Lancaster, PA

Pacific Fishery Management Council

- June 11-16, 2026 – Spokane, WA
- September 17-22, 2026 – Vancouver, WA
- November 13-18, 2026 – Garden Grove, CA
- December 31, 2026 – Location TBD

Pacific Flyway Council

- August or September 2026 – Date and location TBD

Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

- June 1-5, 2026 – Boise, ID

Wildlife Conservation Board

- May 28, 2026 – Sacramento, CA
- August 27, 2026 – Sacramento, CA
- November 19, 2026 – Sacramento, CA

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); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Notice of Location of May 6, 2026 Hearing
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 9:18:50 AM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a notice of location for the May 6, 2026, Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: California Fish and Game Commission <fgc@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2026 8:58 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of Location of May 6, 2026 Hearing

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

View as a webpage / share

Image of California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Location of May Hearing

Greetings,

The notices of intent to amend regulations regarding Central Valley sport fishing and Klamath River Basin sport fishing were provided when the location of the May 6, 2026 Commission meeting had not yet been determined.

The location has been determined and the hearing for the above rulemakings will be held from the following location:

Hilton Garden Inn
6878 Hollister Avenue
Goleta, CA 93117

For more information, please see the Notice of Location of Hearing.

Sincerely,

David Haug
Regulatory Analyst
California Fish and Game Commission

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

Item 8

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	15 Marina Boulevard - 23 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:36:53 PM
Attachments:	PC 1 - 15 Marina Blvd - 23 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 23 Letters from members of the public, regarding the proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Bridget Maley
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Saturday, April 18, 2026 5:09:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email	bridget.maley@gmail.com
From your constituent	Bridget Maley
Subject	Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.

2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Bridget Maley

From: corinna seibt
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 11:33:22 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email corinna.corinna@live.com

From your constituent corinna seibt

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.

2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

corinna seibt

From: jeffrey p ricker
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 11:31:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email the.dreadnought@yahoo.com

From your constituent jeffrey p ricker

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.

2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

jeffrey p ricker

From: corinna seibt
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 11:30:36 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email corinna.corinna@live.com

From your constituent corinna seibt

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.

2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

corinna seibt

From: Qi Wolf
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 7:11:23 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email cutelynx@yahoo.com

From your constituent Qi Wolf

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.

2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Qi Wolf

From: Carolyn M Conwell
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 9:11:49 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email	cmconwell@gmail.com
From your constituent	Carolyn M Conwell
Subject	Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission: I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents. The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal: 1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan. 2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Carolyn M Conwell

From: Alexander Davis
To: So, Lydia (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Campbell, Amy (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Mcgarry, Sean (CPC); Williams, Gilbert A (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject: Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 4:18:23 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email	alecd69@gmail.com
From your constituent	Alexander Davis
Subject	Oppose the 25-Story Proposal
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.

2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board’s recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Alexander Davis

From: Bautista
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:58:16 AM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Victoria
Last Name	Bautista
Email Address	jvabautista599@gmail.com
Street Address	3940 Cabrillo St
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Kaufman
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:04:45 AM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Jeanne
Last Name	Kaufman
Email Address	gigikaufman@sbcglobal.net
Street Address	2472 Francisco St
Email Subject	gigikaufman@sbcglobal.net
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Correa Sepulveda
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:36:34 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	ilia
Last Name	Correa Sepulveda
Email Address	iliacorrea23@gmail.com
Street Address	1273a South Van Ness Avenue
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Faldt
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 5:54:28 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Mallory
Last Name	Faldt
Email Address	malloryfaldt@gmail.com
Street Address	3240 Gough St.
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: bonnifay
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 1:43:42 PM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	victoire
Last Name	bonnifay
Email Address	victoirebb@aol.com
Street Address	1245 Montgomery Street
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Sachs
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 12:03:41 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Susan
Last Name	Sachs
Email Address	ss@susansachs.com
Street Address	1777 Vallejo St
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Kopecna
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 7:26:51 PM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Jana
Last Name	Kopecna
Email Address	jkopecna@gmail.com
Street Address	2435 Francisco st
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Hu
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 3:55:38 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Jan
Last Name	Hu
Email Address	jan.cj.hu@gmail.com
Street Address	719 Fillmore St
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Yarkin
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 1:13:37 PM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Ray Ellen
Last Name	Yarkin
Email Address	ryarkin@gmail.com
Street Address	2190 Broadway
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Novozhilova
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 12:22:21 PM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Anastasia
Last Name	Novozhilova
Email Address	anastasianovozh@gmail.com
Street Address	1938 Jefferson
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Miller
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 4:23:34 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Linda S.
Last Name	Miller
Email Address	linda.miller@gmail.com
Street Address	1442 Jefferson St.
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Hansen
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 3:45:31 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Lejf
Last Name	Hansen
Email Address	lejfrhansen@gmail.com
Street Address	2424 Francisco st
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Sternos
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 11:56:25 AM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	John
Last Name	Sternos
Email Address	widiber20202929920202@gmail.com
Street Address	2340 Francisco St
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Loy
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 8:13:43 AM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Vanessa
Last Name	Loy
Email Address	vanessa.loy@gmail.com
Street Address	1650 North Point Street
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Butler
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 7:53:42 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Janice
Last Name	Butler
Email Address	jncbtlr@yahoo.com
Street Address	2100 Vallejo st
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Broadbeck
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); investor-relations@albertsons.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; media@albertsons.com; PIC, PLN (CPC); ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:58:22 PM

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

YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Kim
Last Name	Broadbeck
Email Address	kbsf2009@gmail.com
Street Address	572 Moultrie Street SF
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project
Email Message Body	Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors, This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment. I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site. While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo). Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve. Sincerely,

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260361 - Outdoor Smoking Patios - 2 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:40:26 PM
Attachments:	PC 2 - 260361 Smoking - 2 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 Letters from members of the public, regarding:

> **File No. 260361:** Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; and eliminating exceptions allowing indoor smoking in bars with no employees, bars with historically compliant semi-enclosed smoking rooms, and hotel rooms, to conform to provisions of California law.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Paul Mogannam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposing the the ban
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 7:42:28 AM

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

As a local businessman I'm opposing the ban on cigarettes smoking on patios, and Parklet.

Thanks for the consideration.

Paul Mogannam
Sent from my iPhone

From:	Tim Omi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	MelgarStaff (BOS); WongStaff (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); ChenStaff; ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject:	Opposition - Closing the Loophole for Out Door Smoking
Date:	Friday, April 17, 2026 10:10:58 AM
Attachments:	Oppistion - Closing Loophole Smoking Outdoors Bars .pdf

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

Dear Supervisors,
Please find our formal opposition to the proposed legislation to close the loophole on bars that allow outdoor smoking.

Timothy Omi
tim@sfcdma.org
1-415-590-0930
President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
President, Fillmore Merchant Association

Item 10

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Balboa Skate Park - 2 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:43:45 PM
Attachments:	PC 3 - Balboa Skatepark - 2 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 Letters from members of the public, regarding Balboa Skatepark.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Dillon Krull
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 3:24:38 PM

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

SF Boardof Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Dillon Krull
krulldillon@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: Basil Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 7:21:43 PM

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

SF Boardof Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Basil Hall
basil.london.hall@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

Item 11

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Julien DeFrance - 5 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:46:03 PM
Attachments:	PC 4 - Julien DeFrance - 5 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 5 Letters from Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (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)
Subject:	Fwd: MUNI BUDGET - Balance It Without Double-Taxing Riders Who Already Pay!
Date:	Friday, April 17, 2026 5:03:43 PM

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

Begin forwarded message:

Subject: MUNI BUDGET - Balance It Without Double-Taxing Riders Who Already Pay!

Dear Mayor and SFMTA Board Members,

Riders are fed up. And the numbers back them up.

Muni is running a structural deficit while fare evasion goes largely unchallenged. Law-abiding, fare-paying San Franciscans are already enduring overcrowded vehicles, safety concerns, and sanitary conditions that no transit agency should tolerate. Now you want to ask those same riders — and every homeowner in the city — to bail you out through a new parcel tax? That is not a solution. That is an insult.

Let me tell you. Here is what riders and taxpayers expect from this board:

FARE ENFORCEMENT — FRONT DOOR BOARDING, NO EXCEPTIONS

Do not solely rely on fare inspectors to get people to respect the rules.

Enforce front-door boarding on every vehicle, every route, every time. Operators must be empowered — and required — to deny entry to anyone who does not pay before boarding. No fare, no ride. Full stop. This is not punitive. It is how every functional transit system in the world operates. San Francisco should be no different.

CUT FRIVOLOUS SPENDING

Before asking the public for more money, audit every grant, every program, and every administrative expense that does not directly move riders from point A to point B safely and on time. Muni's core mission is transit. Fund that. Cut the rest.

BALANCE THE BUDGET WITHOUT CUTTING SERVICE

Riders depend on Muni. Cutting routes or frequency is not acceptable. Neither is raising taxes on people who are already paying their fare and then some. The answer is internal discipline — reduce overhead, eliminate low-ridership vanity programs, and run a leaner operation that delivers on its actual mandate.

Fare-paying riders are not your piggy bank. They are your customers. Start treating them like it.

Best regards,

JD.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); blueprint@sfblueprint.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (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)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Logan, Samantha (BOS); Cooper, Raynell (BOS); Macfie, William (BOS); Matter, Cassandra (BOS); Lee, Amy (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS); Bell, Tita (BOS); Nagano, Tomio (BOS); Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS); Herrera, Ana (BOS); Gaona, Sasha (BOS); Fieber, Jennifer (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Farrah, Michael (BOS); Hare, Emma (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Yu, Angelina (BOS); Burke, Robyn (BOS); Yan, Calvin (BOS)
Subject:	Prop D Supporters? STOP Misleading San Franciscans, RECONSIDER NOW! VOTE NO ON PROP D!
Date:	Thursday, April 16, 2026 6:21:17 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 urge some of you to reconsider their clueless and/or misguided support for Proposition D, the so-called “Overpaid CEO Tax.”

With respect, this measure is being sold to voters under a deeply misleading premise, and elected officials who know better have a responsibility to say so.

Let’s be clear: Prop D is not a tax on CEOs. It is a gross receipts tax — a tax on business revenue — that companies will inevitably pass on to consumers in the form of higher prices. San Franciscans are already stretched thin. This will make everything more expensive, for everyone.

Worse, the measure would represent the largest business tax hike in San Francisco history — in some cases an increase exceeding 800% — at the exact moment our city’s economic recovery remains fragile. Incentivizing large employers to leave is not a budget strategy. It is economic self-sabotage.

Here are two more inconvenient truths your constituents deserve to hear:

1. This tax punishes the wrong companies. Due to how pay ratios are calculated, tech giants like Google, Meta, and Amazon are largely exempt — their highly paid workforces keep their ratios low. The businesses actually hit are grocery stores, pharmacies, and retailers with hourly workers. These are the neighborhood businesses San Franciscans depend on daily, and many are already closing their doors.

2. Prop D breaks a deal voters already ratified. Just two years ago, in 2024, labor, business, and city leaders negotiated Proposition M — a broadly supported business tax overhaul that voters passed. Prop D tears up that compromise before the ink is even dry. Stability and predictability matter to businesses deciding whether to stay in San Francisco. Constantly relitigating settled policy sends exactly the wrong signal.

San Francisco cannot afford political theater disguised as tax policy.

I urge you to show your constituents the honesty and leadership they deserve — and VOTE NO ON PROP D.

Respectfully,

JD.

From: Julien DeFrance
To: Mayor, MYR (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); MTABoard; constituentrqst@sfmta.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (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); SFPD, Chief (POL)
Subject: Re: URGENT / IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED - REOPEN MARKET ST TO ALL CAR TRAFFIC NOW!
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 3:33:02 PM

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

The recent decision to allow Ubers, Waymos, and taxis on Market Street is acknowledged — but let's be clear: it is a bandaid, not a solution.

San Franciscans deserve full, unrestricted access to this street, not a policy that privileges ride-share and autonomous vehicles while ordinary drivers remain excluded.

Half-measures do not revive a neighborhood or restore a local economy.

REOPEN MARKET ST TO ALL CAR TRAFFIC NOW!

On Mon, Apr 20, 2026 at 3:21 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,
>
> **I am writing to demand the immediate and unconditional reopening of Market Street to all car traffic, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.**
>
> **Cars, bikes, and public transit coexisted on Market Street for decades.**
>
> The car-free policy has been a failure by every measurable standard. Foot traffic has collapsed. Dozens of businesses have closed. **The street is a dead zone.** While COVID dealt a serious blow to small businesses, the Market Street closure compounded the damage at the worst possible time — and that damage is ongoing.
>
> Making matters worse, SFPD is severely understaffed. Assigning officers to cite drivers who intentionally or inadvertently drive or turn onto Market Street is an inexcusable misuse of limited police resources. Those officers should be focused on drug dealing, shoplifting, and vehicle and package theft — crimes that are actively harming residents and businesses every single day.
>
> **The solution is straightforward: reopen Market Street to all vehicles immediately, without conditions or further delay. Our businesses and our neighborhoods cannot afford more inaction.**
>
> I urge you to act now.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> JD.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Chris Schulman; info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); DPW, (DPW); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	URGENT - EYE SORES / Graffitis / Illegal Postings at 190-198 Fern St, Van Ness/Bush, 1460 Bush St, 1339 Polk St, Van Ness/Pacific. Etc…
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 11:16:35 AM

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

Good morning,


Despite regular and countless reports to 311, Solve SF, and emails, etc… there locations appear to never be remediated.

As this has now been the case for many months if not more than a year, could you please ensure the proper clean up and repainting of the following locations?

190-198 Fern St
Van Ness/Bush
1460 Bush St
1339 Polk St
Van Ness/Pacific.
Etc…

Best regards,

JD.








THIS PULL HAS BITE
FLEX YOUR FLAVOR
CHILI CRISP HOT HONEY
ONLINE AND IN STORES NOW




1339

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Mayor, MYR (MYR); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); MTABoard; constituentrqst@sfmta.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (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); SFPD, Chief (POL)
Subject:	URGENT / IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED - REOPEN MARKET ST TO ALL CAR TRAFFIC NOW!
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 3:21:56 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to demand the immediate and unconditional reopening of Market Street to all car traffic, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Cars, bikes, and public transit coexisted on Market Street for decades.

The car-free policy has been a failure by every measurable standard. Foot traffic has collapsed. Dozens of businesses have closed. **The street is a dead zone.** While COVID dealt a serious blow to small businesses, the Market Street closure compounded the damage at the worst possible time — and that damage is ongoing.

Making matters worse, SFPD is severely understaffed. Assigning officers to cite drivers who intentionally or inadvertently drive or turn onto Market Street is an inexcusable misuse of limited police resources. Those officers should be focused on drug dealing, shoplifting, and vehicle and package theft — crimes that are actively harming residents and businesses every single day.

The solution is straightforward: reopen Market Street to all vehicles immediately, without conditions or further delay. Our businesses and our neighborhoods cannot afford more inaction.

I urge you to act now.

Sincerely,

JD.

Item 12

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	San Franisco Budget - 3 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:48:37 PM
Attachments:	PC 5 - San Francisco Budget - 3 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 Letters from members of the public regarding the San Francisco Budget.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Kittler, Sophia (MYR); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 6:38:45 AM

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

Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over $1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

• Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.

• Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.

• Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly $1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

David Katz

From: Julien DeFrance
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Budget, MYR (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChenStaff; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); WongStaff (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); blueprint@sfblueprint.org
Subject: SAN FRANCISCO BUDGET: A Billion-Dollar Deficit Demands REAL CUTS - Not New Taxes!
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 3:54:29 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

After a short analysis of the San Francisco budget, I am realizing that it is trending up. Once again, despite all of the good resolutions, and all of the campaign promises, the city is unable to keep on spending less and be as nimble as it should.

San Francisco is facing a projected $1 billion deficit. The city's response so far — incremental layoffs, slow-walked commission reviews, and new revenue schemes like the parcel tax and the "Overpaid Executive" CEO tax (which you do not support) — does not reflect the urgency this moment demands. These are not solutions. They are delays. Band-aids at most.

Here is what fiscally responsible residents expect:

COMMISSIONS

San Francisco operates nearly 150 commissions. The Commission Streamlining Task Force has done its work. Stop letting special interests and labor groups stall implementation.

A city this size needs 15 to 20 functional commissions — not 70, not 130. Eliminate the rest. Do it now, not after another ballot measure cycle.

NONPROFIT CONTRACTS & NONPROFIT GRANTS

The city should not be funding nonprofits whose executives or board members draw six-figure salaries from public dollars. If an organization raises its own money and operates independently, that is their right.

The moment they seek city funding, compensation must reflect that public trust. This is a straightforward condition — enforce it. Why can't they just earn the minimum wage?

MUNI

Fare evasion is an open secret with real fiscal consequences. Operators should be empowered to ensure every boarding passenger pays or exits. Basic fare enforcement is not a radical idea — it is table stakes for any transit system that wants to be taken seriously. Law-abiding taxpayers shouldn't have to pay for Muni twice.

TAXES

The SF Mandate surcharge has made dining out a luxury many residents have stopped indulging.

New taxes on parcels and executive pay do not fix a spending problem — they paper over it.

IN SHORT - San Francisco does not have a revenue problem. It has a discipline problem.

The path forward is straightforward: focus on core government functions, eliminate redundant bureaucracy, enforce existing rules, and stop funding organizations that have lost sight of the public interest. A billion-dollar deficit is not closed with new taxes. It is closed by spending less.

San Francisco residents are watching — and many of us are now running out of patience.

Respectfully,

JD.

From: Andy C Chow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject: Stricter building inspections to increase City"s revenues
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 12:24:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have an effective suggestion to increase revenues of the City and County of San Francisco. There have actually been a tremendous number of residential homes in San Francisco that have structural changes, electrical, plumbing, and major renovations **without** applying for permits - particularly in Sunset and Silver Terrace Districts. By implementing stricter building inspections like in City of Daly City, City and County of San Francisco can issue violation tickets to these illegal home alterations in order to significantly increase City's revenues.

Thank you!

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: McLaren Park model for the Great Highway.
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 9:34:13 AM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Adriane Khan, regarding the Great Highway/Sunset Dunes.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Adriane Khan <upstairskitty@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2026 5:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: McLaren Park model for the Great Highway.

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

Hello Supervisors,

San Francisco is divided over the use of the Great Highway. I'm offering a practical compromise that may help bridge both perspectives. We don't have to choose between cars and people—we've already shown we can support both.

In 2017, San Franciscans reached a workable balance at McLaren Park, preserving recreation space while maintaining a traffic corridor. A similar approach could be considered for the Great Highway.

At Mansell Street, a four-lane roadway was reconfigured into two lanes for vehicles and two lanes for walking and biking.

This model could serve as a fair compromise for residents on both sides of the Great Highway

debate.

I encourage you to visit McLaren Park and see this project in person at Mansell Street and John Shelley Drive.

Thank you for your consideration,

Adriane Khan
SF resident

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	PG&E Rate Increase Request Application
Date:	Friday, April 17, 2026 4:36:42 PM
Attachments:	PGE Notice of Application.pdf

Good afternoon Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), submitting a notice of Pacific Gas and Electric Company rate increase request for its Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) 2027 cost recovery application to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) A.26-03-031.

Sincerely,

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

DATE: April 13, 2026
TO: STATE, CITY AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RATE INCREASE REQUEST FOR ITS DIABLO CANYON POWER PLANT (DCPP) 2027 COST RECOVERY APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC) A.26-03-031

What is being requested?
PG&E is requesting $595 million in revenue for 2027 to recover forecasted costs associated with the continued operation of DCPP. As the owner of DCPP, PG&E is allowed to collect operating costs from customers of the large electric utilities in California with no additional markup. Based on a predetermined share of each utility's allocation of statewide DCPP costs, PG&E would recover $340 million, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) would recover $208 million and San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) would recover $47 million. The requested revenue reflects forecasted costs necessary to support statewide electric grid reliability and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while DCPP continues operating.

How would this impact the typical residential customer?
The bill for a typical non-CARE bundled residential customer using 500 kWh per month would increase from $197.51 to $198.59 or 0.5%, compared to current bills. Actual impacts will vary depending on usage and the applicable Base Service Charge, if eligible.

Additional information
You can read more about PG&E's request and make public comment by visiting **apps.cpuc.ca.gov/c/A2603031.** For questions about participating in CPUC matters, you can contact the Public Advisor's Office at **Public.Advisor@cpuc.ca.gov**, **1-866-849-8390**, or 505 Van Ness Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102. Please reference A.26-03-031 in any communication with the CPUC.

Questions about the request
Detailed rate information will be sent directly to customers in a bill insert in April 2026.

If you have questions about PG&E's request, please contact PG&E at **1-800-743-5000**. For TTY, call **711**. Para obtener más información sobre cómo este cambio podría afectar su pago mensual, llame al **1-800-660-6789** • 詳情請致電 **1-800-893-9555.**

If you would like an electronic copy of the filing and exhibits, please write to the address below:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Diablo Canyon Power Plant 2027 Cost Recovery Application (**A.26-03-031**)
P.O. Box 1018
Oakland, CA 94604-1018

Message paid for by customers.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 APR 17 PM04:14
JKA

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260216 - Fire Sprinklers - 6 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:51:06 PM
Attachments:	PC 8 - 260216 Fire Sprinklers - 6 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 6 Letters from members of the public, regarding:

> **File No. 260216:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council to evaluate and advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Fire Department, on the criteria and types of evidence the Fire Marshal should consider in determining whether to waive, modify, or delay certain compliance requirements under the Fire Code that certain existing high-rise residential buildings have sprinkler systems; and to set forth the membership and duties of the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Jill Faber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: jilllfab@aol.com
Subject: Public Comment on SF Fire Sprinkler Mandale
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 4:01:12 PM

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

To: Board of Supervisors
Re: File No.260216
From: Jill Faber, resident at 2190 Washington St., Apt 801, San Francisco CA 94109

As a renter at 2190 Washington Street, the fire sprinkler mandate would be a hardship because I am (in 2 months) 79 years old and moving out while such a big infrastructure project took place would be difficult. I moved in to this building 2 and a half years ago because it appeared safe: concrete walls, 3 fire escapes, building manager on site, doorman and garage. Now I learn that you believe I am not safe. I look forward to reading your Technical Advisory Committee's recommendations for an exemption for my building because I believe we could qualify or that there must be less expensive ways to improve fire safely than the huge amounts discussed as a legal pass through for this type of sprinkler system in a rental building.

Jill Faber

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the vital sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."
President Dwight D. Eisenhower

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 6:43:20 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Kathryn Mabron

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	260216 Fire Sprinklers - 2 Letters
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:12:41 AM
Attachments:	260216 Fire Sprinklers - 2 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 Letters from members of the public regarding:

> **File No. 260216:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council to evaluate and advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Fire Department, on the criteria and types of evidence the Fire Marshal should consider in determining whether to waive, modify, or delay certain compliance requirements under the Fire Code that certain existing high-rise residential buildings have sprinkler systems; and to set forth the membership and duties of the Fire Code Technical Advisory Council.

Sincerely,

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

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:39:48 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Joie Ryan

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 2:49:44 PM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Kathryn Mabron

From: Blueprint SF
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 1:15:27 AM

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as $300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

• Pass the Technical Advisory Committee ordinance.

• Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Elizabeth Guillen

From: Michela Garber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:23:56 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Michela Garber
garber.michela@gmail.com
1246A 9th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 251003 - Permanent Supportive Housing - 190 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 2:39:42 PM
Attachments:	PC 9 - 251003 PSH - 190 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 190 Letters from members of the public, regarding:

> **File No. 251003:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing ("PSH") that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents ("Drug-Free PSH") to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone ("Drug-Tolerant PSH"), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH's strategies to meet PSH residents' demands

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Laurence Wiener
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Crayton, Monique (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS)
Subject: Drug Free Supportive Housing Support Letter - File #251003 - Position: Support
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 8:42:54 AM
Attachments: PSH Support Letter Dorsey.v2.pdf

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

DOCTORS AGAINST OVERDOSES
SAN FRANCISCO

April 21, 2026

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

Re: *File #251003 - Position: Support* - Strong Support for Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing Legislation

Dear Members of the Board,

On behalf of Doctors Against Overdoses, I write to express our strong and unequivocal support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

This legislation addresses a fundamental gap in our current system—one that has real and measurable consequences. San Francisco's supportive housing model, while well-intentioned, has evolved into a system that offers too few viable options for individuals who are seeking recovery or who cannot stabilize in environments where ongoing illicit drug use is prevalent.

As a physician engaged in overdose prevention, I understand how profoundly environment influences outcomes. For many individuals, placement into settings where drug use is normalized is not simply suboptimal—it can actively undermine recovery, destabilize health, and increase the risk of overdose.

The absence of recovery-oriented housing options is not a neutral policy choice. It is a driver of continued instability and preventable harm.

Importantly, this legislation reflects a thoughtful and clinically grounded approach. It is not punitive. It explicitly recognizes that substance use disorder is a chronic, relapsing condition, and includes safeguards such as support for relapse, the absence of automatic eviction for a single episode of use, and efforts to provide alternative housing when needed. It also requires the City to measure and respond to resident demand—an essential step in aligning policy with the needs of those it is intended to serve.

At the same time, available data underscores the urgency of expanding options. A substantial proportion of overdose deaths in San Francisco occur within Permanent Supportive Housing settings, highlighting that the current system is not adequately supporting all residents in achieving stability.

This legislation takes an important step toward correcting that imbalance by creating a voluntary, drug-free supportive housing option. It restores a basic principle that exists throughout the broader housing system: that individuals should be able

to choose a residential environment that supports their safety, health, and personal goals.

We recognize and support the thoughtful concerns raised by the San Francisco Marin Medical Society (SFMMS). These concerns are not in opposition to this legislation—they are essential to its success. Implementation must ensure continuity of care, protection of medication-assisted treatment, and safe, structured transitions between housing settings.

From an overdose prevention perspective, expanding recovery-oriented housing options is not optional—it is necessary. Drug-free PSH should exist as part of a coordinated continuum of care that includes harm reduction, medical treatment, and other housing models. A single-model system cannot meet the complexity of substance use disorder.

San Francisco is confronting a public health crisis defined by overdose, instability, and fragmentation of care. Continuing to rely on a one-size-fits-all approach will not produce different results.

This legislation introduces needed balance, restores meaningful choice, and aligns housing policy more closely with clinical reality.

For these reasons, Doctors Against Overdoses strongly supports its passage.

Respectfully,

Laurence Wiener, MD
Founder, Doctors Against Overdoses
San Francisco

From:	Cody Keene
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Lauren Hall; Wong, Alan (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS)
Subject:	Expanding Drug-Free Housing Ordinance – Request for Amendments
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 9:38:33 AM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png DISH SF - Expanding Drug-Free Housing Ordinance Response_final.pdf

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of DISH SF to share the attached letter regarding the proposed Expanding Drug-Free Housing Ordinance.

As an organization providing supportive housing to hundreds of extremely low-income San Franciscans with complex health needs, we share the City's commitment to expanding housing options that promote recovery, stability, and long-term well-being. We strongly support a full continuum of care, including recovery-oriented housing. However, we have concerns about the current legislative approach and its potential impact on our ability to effectively serve those most in need.

Our experience and recent tenant survey data suggest that while there is interest in recovery-oriented environments, policies that rely on eviction as a response to relapse may ultimately limit access to housing and undermine recovery outcomes. We believe it is critical that housing policies remain flexible, data-informed, and centered on the lived experiences of those directly impacted.

In the attached letter, we outline specific amendments that would allow San Francisco to expand recovery housing while preserving the effectiveness of housing-first supportive housing models.

We appreciate your leadership on this issue and welcome the opportunity to continue this conversation.

Sincerely,

Cody Keene

Public Policy Manager
(He/Him/His)
Delivering Innovation in Supportive Housing (DISH)
T: 415.535.4664
codykeene@dishsf.org

DELIVERING INNOVATION IN SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

DISH CENTRAL OFFICE
1119 Market Street
2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

DISH PO BOX
PO Box 427129
San Francisco, CA 94142

PH: 415.776.3474
info@dishsf.org

April 23rd, 2026

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

RE Drug Free Housing Ordinance

Dear Supervisors,

We provide supportive housing to hundreds of extremely low-income San Franciscans that have experienced chronic homelessness and have complex health needs. We have a 20-year track record of reducing barriers to housing and innovating our approach to meet the needs of the community we serve. We believe that the foundation for stability and recovery is housing—and have an opportunity and responsibility to ensure that housing meets the needs of those that need it the most.

We share the goal of ensuring people have access to housing models that support recovery, stability, and long-term well-being. We support the expansion of recovery housing and agree that a continuum of housing options, including recovery-oriented environments, are essential. **San Francisco can expand recovery-oriented housing without prohibiting the expansion of non-recovery focused PSH which is already under threat from federal policy proposals. This is not an either/or decision.**

A full continuum of care is essential to address homelessness effectively. Based on our experience, we **do not support** the proposed approach outlined in the Expanding Drug-Free Housing legislation and particularly its prohibition of local funds for much needed flexibility to implement housing first supportive housing and allowance of eviction as a tool to address symptoms of substance use disorder.

Based on our discussions with the Mayor's office and Supervisor Dorsey, we incorporated questions regarding abstinence-based housing in our recently completed annual tenant survey as we firmly believe policy should be driven by those most impacted by it. **The proposed surveying of tenants noted in the legislation should happen prior to the adoption of this legislation vs. after the fact.**

In an effort to inform our work in PSH, we queried our tenants with the various housing options, and found that while there was notable interest in a community

where residents opted in drug/alcohol free environment, **only 10% (53 out of 504 residents) were interested when the proposed model was not just recovery focused, but included eviction as a potential consequence of relapse**. Of that group of 53, **the majority (38) indicated that they would be interested in moving to independent living if that option (affordable housing without services) were available** pointing to an unmet need for residents in PSH to have the opportunity to move on to long term affordable housing.

Many of the residents in recovery in our housing programs have clearly stated that without the ability to enter housing while still actively using drugs or alcohol that sobriety would have not been achievable. Housing first is the first step, not the last.

San Francisco can use its resources effectively while moving recovery-oriented housing without this current legislation which hamstrings our ability to be nimble and responsive to the needs of those currently unhoused in San Francisco. We have new leadership coming at HSH and they will need flexibility to improve our systems and the support of the Board to address this ongoing crisis.

We request these changes as amendments, which are described below.

1. **Remove the total funding ban of low-barrier housing to allow local funding**
2. **Expand recovery-oriented housing by implementing two pilots for recovery-focused supportive housing and recovery-focused transitional housing and incorporate learnings from those programs and the proposed survey into City policy**
3. **Ensure that evictions are strictly for behavioral violations of the lease versus relapse of substance use**

We sincerely appreciate your consideration of these requests for the Expanding Drug-Free Housing ordinance. Together, we can continue increasing and improving our housing system where recovery-housing is expanded in San Francisco.

Respectfully,



Lauren Hall, Co-Founder and Co-CEO
laurenhall@dishsf.org

From:	Keith Humphreys
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Crayton, Monique (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS)
Subject:	File #251003 -- Position: Support
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:30:41 AM
Attachments:	image.png Letter in Support of Drug-Free Housing in San Francisco.doc

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

Dear Board of Supervisors

Please find attached a letter explaining my support for this measure.

Thank you
Keith Humphreys



From: TAC
To: tac_s_f@yahoo.com
Cc: Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Subject: File 251003 – Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing – Oppose as Currently Written
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:24:03 AM

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

Supervisor Matt Dorsey
Chair, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: File 251003 – Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing – Oppose as Currently Written

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

The Tenant Associations Coalition of San Francisco (TAC) and its affiliated tenant associations write regarding your legislation, File 251003 – Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing.

TAC is a grassroots coalition dedicated to protecting and expanding the rights of tenants across San Francisco, with a particular focus on vulnerable residents in supportive housing, SROs, and affordable housing programs. We strongly support efforts to diversify the city's housing and service system so it can better meet the varied and complex needs of people experiencing homelessness and those living in permanent supportive housing.

The goal of expanding recovery-oriented and sober housing options is laudable. Recovery from substance use disorder is a deeply personal and often nonlinear journey, with many starts and stops. Many current supportive housing residents would benefit from enhanced recovery supports, and many others actively seek intentional, recovery-friendly environments—whether through sober living, scattered-site housing, or site-based supportive housing with strengthened services such as trauma-informed therapy, peer support, and relapse-prevention resources.

Unfortunately, as currently written, this legislation misses the mark. Rather than expanding genuine choice and capacity, it risks pitting different housing models against one another and reducing the flexibility the City needs to develop the full range of housing options required to address homelessness effectively.

Standard lease language already prohibits illegal activity on the premises. Illegal drug use, as well as smoking and drinking in common areas, is already banned in supportive housing. The legislation as drafted creates unnecessary confusion for

providers and operators while adding layers of bureaucracy that could slow down housing production and limit innovation in service delivery.

We urge you to reconsider the approach in File 251003. True solutions require a balanced, evidence-based strategy that preserves tenant protections, maintains housing stability as a foundation for recovery, and allows providers the flexibility to tailor models to individual needs—rather than imposing a one-size-fits-all framework that could lead to increased evictions and further destabilization.

We remain committed to working collaboratively with you and other stakeholders to develop policies that genuinely expand housing choice, support recovery where desired, and uphold the rights and dignity of all San Francisco tenants.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these concerns with you or your staff in greater detail.
Sincerely,

Michael Nulty
Program Director
Tenant Associations Coalition of San Francisco
and its affiliated tenant associations

Tenant Associations Coalition of San Francisco
P.O. Box 420846;
San Francisco, CA 94142-0846
415-339-8327 Voice / 415-820-1565 Fax
http://15thanniversarytac.blogspot.com/
http://tenantassociationscoalition.blogspot.com/
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/TenantAssociationsCoalition/
Serving San Francisco since September, 1997

From: Kevin Bess
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Housing First! Vote No!
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 4:46:19 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Kevin Bess
bess.kevin@gmail.com
475 27th Ave Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94121

From:	Goossen, Carolyn (PDR)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Subject:	Letter requesting amendments to File #251003 Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:10:11 PM
Attachments:	Letter from SF Public Defender regarding File #251003 .pdf

Dear Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter regarding File #251003 - Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Carolyn

Carolyn Ji Jong Goossen
譚子莊
She/Her/Hers
SF Policy Director
San Francisco Public Defender's Office
Cell: 415-370-5621
carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org

Keith Humphreys, Ph.D.
Esther Ting Memorial Professor
401 N. Quarry Road, Room C-305 (MC:5717)
Stanford University School of Medicine
Stanford, CA 94305-5717
KNH@Stanford.edu

April 22, 2026

Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Drug-Free Housing, File # 251003 — Position: Support

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

As someone who has studied addiction for over 35 years, served as the Senior Drug Policy Advisor in President Obama's White House, and currently volunteers in the Tenderloin, I am writing in support of this proposal to expand the availability of drug-free housing in San Francisco and to survey residents of publicly-supported housing on their housing preferences.

Housing First programs are important, particularly for people who suffer from serious mental illnesses such as schizophrenia. But a review of evidence by the National Academies of Science (https://www.nationalacademies.org/projects/PGA-STS-15-01) concluded they not reduce substance use which poses a challenge for people who are facing addiction.

In contrast, drug-free housing options particularly benefit people struggling with their use of methamphetamine, fentanyl, and other drugs. For example, a DePaul University study of individuals randomly assigned after addiction treatment either to Oxford House (a substance-free setting with a pro-recovery culture) or other forms of aftercare found that over the ensuing 2 years, Oxford House residents had double the rate of abstaining from substance use. and were 50% more likely to have a job.

Under current California law, it is unfortunately not legal to use state housing dollars to create drug-free housing options that would yield benefits like this. The only option San Francisco therefore has is what this proposal offers, namely using local funds

to support such therapeutic living environments. I believe that doing so will greatly aid people who are seeking recovery from addiction and I therefore respectfully urge you to support this proposal.

Sincerely,



MANOHAR RAJU – PUBLIC DEFENDER
MATT GONZALEZ – CHIEF ATTORNEY

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC DEFENDER
Greater Than One

April 22, 2026.

To the Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the San Francisco Public Defender's Office, I am writing to oppose and express concerns regarding **File #251003**, the ordinance to expand drug-free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). While our office supports the goal of diversifying our city's supportive housing stock, we believe the ordinance, as currently drafted, risks harming our most vulnerable residents by increasing eviction rates among people who most need stability.

From our experience representing housing-insecure and unhoused clients, we know that secure housing is essential for stability and safety. While we agree that San Francisco should offer varied housing options, we are concerned that this ordinance prioritizes strict compliance over long-term stability—a shift that could inadvertently lead to a cycle of displacement for individuals in the middle of their recovery journey.

To mitigate these risks, we respectfully request that the ordinance be amended to provide **stronger, binding eviction protections.** If a tenant is at risk of losing their placement because they are still navigating their recovery, they must be allowed to remain in their unit until a move to an appropriate alternative placement is finalized. Currently, Section 12K.6.3b only "reaffirms a commitment to use best efforts" to provide alternative housing. This language offers no guarantee, leaving residents with the very real fear of returning to the streets. To be effective, the ordinance must move beyond a "commitment" and provide a **clear, binding guarantee of placement**. Research shows that homelessness exacerbates substance use disorders; we must ensure that an ordinance intended to support recovery does not instead drive people back into homelessness.

Our concerns are also rooted in the clinical reality of substance use disorder (SUD). As a chronic condition, intermittent use is often a part of the recovery process rather than a failure of treatment. It can take years of engagement to achieve sustained remission, and during that time, punitive measures like discharge and disconnection only increase the risk of overdose and incarceration. We must bear in mind that homelessness itself drives up rates of substance use disorders, which is not an outcome any of us wants.

Finally, we are concerned that this legislation risks creating confusion for supportive housing providers. Standard leases already prohibit illegal activity, as well as smoking and drinking in common areas; beyond these shared spaces, housing units are private, non-surveilled environments. We believe strongly that as a city, we need to increase the production of supportive and affordable housing, and we would not want to see our current or future pipeline impacted in a negative way.

Thank you for your consideration.

Adult Division - HOJ
555 Seventh Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
P: 415.553.1671
F: 415.553.9810
www.sfpublicdefender.org

Juvenile Division - YGC
375 Woodside Avenue, Rm. 118
San Francisco, CA 94127
P: 415.753.7601
F: 415.566.3030

Mental Health Unit - JJC
258A Laguna Honda Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94116
P: 415.753.8174
F: 415.753.8175

Clean Slate
P: 415.553.9337
www.sfpublicdefender.org/services

Community Justice Center
P: 415.202.2832
F: 415.563.8506

Bayview Magic
P: 415.558.2428
www.bayviewmagic.org

MoMagic
P: 415.567.0400
www.momagic.org

Respectfully,



Carolyn Goossen (she/her)
SF Policy Director
San Francisco Public Defender
carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org

From: Joseph Wang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Please Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:45:22 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors, and Mayor Lurie,

Please vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is touted as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Joseph Wang
joew10@yahoo.com
1087 Capitol Ave
San Francisco , California 94112

From:	Megan Murphy
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment: Please Improve File #251003 Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 8:32:42 PM

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 **Megan**, I'm a District 1 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), t**he ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,

From:	Kevin Liu
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Cc:	Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comments (Second Batch): Please Improve File #251003 Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:28:10 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-tndc_logo_.png Outlook-tndc_logo_.png Resident letters about Housing First continued.pdf

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached file for additional letters from TNDC residents addressing the ordinance "Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing."

Kindly,

Kevin Liu, RD, MPH (he/him pronouns)
Overdose Prevention Outreach Coordinator
Community Organizing Office
Phone: 415-967-6771 | Email: kliu@tndc.org

210 Golden Gate Ave, San Francisco, CA 94102

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!

From: Kevin Liu <kliu@tndc.org>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2026 5:44 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; monique.crayton@sfgov.org <monique.crayton@sfgov.org>
Cc: Alan.Wong@sfgov.org <Alan.Wong@sfgov.org>; Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; connie.chan@sfgov.org <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org <Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org>; Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>; Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comments: Please Improve File #251003 Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached file for letters from TNDC residents addressing the ordinance "Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing."

Kindly,

Kevin Liu, RD, MPH (he/him pronouns)
Overdose Prevention Outreach Coordinator
Community Organizing Office
Phone: 415-967-6771 | Email: kliu@tndc.org

210 Golden Gate Ave, San Francisco, CA 94102

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!

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Javier Solorzano, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

I lived in a shelter for 2.5 years. When I was there, I shared space with drug users. People who find themselves at a shelter are already stressed, and the drugs help with coping. At the shelter, you often are not able to rest properly, which leads to more suffering. At the shelter I was at, when people struggling with their substance use asked for housing, they were told that they "actually don't want housing." I did not see this to be the case. Drug users were at the shelter specifically hoping for more permanent housing, but they were de-prioritized for housing; people with disabilities and the elderly who don't struggle with their substance use were prioritized instead for placement into housing. I got housing after 1 year. However, for drug users and other folks, I think 5-7 years is typical. It makes a lot of sense for people struggling with their substance use to get housing because it is how they heal. With housing, you feel a sense of belonging and ownership of your own space in a way that helps you see a path towards better health, as you are able to take care of your body, shower more often, sleep, feed yourself better, and feel secure; you are treated as a normal part of society. The more help that drug users can get, the better. Instead, what we are seeing is that help for them is getting cut, which only leads to a steeper road for people to get off the streets and not struggle with their substance use. Further, with Sober Housing leading to evictions for drug use after people have already gotten the housing, this leads to more stress, since folks know how hard it is to get housing in the first place.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Javier Solorzano

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Kevin Liu, I'm a District 5 community worker at TNDC, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

Tenants of Housing First in TNDC buildings let me know the importance of their housing, and I want to take this opportunity to urge you to listen deeply to them if, as a city, we want to solve problems. People had a *hard time* on the streets before getting housing due to the *stigma* against using substances to cope and the *hardship* of living without sleep and security. Often, my friends in Housing First LOST their "normal" housing first, which unmasked prior substance use problems or led to low-level crimes or mental health disturbances. So, could it be that Housing is what Heals? Instead of sending folks repeatedly to emergency rooms or jails, how about we provide housing?
For residents, researchers, and practitioners like me, it's evident that Housing First heals, so this proposal will lead to more homelessness and substance use on the streets.
Further, consider that for folks who DECIDE to get treatment and achieve sobriety, or have always been sober, they also want Housing First for themselves and their neighbors who are not sober. Despite the disturbances that those struggling with their substance use in Housing First may cause to their neighbors, these neighbors express that all folks have the right to stay, and that there is a need for more support for those that are struggling. For my friend with a former alcohol problem and my friend that uses tobacco, Housing First has saved their lives. The social workers and community support in their housing helped and continues to help. As another friend suggests, enhancing support may look like offering Housing First tenants access to Green Space to benefit folks mentally and spiritually, as many people may know firsthand from the pandemic.
Finally, let's talk about forced sobriety, relapse, and eviction. Forced sobriety is already a tough spot, and with relapse being a PART of recovery, eviction should never be the response to relapse. Housing heals because it offers dignity, allowing folks to take care of their bodies, sleep, have security, shower more, and eat better. Also, when folks can take care of themselves, they feel normal and a sense of belonging; for as long as we live in a world that stigmatizes folks for having foundational needs, this sense of normality and belonging people get from Housing First is indespensible.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Kevin Liu

Dear Chair Dorsey and Members of the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee,

My name is Curtis Bradford, and I am writing not from theory, ideology, or politics, but from lived experience.

I know what it means to struggle. I know what it means to lose my footing, to battle addiction, to live with shame, and to wonder whether life could ever become something steady, meaningful, and whole again. I also know what helped save me, and it was not rejection. It was not punishment. It was not being told I had to become perfect before I was worthy of safety.

What helped save my life was housing, stability, compassion, and the simple but profound truth that people need a safe place to land before they can truly begin to heal.

Supportive housing gave me that chance. Harm reduction gave me that chance. They created the space where recovery could become possible. They did not stand in the way of my recovery, they helped make it real.

Recovery is not something most people can build while being pushed from doorway to doorway, from shelter to street, from fear to fear. Recovery needs ground under it. It needs dignity. It needs consistency. It needs the kind of support that says, “You are still human, you are still valuable, and your life is still worth investing in, even now.”

That approach saved me.

I was once homeless. I lived for many years in an SRO on disability. I know what it means to need affordable, supportive housing not as an abstract policy idea, but as a lifeline. Today, because people and systems did not give up on me, I have been clean and sober since January 10, 2011. Today I serve as Community Organizing Manager for a large Tenderloin CBO.. Today I help build resident leadership, community power, and civic participation in the Tenderloin and SoMa. Today I have a life filled with purpose, service, connection, and hope.

That life did not begin because someone demanded that I be fully healed before I could come inside. It began because I was allowed to survive long enough, safely enough, and with enough support, to find my way toward healing.

I support having recovery-focused housing options for people who want and need them. Choice matters. Sober housing has an important place in the continuum of care. But making sobriety a requirement for all new City-funded supportive housing is a dangerous mistake.

It misunderstands how recovery actually happens for many people. It turns housing from a platform for healing into a prize people must earn first. And for many of our most vulnerable neighbors, that will not lead to recovery, it will lead to more suffering, more instability, and more death.

The people I work with, and the community I come from, are not served by one-size-fits-all answers. People arrive with different histories, different traumas, different needs, and different stages of readiness. Real compassion means building a system large enough to hold that truth. Real public policy should widen the path to recovery, not narrow the doorway to housing.

I am living proof that supportive housing and harm reduction can save lives. I am living proof that a person's worst chapter does not have to be their final chapter. I am living proof that when we meet people with dignity instead of judgment, they can rise into lives of service, leadership, and love.

Please do not adopt a policy that would make it harder for people like me to get the foothold we need to survive and recover.

San Francisco should expand options, yes, including sober housing for those who want it, but it should not abandon the housing-first and harm-reduction principles that have helped so many people stay alive long enough to choose recovery.

My life is what can happen when the City chooses compassion over exclusion, support over stigma, and hope over fear.

Please reconsider File No. 251003 and work with community to draft amendments that really meet SF's residents' needs.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Curtis Bradford
District 6 Resident

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Mackil Brant Taylor, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

Prior to getting permanent housing, a lot of people were evicted or suspended from their housing, which led to relapse in terms of their drug use. Also, people who are released from custody should be able to access Housing First permanent housing and make their own choice to live a crime-free, drug-free life. Homelessness shows we have poor community healthcare.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Mackil Brant Taylor

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Taylor Smith, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

I was homeless and an avid drug addict, people say, living on the street, but I like to say I was dying on the street, and I finally got sick and tired of being sick and tired, so I voluntarily admitted myself into detox, Joe Healey detox to be exact. The third day, my counselor asked me to come with him to his desk because I had a phone call, and it was a rep asking me if I was interested in housing. I have had a home here at Kelly Cullen Community since March 16, 2013, and it saved my life without a doubt. With this housing, I am not fighting for survival out on the streets and have been supported to stay sober. This housing works.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Taylor Smith

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is David Rodriguez, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

I was homeless for over a decade. As a homeless patron I was sent to the mental ward between 10 to 15 times. I was housed in 2021. I was sent to the mental ward only once, and that was in the beginning. Housing gave me room to heal.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
David Rodriguez

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Miguel Garcia, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

My history is an alcohol problem. Now, I live at Kelly Cullen Community, and I'm OK now. I feel stable. The problem with being on the streets is that you struggle and the drugs surround you, so it is not hard to end up using the drugs. But when you have housing, the housing itself helps you stabilize and that can fix your drug problem; it also gives you just enough space from the drugs on the street.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Miguel Garcia

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Ray Orfiano, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

If I wasn't housed first, I wouldn't be alive today. In 2021, I was housed at Kelly Cullen Community with a severe alcohol problem, and if it wasn't for the social workers Clair and Tommy Dean checking in on me, I would not have been found when I was already half-dead. If it wasn't for them then sending me to the hospital for a two-year fight for my life and helping me keep my housing, I wouldn't be alive today. The Sober First model forces folks to be sober, and people don't want to be sober unless they make the decision for themselves to be sober.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Ray Orfiano

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Anthony Prater, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

This proposal will create more homelessness, and I myself have benefitted from such a program as Housing First. The 'first, house' approach has helped clean up San Francisco.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Anthony Prater

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Dennis Hughes, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

I'm an anomaly. Don't drink, smoke, nor do drugs. Never have. But my Housing First building has helped me when I was homeless because of financial reasons. I was able to get a job as a security guard. I've had that job for 16 years. I also teach chess. Having this Housing First residency has helped me tremendously, and my neighbors in this building and I are part of a community here. I like the idea of Sober Housing, but I'm thinking about it in the context of it being a step up for someone like me that first got the benefits of Housing First. My neighbors have benefitted from our current housing. I've watched them do better with the aid of social workers. Don't take the option of Housing First away from those who could use the help. Don't take this option away.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Dennis Hughes

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Tim Coughlin, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

I found "ok" housing and a social worker after being forced into 3 years of "homelessness" by my long-time friend "Roy," whom I lived with for 24 years. During my 3 years of homelessness, I lived in a tent. Most people that get housing through Housing First have been displaced. For instance, my neighbor used to live in the Fillmore; he struggles with his substance use and can be a disturbance to me sometimes as a result, and I believe he has a right to stay so that he can sleep and shower. In my case, I smoke tobacco, which makes my asthma worse, but I have housing and am able to control the asthma symptoms because of access to my own place to shower, free groceries from the 'produce drop' at my building, a social worker in the building, and connections with other tenants that help me access medications for my asthma as well as dental care. As for how I was originally displaced from housing, it was because Roy wouldn't pay the landlord of the condo we stayed at, which had a pool and access to a forest, since the price Roy was charged was way beyond the purchase price of the condo. Since Roy refused to pay, eventually the landlord summoned the police who asked him to walk NOW or be put in jail. "This cop is a powerless, hated hoodlum," Roy thought, and decided "No, I'll stay home." Next thing you know, Roy's in jail (and eventually died there), all our furniture is gone, and I had to leave.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Tim Coughlin

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Paul Isaacson, I'm a District 5 resident, and I am writing to share concerns about File #251003, the ordinance Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing. I support expanding housing that provides a supportive environment to recover from drug use or live in a sober environment if that is what someone prefers. However, the way this ordinance is currently written will create the unintended consequences of making it more difficult to fund deeply affordable housing and increasing evictions, which would lead to increased street homelessness and public drug use.

As a "no-anything" type of person, I would prefer there to be no use of anything addictive, and no smoking, at my residence. However, this should not take away from the reality that in order to make a vast improvement on the streets, there should be far more housing for everyone, especially those abusing any substance and want housing. I also question the financial risk this legislation may pose to current Housing First buildings, potentially destabilizing these buildings and directly impacting tenants like me. I wholeheartedly approve of the language of the amended legislation. We should expand housing by adding a pilot program for sober housing. And, of primary importance, are the phrases of the last page that tenants should "feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help" because they are not afraid of eviction. My model or analogy for Housing First is that it is like the paramedic's priority of stabilizing the patient. Then, we should focus on adding more supportive services; for example, in my ideal world, with all the open land and buildings at the Presidio and other locations, we would encourage and incentivize Housing First tenants to get off the concrete and onto land and into the woods, with fresh air.

Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of permanent supportive housing (PSH), **the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing.** This would encourage an exploration and evaluation of this model, without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH. The current waiver language would create another hurdle. A pilot program is proactive and will generate an additive model that creates more housing, rather than creating restrictions on desperately needed housing for people experiencing homelessness.

The ordinance should also be amended to provide stronger eviction protections. If a tenant is at risk of being evicted, the tenant should be allowed to stay in housing until they can move into alternative housing. This will avoid increasing homelessness and forcing someone struggling with drug use out onto the street. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment, but a promise that someone will be placed into alternative housing.

We all want people to feel comfortable in their housing, and in order to make that happen, we need to be intentional in the creation of a new type of recovery housing. Tenants should feel that they made a voluntary choice to be there because they had other housing types and chose this option. Tenants should feel safe in admitting that they relapsed and need help because they are not afraid of ending up back on the street. Amending the ordinance will produce an effective type of recovery housing that could be helpful and life-changing for tenants and communities.

Sincerely,
Paul Isaacson

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) -
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 7:13:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) -
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:35:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Doreen Horstin
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 4:34:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Doreen Horstin

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Robert Mansfield
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:52:28 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Robert Mansfield

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Christopher Humphreys
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:16:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Christopher Humphreys

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Jacqueline Murphy
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:14:39 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Jacqueline Murphy

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Aaron Thomas
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:42:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Aaron Thomas

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Billy Allen
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:28:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live and in the Tenderloin and work at Tenderloin Housing Clinic. I am also a member of the OFarrell Neighbors Group. I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Billy Allen

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Leilani Merrill
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:06:14 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Leilani Merrill

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Austen Woods
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:08:28 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Austen Woods

From: Carlos Ciudad-Real
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Reject File No. 251003
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 11:11:03 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Carlos Ciudad-Real
cmciudadreal@gmail.com
1222 Harrison St, Apt 1203
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Jaqueline Beltran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:11:37 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent Jaqueline Beltran

Email j.bb89@yahoo.com

Subject Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Jaqueline Beltran

From: Mike Nohr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:00:18 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent: Mike Nohr

Email: mikejnohr@aol.com

Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Mike Nohr

From: Mike Lin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 1:24:29 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent: Mike Lin

Email: mikelinsf@gmail.com

Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Mike Lin

From: Marlene Trab
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 1:21:25 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent: Marlene Trab

Email: tranmarlene@yahoo.com

Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Marlene Trab

From: Nancy Federico
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:02:25 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent Nancy Federico

Email nlfederico@msn.com

Subject Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Nancy Federico

From: Melissa Hernandez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on Dorsey's cruel anti-PSH legislation (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 11:37:29 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of D11, and I am reaching out to urge you to vote no on File No. 251003. This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Melissa Hernandez
mghernandez117@gmail.com
256 Brighton Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Alexander Gray
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 10:31:00 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Alexander Gray
Brentwoodgray@gmail.com
345 Brentwood Avenue
San Francisco, California 94127

From: Andrew Scudder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 10:21:46 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Andrew Scudder
andrew@andrew-scudder.com
145 Hampshire St. Unit B
San Francisco, California 94103-4811

From: Jill Parker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 10:04:32 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please chose humanity.

Consider that any individual on the street is someone's child, sibling, niece/nephew.

These problems need solutions. The first step is humanity.

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

Please choose humanity.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jill Parker
iamjillparker@gmail.com
1259 6th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Yves Chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 9:18:39 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Yves Chu
yveschu22@gmail.com
75 gough st
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94102

From: Dee Dee Kramer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 9:17:03 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Dee Dee Kramer
wende3de3@gmail.com
320 , Lee Street
Oakland, California 94610

From: Aidan Dillon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 8:33:02 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Aidan Dillon
aidandillon007@gmail.com
649 CLAYTON ST
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Bahareh Soltani
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 8:19:10 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Bahareh Soltani
soltani.berry@gmail.com
2999 California St. #203
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Hugo Kobayashi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 8:06:07 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Hugo Kobayashi
sffishhead@yahoo.com
1391 8th Avenue, #3
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122

From: Cannon Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:53:35 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Cannon Brown
District 9

Cannon Brown
cannonsdroid@gmail.com
480 14th Street #2
San Francisco , California 94103

From: Jonathan Banasky
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:53:12 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jonathan Banasky
jonbanasky@gmail.com
160 Linda st
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Mary Bugarin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:47:07 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Mary Bugarin
maria.bugarin7@gmail.com
1130 Filbert
San Francisci, California 94109

From: Simone Baggetto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:03:21 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Simone Baggetto
sbaggetto@gmail.com
2674 McAllister St
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Libet Mera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:39:21 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Libet Mera
linet.mera@gmail.com
1059 47th st
Emeryville, California 94608

From: Noah Sloss
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:33:01 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Noah Sloss
noahsloss@gmail.com
2280 Pine St #102
SF, California 94115

From: Barbara Barnes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:13:32 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Barbara Barnes
barberic23@mac.com
70 Porter Street
San Francisco, California 94110-5918

From: Toshio Meronek
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:10:34 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Toshio Meronek
toshio.meronek@gmail.com
83 McAllister St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: vivred123@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 8:19:41 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

vivred123@gmail.com
176 Winfield Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Misha Steier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 8:00:51 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Misha Steier
mishasteiersf@gmail.com
1723 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco , California 94132

From: Raya Steier
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 8:00:12 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Raya Steier
sarkar.raya@gmail.com
1723 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco , California 94132

From: Reid Coggins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 7:36:55 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Reid Coggins
reidcoggins@gmail.com
161 Henry St, 8
San Francisco, California 94114-1253

From: Daniel Tan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 7:36:25 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Daniel Tan
hello@gmail.com
334 Guerrero Street, San Francisco, CA
San Francisco, CA, California 94103

From: Charlie Kupperman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:28:15 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

I believe the goal of any sane policy is to provide people with stable housing and support so that they can get jobs and get clean. Penalizing people for making a single mistake is inhumane and counter-productive, and will lead to more drugs on the streets. Rather, we should be providing permanent supportive housing alongside sober housing, and expanding the resources availalbe to people who are in supportive housing.

This is cruel and absolutely unnecessary, and part of a recent move towards penalizing the poor for simply existing.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Charlie Kupperman
charlieanders2@gmail.com
874 Page Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Sara Greenwald
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 6:17:37 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share.

As you know, however, it also prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model. That's no good because we need housing also for those homeless people who present the most disturbing cases because they are so disturbed by addiction, and often mentally disturbed either by the addicting substance or as some other aspect of their problems. These people are generally in no shape to deal with these problems while living on the street. Our police should not be burdened with dealing with them and our jails should not be the place where they are put, because the police have a great deal of work more important than making sweeps to arrest unhoused, addicted and mentally unbalanced people and the jails lack the facilities to house them.

Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.
In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. That part of the system is one of few that is not broken, so let's not try to fix it.

Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Sara Greenwald
saragreenwald2@gmail.com
1323A Lyon St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Danny Laughin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 5:55:13 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Danny Laughin
dan422963@yahoo.com
PO Box 422963
San Francisco, California 94142

From: Karla Jonson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 5:46:57 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I stand with my neighbors and urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

Please vote no on File No. 251003.

Karla Jonson
kdjonson@gmail.com
411 Holly Park Circle
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Mary Scheib
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 5:41:01 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As a constituent, nurse practitioner and indivisible member, I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city

contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

Follow the science and vote no on File No. 251003.

Mary Scheib
maryscheib17@gmail.com
970 Duncan St #106
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Betty Traynor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 5:18:39 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote NO on File No. 251003.

Betty Traynor
btraynor@att.net
25 Western Shore Ln #6
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Lynn Wenger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 4:30:06 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Lynn Wenger
lwenger62@gmail.com
397 Park St.
Sand Francisco, California 94110

From: Fran Taylor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 4:21:43 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Fran Taylor
duck.taylor@yahoo.com
2982 26th Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Zac Tanner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:54:26 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Zac Tanner
zactanner8@gmail.com
205 Collins Street, Apt. 9
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Robert Kolbe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:52:40 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Robert Kolbe
robert.kolbe@gmail.com
937 Clay St Apt 401
San Francisco, California 94108

From: Esther Chung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:47:33 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Esther Chung
estherchung5@gmail.com
1135 66th St
Emeryville, California 94608

From: Kenneth McGuire
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:20:35 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Kenneth McGuire
kendilious@gmail.com
759 6th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Emily McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:08:33 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Emily McCarthy
emily@riffcitystrategies.com
5116 Anza St
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Sparrow Frost
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:27:04 PM

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,

Dear Members of the SF BOS,

Please vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). While the name of this ordinance deceptively implies it will expand housing, what it actually does is restrict funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave more people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration

has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer wait lists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

As a resident of this city who witnesses and empathizes with the pain experienced by everyone experiencing homelessness I see every day, I am strongly urging you not to limit the support we can give to those who need it most - vote no on File No. 251003.

Sparrow Frost
mixterfrost@gmail.com
134 Duboce Ave 14
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Joseph Fernicola
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:22:26 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Joseph Fernicola
joefernsf@gmail.com
143 Manini St
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

From: Lydia Koehn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:16:40 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Lydia Koehn
koehn.lydia@gmail.com
653 Hillsborough Street, Apt. B
Oakland, California 94606

From: Daphne Gottlieb
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:16:34 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Daphne Gottlieb
daphne@daphnegottlieb.com
589a dolores st.
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Arnold Warshaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:13:56 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Arnold Warshaw
arnieccsf@yahoo.com
2 Maynard St. Apt. 1
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Megan Dabkowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 1:24:27 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Megan Dabkowski
megan.dabkowski@gmail.com
18 Gardenside Dr Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Noah Levitt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 1:13:06 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I'm an SF resident of D11 (Chen).

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly

funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Noah Levitt
nlevitt@gmail.com
154 Trumbull St
San Francisco , California 94112

From: Nikolas Stelmashenko
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 12:49:56 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

-Nikolas Stelmashenko
President of the Masters in Social Work Council of San Francisco State.

Nikolas Stelmashenko
nikolasstelmashenko@gmail.com
433 acacia avenue
San Bruno, California 94066

From: Andrés Oswill
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 12:47:27 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Andrés Oswill
District 6 resident

Andrés Oswill
andresoswill@gmail.com
1401 Mission St, 510
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Cayla Lewis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 12:15:46 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Cayla Lewis
cayla.ann.lewis@gmail.com
398 capp st
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Vidushi Bhargava
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 11:57:21 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Vidushi Bhargava
vidushi321@gmail.com
205 COLLINS ST
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Susannah Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 11:38:45 AM

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,

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

I strongly urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). Creating and expanding sober housing does not need to be put in opposition to Permanent Supportive Housing, which is what this ordinance does. We can have, and continue to allow the creation of both. As a city we have again and again supported successful Harm Reduction strategies, only to have politicians continue to fight against them in order to be "tough on crime".

This ordinance will leave people homeless, exacerbate the problems on our streets, and hurt all of us.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city

contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Susannah Smith
suzsmithqb@gmail.com
467 29th St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Christin Evans
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:46:30 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Christin Evans
christin@booksmith.com
173 Marview Way
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Ani Lopez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:02:06 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Ani Lopez
antoinettelopez624@gmail.com
353 Anza St
San Francisco, California 94118

From: lvelez@cohsf.org
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:22:07 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

lvelez@cohsf.org
411 Bartlett
Sam Francisco, California 94110

From: lvelez@cohsf.org
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:22:06 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

lvelez@cohsf.org
411 Bartlett
Sam Francisco, California 94110

From: David Zlutnick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 8:21:17 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

David Zlutnick
davidzlutnick@gmail.com
425 Warren Dr., #3
San Francisco, California 94131-1074

From: Katherine Scott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 7:25:39 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Katherine Scott
katherineascott@gmail.com
3033 Rivera
San Francisco , California 94116

From: Emily Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 12:23:46 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Emily Jones
mailemilyjones@gmail.com
409 Clayton Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Mitesh Jain
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 12:16:02 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Mitesh Jain
jainmitesh09@gmail.com
400 oak st
San Francisco , California 94102

From: Owen Miller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 10:36:03 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Owen Miller
dancehardordie@gmail.com
1250 Broderick st, Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94115

From:	Lea McGeever
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject:	Choose Supporting Life Over Degrading It. Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:25:55 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to STOP PRETENDING YOU DON'T KNOW BETTER and vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people WITHOUT A FUCKING HOME WITH YOU NEED TO SURVIVE AND BE ALIVE.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the SCIENTIFICALLY PROVEN, evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery AND FUCKING SURVIVAL BECAUSE WE ARE BIOLOGICAL CREATURES WITH SURVIVAL NEEDS, NOT FUCKING WAYMO CARS. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record AND MOVES IT TOWARDS CITY-SPONSORED MURDER.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response AND FINANCIAL INVESTMENT. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable (VULNERABLE TO ABUSE AND DEATH) residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you TO WIELD YOUR VOCAL CHORDS FOR GOOD to vote no on File No. 251003.

Lea McGeever
lea.mcgeever@gmail.com
1095 market st
Sf, California 94103

From: Emily Coady
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Please Vote No!! Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:12:54 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Emily Coady
D8 resident

Emily Coady
ejocoady@gmail.com
952 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - David I Lewis
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:23:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

First off, before I put my name on this letter that was well written and I agree wholeheartedly, I need to express my personal feelings as well as my personal experience. I know first hand the success that can be had from living a life free from active addiction. I support drug-free housing.
Secondly, the experience I have witnessed in my own building, whereas two units were rented out by organizations to help the homeless and both have resulted in very alarming situations for all the regular tenants in the building. These individuals have brought their addiction habits and destructive lifestyles directly into the lives of innocent tenants. Continuing to enable addicts and providing housing just prolongs the misery and subject everyone else to this misery.

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
David I Lewis

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Jane Weil
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:07:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Jane Weil

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Amber Richmond
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 5:47:34 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Amber Richmond

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - kaaren alvarado
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 5:09:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
kaaren alvarado

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Shane McKinney
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:39:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Shane McKinney

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Danica Gutierrez
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 1:57:33 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Danica Gutierrez

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Angela Tickler
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 1:32:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Angela Tickler

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Forrest Liu
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 11:15:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Forrest Liu

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Ellie Yelding-Sloan
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:39:19 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Ellie Yelding-Sloan

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Ellen Grantz
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:09:34 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl
San Francisco, CA 94102

April 20, 2026

Subject: MADAAD's Support for San Francisco's Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing Ordinance (File No. 251003)

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,
We, the members of Mothers Against Drug Addiction & Deaths (MADAAD), write in strong support of the ordinance to expand Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.
As Bay Area mothers of children who have struggled with addiction — some in recovery, some incarcerated, some homeless, and some whom we have lost — we are forever grateful to the frontline workers, doctors, nurses, and case managers who fight every day for those suffering on San Francisco's streets.
When someone makes the courageous decision to begin their recovery journey, the last thing San Francisco should do is undermine that effort by placing them in housing where active drug use by a neighbor can trigger relapse. Yet this is precisely what is happening today. The city and state invest extraordinary resources in permanent supportive housing, only to see residents' recoveries jeopardized by unlimited drug use within those taxpayer-funded units.
It doesn't have to be this way. San Francisco is free to direct its housing dollars toward drug-free environments. Under this ordinance, new city-funded PSH can be designated drug-free — giving people in recovery the stable foundation they need to truly heal and rebuild their lives.
We urge you to support this ordinance. Thank you for your leadership and your commitment to the people of San Francisco.
Respectfully,

Mothers Against Drug Addiction & Deaths (MADAAD)
Ellen Grantz

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Tony Fox
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 6:59:44 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Tony Fox

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Jeffrey Webb
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 6:33:35 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I’m writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California’s Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person’s behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It’s time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Jeffrey Webb

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Jodi Klein
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 9:11:24 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options. Please support this need by voting YES on Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance.

Thank you.
Jodi Klein

From: Jotform
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS); info@drugfreesidewalks.org
Subject: Re: Support Drug-Free Housing Ordinance (File #251003) - Diana Helander
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:27:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my support for expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Data from the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner highlights the need for improvements in our housing policy - between June 2024 and July 2025, 26% of overdose deaths occurred in PSH, a higher percentage than in shelters, hospitals, private homes, or on the street.

Today, under California's Housing First law, state funds are prohibited from being used for drug-free housing. San Francisco funds are not subject to the same law, however San Francisco voluntarily decided to follow suit. As a result, if a family or an individual living deeply below the poverty line qualifies for permanent supportive housing, almost 100% of these units allow illicit drug use. A single PSH building averages two calls per day to the police. This is a tough environment for a person in recovery, much less a child.

You wouldn't ask someone who is recovering from a broken leg to move to a 5th floor walkup but this is in effect what we're asking recovering folks to do by not providing sober housing for those who want it. Our current policy places obstacles in the path of their recovery.

We have nearly 10,000 site-based PSH units and their status as drug-tolerant will not change under this ordinance. But we can change future permanent supportive housing funded by the city to be drug-free so that people have options.

The last thing I want to see is an increase in the number of people living on the streets. The good news is that this ordinance has been written so that people who have a single relapse are not automatically evicted, instead they will be offered relapse services. And, if a person's behavior continues to substantially disrupt their building, the City will seek to find the person housing that is appropriate for their situation.

The number of overdose deaths barely budged between 2024 and 2025 in San Francisco. It's time to expand our housing solutions and it starts by allowing drug-free housing options.

Thank you.
Diana Helander

From:	Adam Francis
To:	Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); WongStaff (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Gaona, Sasha (BOS); Conrad Amenta; Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS)
Subject:	SFMMS Oppose Unless Amended - Drug-Free PSH - Ordinance 251003
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:54:29 AM
Attachments:	SFMMS Oppose Unless Amended - Ordinance 251003 (Dorsey) 2026.pdf

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

Hello Supervisor Dorsey,

Thank you for taking the time to hear our concerns last week about Ordinance 251003. As mentioned, while we appreciate the recent amendments to the ordinance, we have several concerns about the current language of the legislation. Please find a letter attached detailing those concerns and our proposed amendments.

Please do not hesitate to reach out with any questions.

Thank you,

Adam Francis
Senior Director, Advocacy and Policy
San Francisco Marin Medical Society
Phone: 415.561.0850 ext. 200
www.sfmms.org

SAN FRANCISCO MARIN MEDICAL SOCIETY

April 21, 2026

Supervisor Matt Dorsey
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Ordinance 251003 (Dorsey)
Position: Oppose Unless Amended

Dear Supervisor Dorsey:

The San Francisco Marin Medical Society (SFMMS), representing more than 3,500 physicians of every medical specialty and mode of practice in San Francisco and Marin Counties, has adopted an Oppose Unless Amended position on Ordinance 251003 – Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). While SFMMS agrees with the goal of adding and prioritizing sober-living options in the city's PSH portfolio, we have several concerns with the ordinance as currently drafted.

Defining Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing

The ordinance's findings indicate that the type of housing to be funded would be for two different populations that have two very different sets of needs:

1) Unhoused individuals and families seeking a less disorderly living environment.
2) Unhoused individuals in recovery or seeking recovery services.

The first set of individuals would likely be best served by housing with diligent property management. The second set would need diligent property management combined with recovery services, which require a different set of resources, staffing, and coordination with the health care system, among other considerations. To simplify our input, SFMMS has focused its amendments on addressing the needs of individuals suffering or recovering from SUDs who seek to live in Drug-Free PSH.

As such, SFMMS requests that SEC. 12K.2. DEFINITIONS be amended to read:

> *"Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing" or "Drug-Free PSH" means Site-Based PSH that supports individuals and families in recovery or seeking to recover from substance use disorders ("SUDs"), prohibits the use of illicit drugs, and where multiple instances of on-site illicit drug use in combination with a stated goal of not reducing use is grounds for eviction.*
>
> *"Illicit drug use" means the use of a controlled or regulated substance in a manner that is unlawful under state or federal law, including use without a valid prescription or outside the scope of lawful medical or other legally permitted use, regardless of whether the substance itself may be lawfully possessed or used under other circumstances. Participation in Medication-Assisted-Treatment, administered by a licensed healthcare provider in accordance with applicable laws and medical guidance, shall not be deemed illicit drug use.*

This includes deleting the definition of "Drug Tolerant" housing here and throughout the ordinance.

Prioritizing and Funding Drug-Free PSH

Longstanding state and county homeless policy adheres to the "Housing First" principle, which prioritizes moving people off the streets and into permanent, stable living situations, and using that as a foundation to improve the health of individuals struggling with substance use or other mental health conditions. This strategy is based on decades of strong research and data as to its effectiveness. In these settings, the use of alcohol or drugs in and of itself is not an allowable reason for eviction without other lease violations (such as disturbing neighbors, damaging property, etc.). Because of this policy, California and other potential funders of supportive housing have set strict limitations on the type of housing their funds can be used to support.

SFMMS shares your belief that "Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing" is worthy of funding and that Drug-Free PSH would be beneficial to current and future residents seeking to stabilize their lives as they exit homelessness, particularly those who are in recovery or seeking to recover from SUDs. SFMMS also supports a wide array of treatment, services, and housing options for those that need them. To that end, SFMMS supported California Assembly Bill 255 (Haney) in 2025, and Assembly Bill 1556 this year – both aimed at creating flexibility to fund recovery oriented supportive housing at the state level.

Ordinance 251003, however, goes against that principle of flexibility. Mandating exclusive funding for recovery housing, and creating obstacles to override that mandate, reduces the City's ability to meet other housing needs as they arise(e.g., mental health housing, veterans housing, or housing for those who are unable or unwilling to discontinue substance use). Presumably restrictive funding policy is the main reason this ordinance was introduced. San Francisco should not make the same mistake of creating another restricted funding source. SFMMS agrees that, due to current circumstances, **a prioritization of funding for recovery housing is appropriate**, but does not agree with creating obstacles to the City's ability to use its own housing funding in the most appropriate manner identified at any given point in time.

As such, SFMMS requests that SEC. 12K.4 be deleted, and SEC. 12K.3 be amended to read:

> *It shall be City policy to expand the availability of, and prioritize City funding for, Drug-Free PSH to meet the demand from individuals in need of Site-Based PSH who prefer that option. The goal of this policy is to promote long-term housing stability, and minimize returns to homelessness and substance use.*

Rules and Regulations For Evictions and PSH Operators

SFMMS is also concerned about the process and justification for removing individuals from Drug-Free PSH, particularly related to an individual with an SUD. SFMMS appreciates the changes made in the current draft of the ordinance, but does not believe enough clarity has been provided as to the process of eviction, or the step-up in care an individual would need when in a health and housing crisis. At a very basic level, individuals with an SUD evicted from supportive housing because of relapses should be moved to a setting with more intense services, not relegated to an unknown setting with less support and possibly homelessness. As currently written, the ordinance fails to ensure this important outcome, and does not require the process necessary to ensure a vulnerable individual does not fall through the cracks.

As such, SFMMS requests that Sec 12k.6(a) be amended to read:

> *(4) Stipulate that an operator may not evict an individual based solely on substance use until new housing or a residential treatment placement has been secured; and*
> *5) Establish minimum action requirements when a documented use of illicit drugs by a tenant occurs, including:*
>
> > *i) A qualified behavioral health provider conducts a standardized assessment to establish whether a tenant has a diagnosis of a substance use disorder;*

ii) Documenting and implementing a care plan that includes the tenant's goals with their substance use;

iii) In the event the tenant's goals are no longer remission and abstinence from substance use, assist the tenant in transitioning to new housing.

(b) Establish processes and policies for a tenant's transition away from Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing, including:

1) That the tenant maintains at least the same level of access to case management and support as was received in Drug-Free PSH;

2) Individuals are not evicted until they have a confirmed shelter bed placement or alternate PSH site or another location of the individual's choosing.

3) In the event that the alternate placement is not to the individual's satisfaction, a good faith attempt should be made to accommodate the tenant's needs, with re-entry back into the coordinated entry assessment queue as a last resort.

Monitoring Eviction Patterns in Drug-Free PSH

Lastly, SFMMS is concerned about the historic pattern of eviction disproportionately affecting marginalized communities. As such, SFMMS requests that a Section be added that states:

(a) HSH shall annually compile and publish a report that includes statistics related to evictions from Drug-Free PSH.

(b) Based on the findings and analysis of that report, HSH shall institute policy changes, if necessary, to ensure people of color or marginalized groups are not disproportionally affected by such evictions.

In addition to the issues described above and which SFMMS seeks to address in its proposed amendments, there are several other remaining questions and concerns:

- What will enforcement of "Drug-Free" policies look like in these new settings?
- Does Drug-Free PSH prohibit offsite substance use and how is that addressed?
- How will a person be monitored and determined to be using illicit drugs?
- How will "demand" for this type of housing be defined and continuously evaluated?

Should you have any questions about these proposed amendments, please do not hesitate to contact Adam Francis, Senior Director of Advocacy and Policy (afrancis@sfmmf.org). As always, we greatly appreciate your efforts on this matter, as well as your openness to continued dialogue as we work through these complicated important issues.

Sincerely,
Heyman Oo, MD
Chair, Advocacy and Policy Committee
San Francisco Marin Medical Society

CC: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Angela Cavillo, Clerk to the Board of Supervisors

From: Ellen Grantz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Jacqui Berlinn; Gina McDonald; Tanya Tilghman; Liz Breuilly
Subject: Support for File No. 251003
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:08:07 AM
Attachments: MADAAD letter to BOS in support of drug free housing.pdf

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl
San Francisco, CA 94102

April 20, 2026

Subject: MADAAD's Support for San Francisco's Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing Ordinance (File No. 251003)

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We, the members of Mothers Against Drug Addiction & Deaths (MADAAD), write in strong support of the ordinance to expand Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

As Bay Area mothers of children who have struggled with addiction — some in recovery, some incarcerated, some homeless, and some whom we have lost — we are forever grateful to the frontline workers, doctors, nurses, and case managers who fight every day for those suffering on San Francisco's streets.

When someone makes the courageous decision to begin their recovery journey, the last thing San Francisco should do is undermine that effort by placing them in housing where active drug use by a neighbor can trigger relapse. Yet this is precisely what is happening today. The city and state invest extraordinary resources in permanent supportive housing, only to see residents' recoveries jeopardized by unlimited drug use within those taxpayer-funded units.

It doesn't have to be this way. San Francisco is free to direct its housing dollars toward drug-free environments. Under this ordinance, new city-funded PSH can be designated drug-free — giving people in recovery the stable foundation they need to truly heal and rebuild their lives.

We urge you to support this ordinance. Thank you for your leadership and your commitment to the people of San Francisco.

Respectfully,

Mothers Against Drug Addiction & Deaths (MADAAD)

From: Sophie Dukes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 7:50:43 PM

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent: Sophie Dukes

Email: gone2nyc@gmail.com

Subject: Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Sophie Dukes

From: Scott Feeney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 2:55:09 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

Please vote no on File No. 251003. Thank you!

Scott Feeney
scott@oceanbase.org
370 Shotwell St
San Francisco, California 94110-2799

From: Leonor Melara
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:53:30 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Leonor Melara
leonormelara@gmail.com
425 Warren Drive, 3
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Sophie Rich
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:33:59 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Sophie Rich
sophierich47@yahoo.com
1786 16th Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Harlo Pippenger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:49:07 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Harlo Pippenger
Harlo.p.pippenger@gmail.com
971 Eddy St, 211
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Joel VanderWerf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:49:07 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Joel VanderWerf
joelvanderwerf@gmail.com
44B Rausch St.
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Jordan Whiteley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:04:52 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jordan Whiteley
thejordanwhiteley@gmail.com
25 Joost Ave
San Francisco, California 9413-

From: Alan Shaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:26:52 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Alan Shaw
alanshaw@alanshaw.com
1318A Natoma St
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Keegan Ciara
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 4:16:13 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Keegan Ciara
ciaraksf@gmail.com
4225 23rd Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Nicholas Parker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 4:11:22 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Nicholas Parker
mercurycoffee@gmail.com
1275 2nd Ave #5
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Michelle Chen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:59:34 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Michelle Chen
mjtchen68@gmail.com
1967 Hayes Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Dave Madden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:09:53 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). While this ordinance may seem to expand sober housing—a goal shared across political spectrum—it will actually block the creation of such housing and leave people homeless.

Housing First, California's evidence-based model for addressing homelessness, is effective because it places the foundation for recovery on stable housing. A study of over 6,500 Californian programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance will move the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model, as supporters of this ordinance are claiming. Rather, the problem comes from the uneven services provided such residents. PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs, such as Episcopal Community Services, have proven effective. This ordinance does not require such interventions that prevent overdoses and help people get sober.

Instead, it offers eviction.

Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death. This ordinance will only exacerbate such problems, handing landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting public funds to do so.

San Francisco needs better, evidence-based programs to address homelessness and drug addiction. I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Dave Madden
gmail@davemadden.org
164 Everson St
San Francisco, California 94131-2637

From: Kifflyn Vitina
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:07:54 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Kifflyn Vitina
kvitina@aol.com
10 Lyon St Apt 314
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Hadley Dixon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:02:58 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

PS. When has forcing people undergoing a medical emergency to go cold turkey ever helped? Read some statistics. Cities across the US have tried people-first measures, unlike this one, and seen incredible results.

Hadley Dixon
htilden.9@gmail.com
Htilden.9@gmail.com
San francisco, California 94118

From: Whitney Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 2:02:24 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Whitney Hall
whitneythall47@gmail.com
1801 TARAVAL ST
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Guadalupe Velez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 1:27:31 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Guadalupe Velez
lupe417@gmail.com
411 Bartlett
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Christopher Mika
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 12:33:00 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Christopher Mika
brights_ears_1a@icloud.com
Geary St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Keith Hardaway
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:35:46 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Keith Hardaway
keith.hardaway@proton.me
1157 Valencia St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Osita Ighodaro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:05:39 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Osita Ighodaro
osita.ighodaro@gmail.com
1010 16th St
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94107

From: Jordan Davis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:48:55 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jordan Davis
jodav1026@gmail.com
246 McAllister St Apt 109
San Francisco, California 94102-4707

From: Brianna Anglin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:44:27 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Brianna Anglin
briannasayshi291@gmail.com
1430 Sacramento St.
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Alexandros Karambatzakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:10:30 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Alexandros Karambatzakis
karadimalex@gmail.com
1413 Valencia
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Sayuri Falconer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:52:29 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Sayuri Falconer
sayuri.anya@gmail.com
149 Panama St
San Francisco , California 94132

From: edna kozikaro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:49:12 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am a D6 resident and worker and I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

We need to expand our approach to supportive housing and distribute the IMMENSE RESOURCES OF OUR VERY WEALTHY CITY to house as many people as possible. We all deserve housing, it should not be contingent on sobriety.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

edna kozikaro
ednakozikaro@gmail.com
115 gough street
san francisco, California 94102

From: David Lin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:38:27 AM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

David Lin
davidlin4158@gmail.com
888 7th street
san francisco , California 94107

From: Hannah Yip
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 11:43:12 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Hannah Yip
fit-winters-1c@icloud.com
74 Deming St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Maddie Min
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 10:47:11 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Maddie Min
maddiem2018@gmail.com
175 28th St. #2
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Willow Burke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 10:32:22 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Willow Burke
lillowillow@gmail.com
101 Webster St.
San Francisco , 94117

From: Fanilla Cheng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 10:26:34 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance presents as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave many people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Fanilla Cheng
fanilla.c@gmail.com
1090 Eddy St Apt 205
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Gabriel Goffman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 9:58:59 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Gabriel Goffman
gfgoffman@gmail.com
273 Frederick st
San Francisco , California 94117

From: George Kadifa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 9:58:12 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

George Kadifa
gpkadifa@gmail.com
4A Prospect Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Christopher Lamkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 9:17:00 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Christopher Lamkin
cjlamkin64@gmail.com
600 25th Ave Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Michael Mechmann
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 8:20:18 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Michael Mechmann
michael.mechmann@gmail.com
2776 21st St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Isa Stefan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 8:13:17 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Isa Stefan
alvatenebrae@gmail.com
1177 MARKET ST APT 1432
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94103

From: Hunter Kippen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 8:01:02 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Hunter Kippen
hunterkipt@gmail.com
1631 19th St
San Francisco, California 94107

From: Jenne Ristau
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 7:38:26 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I work with the homeless population everyday as a housing locator. This ordinance creates homelessness.

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for

lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jenne Ristau
Jenneristau@gmail.com
2195 30th Ave
San francisco, California 94116

From: Kate Agathos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 7:32:51 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Kate Agathos
kate.agathos@gmail.com
830 Sutter Street
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Rachel Ellenberger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 7:00:54 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Rachel Ellenberger
rachel.ellenberger@students.dominican.edu
485 7th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Molly Bodkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:59:32 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Molly Bodkin
myneighborollie@proton.me
1177 Market St, 1432
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Caitlin Stanton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:49:46 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Caitlin Stanton
caitlinstanton44@gmail.com
1995 Oak St
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Jeremy Llewellyn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:44:57 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jeremy Llewellyn
jeremy.llewellyn@gmail.com
1445 waller st
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Julian McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:40:08 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Julian McCarthy
jmccarthy0123@gmail.com
923 Folsom
San Francisco , California 94107

From: Carrie Leung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:28:48 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Carrie Leung
carrie.leung@gmail.com
1301 Fulton st apt 310
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Samantha Malpiedi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:14:00 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As a nonprofit worker, I have worked alongside San Franciscans transitioning out of homelessness and how difficult the battle is to get supportive housing in this city.

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for

lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Samantha Malpiedi
samantha.malpiedi@gmail.com
952 Guerrero
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jakub Swiadek
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 5:50:49 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jakub Swiadek
jakubswiadek@me.com
1474 45th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Jason Kruta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Vote No on: Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing (File No. 251003)
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 11:35:54 PM

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,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to vote no on the Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing ordinance (File No. 251003). This ordinance is being presented as an expansion of sober housing, a goal that San Franciscans across the political spectrum share. But it does not simply create a sober housing option. It prohibits city funding for any new Permanent Supportive Housing that does not adopt a sobriety-conditioned model, effectively blocking the creation of housing that keeps people off the streets. Sober housing can and should be expanded without restricting the Permanent Supportive Housing pipeline. This ordinance does the opposite, and it will leave people homeless.

This ordinance undermines Housing First, the evidence-based model that California has established as its standard for addressing homelessness. Housing First works because it treats stable housing as the foundation for recovery. A study of over 6,500 people across 86 California programs found that those with high fidelity to Housing First principles reduced days spent homeless by 87%, compared to just 34% in programs that deviated from the model. In San Francisco, 97% of PSH residents remain successfully housed. This ordinance moves the city away from a framework with a proven track record.

Overdose deaths in Permanent Supportive Housing are a crisis that demands serious response. But this ordinance misdiagnoses the cause. The City places its most vulnerable residents in PSH: people with severe substance use disorders, mental health conditions, and chronic health needs. A high overdose rate in that setting is not an indictment of the housing model. It is an indictment of uneven service provision across the portfolio. San Francisco PSH sites with peer-led overdose prevention programs are preventing deaths right now. Episcopal Community Services has implemented a successful Narcan floor captain program in its buildings that includes trained peer responders, onsite behavioral health services, and Narcan distribution. This ordinance does not require a single one of those interventions. Instead, it offers eviction.

PSH operators in San Francisco already evict tenants with extraordinary regularity and without meaningful accountability. Drug use that causes disruptive behavior is already grounds for lease enforcement. This ordinance does not solve a gap in the system. It hands publicly funded landlords another tool to cycle vulnerable tenants back to the street while collecting city contracts to do so. At the same time, it blocks the creation of new PSH during a period when

federal Continuum of Care funding faces cuts of up to $22 million and the Lurie administration has announced plans to close existing PSH buildings. The result is a bottleneck with no mechanism to address it: more people pushed out of housing, fewer units to take them in, and longer waitlists for everyone. Eviction does not lead to recovery. It severs people from services, pushes them beyond the reach of care, and increases their risk of overdose and death.

I ask you to vote no on File No. 251003.

Jason Kruta
jpkruta@gmail.com
712 Arguello Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

Item 17

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260178 - Transfer Tax - 17 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 12:54:52 PM
Attachments:	PC 10 - 260178 Transfer Tax - 17 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 17 Letters from members of the public, regarding:

> **File No. 260178:** Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to, for transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2026: halve the real property transfer tax rate from 5.5% to 2.75% when the consideration or value of the property conveyed equals or exceeds $10,000,000 but is less than $25,000,000, and from 6% to 3% when the consideration or value equals or exceeds $25,000,000; exempt from these reductions the transfer of single-family residences; reduce the penalties for delinquent real property transfer taxes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From:	Jessica Boswell
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); MahmoodStaff
Cc:	mindfuldestiny@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding
Date:	Sunday, April 19, 2026 9:07:14 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Bilal Mahmood and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over $10 million. 65.8% of District 5 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act (File No. 260178) as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,
Jessica Boswell
mindfuldestiny@gmail.com
District 5 resident

From:	Conor Quigley
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff
Cc:	conorq17@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:32:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Danny Sauter and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over $10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act (File No. 260178) as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,
Conor Quigley
1345 Lombard
conorq17@gmail.com
District 3 resident

From: Zade Vela
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:21:52 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn’t built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There’s a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that’s permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That’s what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Zade Vela
zadevela@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Michael Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 6:38:41 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,
J. Michael Johnson

Michael Johnson
michael.johnson.jd@gmail.com
129 Julian Ave
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Hannah Obanni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 2:34:19 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,
Hannah Obanni, NP

Hannah Obanni
hannahobanni@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Danielle Douglas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:51:44 AM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,
Danielle Douglas

Danielle Douglas
danielledouglas.producer@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

From: Carmen Kuan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:13:19 AM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Carmen Kuan
ashleyc.kuan@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Vance Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 10:39:32 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn’t built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There’s a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that’s permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That’s what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Vance Johnson
vancemigueljohnson@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94108

From: Charlotte Ashlock
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 9:12:43 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As someone who works full time in service of the unhoused people of San Francisco, I understand the importance of affordable housing deeply.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Ashlock
charlotte.ashlock@protonmail.com
600 Hillsborough
Oakland, California 94606-1010

From: William Rosentel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 6:53:19 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn’t built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There’s a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that’s permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That’s what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

William Rosentel
william.rosentel@pm.me

San Francisco, California 94114

From: Bjorn Myrum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 5:42:11 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn’t built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There’s a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that’s permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That’s what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Bjorn Myrum
cheesebjorn@hotmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Samuel Krauth
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 5:32:34 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,
Samuel Krauth

Samuel Krauth
samuelkrauth@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: Sarish Deotale
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 2:24:19 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Sarish Deotale
sarish.deotale@gmail.com
76 Sycamore St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: CoCo Robinson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 1:05:58 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn’t built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There’s a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that’s permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That’s what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

CoCo Robinson
cocorobinson@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: Thomas Kaar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 12:12:07 PM

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,

Hello I am Thomas, a working professional living in San Francisco. I spent almost all of my money in the city and I love SF.

Please oppose the BUILD ACT. We need more affordable housing in this city. We need more housing stock in SF. If we don't make housing more affordable even soft ware engineer working folks like me will have to move out to afford somewhere to live.

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Thomas Kaar

Thomas Kaar
thomkaar@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94158

From: AJ Snyder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 12:07:09 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,
AJ Snyder

AJ Snyder
mauls-cord0i@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: Laurel Michel-Schottman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Don"t Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 1:03:51 PM

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,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over $200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including $42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; $40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and $64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Laurel Michel-Schottman
Lmichels1993@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260302 - Barklee Sanders - 2 Letters
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:25:55 PM
Attachments:	260302 Barklee Sanders - 2 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from Barklee Sanders regarding:

> **File No. 260302:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to authorize the Public Utilities Commission to purchase utility infrastructure from customers that the Public Utilities Commission would otherwise be required to install, subject to specified conditions.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From:	Barklee Sanders
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Resident comment on File No. 260302 (SFPUC Section 99.5) — requesting amendments before Land Use hearing
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 12:59:47 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman and Office of Board President,

I am a resident of Treasure Island writing to ask that File No. 260302 — the proposed Section 99.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code — not advance out of committee without the amendments summarized below.

I have published a detailed resident analysis of the ordinance at:

https://www.treasureislandsfpoweroutages.com/blog#news-2026-04-15-sfpuc-99-5

I would welcome your office's notes, corrections, or additions — especially on any factual points where the analysis has misread the ordinance. My aim is an accurate, constructive record that makes the Committee hearing more useful, not a public attack on the sponsor.

My core concern: Section 99.5 exempts a new category of SFPUC transactions from Chapters 6 and 21 of the Administrative Code. Those are the competitive-bidding and Office of Contract Administration oversight chapters. They are the same chapters former SFPUC General Manager Harlan Kelly Jr. was convicted of circumventing in 2023. Four years after the federal honest-services-fraud conviction, the ordinance would legalize, prospectively, the procurement pathway the jury criminalized — with the added twist that the contractor-selection decision moves to a private developer, which may put that decision outside the reach of the statute Kelly was prosecuted under.

One point I want to be explicit about: the amendments below must apply to every single Section 99.5 transaction — $1 or $100 million. No dollar threshold, no "above $500,000" audit trigger, no "above $5 million" Board trigger, no General Manager discretion exemption for smaller contracts. Thresholds are exactly the escape hatch the Kelly prosecution showed gets abused: a favored contractor's work gets sliced into just-under-the-threshold change orders and the oversight never triggers. The only way to close that path is to apply the rules uniformly.

Specifically:

1. Independent third-party cost audit for every Section 99.5 transaction — no dollar-value exemption.
2. SFPUC approval of contractor selection before construction begins, not just reimbursement at the end — on every transaction.
3. Developer disclosure of contractor relationships — prior work, ownership, affiliated entities — on every transaction.
4. Ethics Commission filing for each Section 99.5 transaction — every transaction.
5. Sunset clause — three years, then Board reauthorization required.

6. Full Board of Supervisors approval for every Section 99.5 transaction — no minimum dollar threshold, no General Manager discretion carve-out.
7. Anti-kickback certification from developer and contractor under penalty of perjury — every transaction.
8. Preserve the workforce protections already in the ordinance.

Treasure Island has had 537+ documented power outages since 1997. We support cleaner ownership of new electric infrastructure here. We are not opposed to the structural intent of this ordinance. We simply cannot afford — literally, 2,000 residents on trust lands already $55.9 million in deficit cannot afford — a procurement model where the developer picks the contractor, the developer sets the price, and the SFPUC pays the bill on its own internal determination.

I would be glad to meet with your staff, provide any data I have on past outages, or revise the public analysis if I have any fact wrong. Please feel free to reply directly or share the link with colleagues.

Thank you for your time and your service.

Barklee Sanders
Treasure Island resident
barkleesanders@gmail.com

From: Barklee Sanders
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Supplement — credential on File 260302 (SFPUC CAC Power Subcommittee Chair, D6)
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 1:18:13 AM

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

Brief supplement to my email earlier today regarding File No. 260302 (SFPUC Section 99.5).

For accuracy and for the record, I should have identified myself in the capacity that bears directly on this ordinance:

I am the Chair of the SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) Power Subcommittee, representing District 6 — the same district that includes Treasure Island. The SFPUC CAC is the formal advisory body established under the San Francisco Charter to advise the SFPUC Commission, General Manager, and the Board of Supervisors on SFPUC policy and operational matters. The Power Subcommittee has direct subject-matter jurisdiction over the kind of SFPUC procurement exemption that Section 99.5 would authorize.

I am also a former Treasure Island resident (roughly five years).

Nothing in the analysis or the requested amendments changes. My concerns about Section 99.5 — that it reverses, without public notice, the post-Kelly joint oversight recommendations from the Controller, City Attorney, and Ethics Commission — are offered both as a former Treasure Island resident and in my CAC oversight capacity.

Full resident / CAC analysis:
https://www.treasureislandsfpoweroutages.com/blog#news-2026-04-15-sfpuc-99-5

Please treat this credential as an additional data point when deciding whether to weigh in at the Land Use & Transportation Committee hearing. The amendments I am asking for apply to every Section 99.5 transaction regardless of dollar value — no $500,000 audit threshold, no $5,000,000 Board threshold, no GM-discretion carve-out. Threshold triggers are the exact escape hatch the Kelly trial record showed gets sliced into just-under-threshold change orders.

Thank you for your time.

Barklee Sanders
Chair, SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee — Power Subcommittee (representing District 6)
Former Treasure Island resident
barkleesanders@gmail.com

Item 19

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Crocker Amazon - 16 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 1:41:55 PM
Attachments:	PC 12 - Crocker Amazon - 16 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 16 Letters from members of the public, regarding the renovation of Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From:	Christine Janis
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Artificial turf - Crocker Amazon and elsewhere
Date:	Saturday, April 18, 2026 9:33:08 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Commissioners, and Supervisors,

I am appalled that the city I have lived in and loved for the last 25 years is planning to install more artificial turf. I'm sure I don't need to inform you if its many issues and dangers, to people and the environment. We should be working to rid our city of this trash, not installing more for future generations to clean up.

If we can't lead the way on this issue, what city in America can?

Sincerely,
Christine Janis
SF district 3

From: Mary Fecher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: CROCKER AMAZON Baseball Fields
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 7:04:34 PM

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

I am writing to you to urge you to help us protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced in artificial turf baseball sports complex.

Synthetic grass is a public health issue according to the following agencies and experts:
Robert M. Gould, M.D. (President of the San Francisco Bay Area Physicians for Social Responsibility.
Dr. Louis Girling, Jr. a pediatrician who lives near Crocker Amazon park,
The following have called for a moratorium:
Mount Sinai Children's Environmental Health Center.
The California Medical Association
Bay Area Physician for Social Responsibility

Parents should be aware that their children may be exposed to hundreds of potentially harmful chemicals while playing on artificial turf!

San Francisco should ban it. It is very toxic and bad for the planet. We should be setting examples for the rest of the world like these places who have banned it:
The Netherlands
Eurpean Union
The city of Millbrae and San Marino
Massachusetts
Salt Lake City
Australia
Israel

There are Native grasses that can hold up to play and require less water.
It's would be a much safer long term investment to have natural grass. New bathrooms are needed anyway why not install sustainable bathrooms that use wather-saving technologies. Use rainwater harvesting.

It seems like a big waste to have to replace the green plastic every 8-10 years especially since it can not be recycled.

I get it! Kids want to play but this is NOT the right choice for them.

Thanks
Mary Fecher

From:	Kimberley West
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Crocker Amazon Park
Date:	Sunday, April 19, 2026 4:13:14 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,
I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.
Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.
Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.
We can and must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.
I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.
Sincerely,

Kim West

From:	Morgan Rossi
To:	john-baptiste@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Subject:	Crocker park
Date:	Sunday, April 19, 2026 4:24:09 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.

We can and must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically

managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

Sincerely,

Morgan Rossi

Sent from my iPhone

From: mary fecher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Fw: Crocker Amazon Park Renovation Plans
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 3:45:10 PM

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

I am writing to you to urge you to help us protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced in artificial turf baseball sports complex.

Synthetic grass is a public health issue according to the following agencies and experts:
Robert M. Gould, M.D. (President of the San Francisco Bay Area Physicians for Social Responsibility.
Dr. Louis Girling, Jr. a pediatrician who lives near Crocker Amazon park,
The following have called for a moratorium:
Mount Sinai Children's Environmental Health Center.
The California Medical Association
Bay Area Physician for Social Responsibility

Parents should be aware that their children may be exposed to hundreds of potentially harmful chemicals while playing on artificial turf!

San Francisco should ban it. It is very toxic and bad for the planet. We should be setting examples for the rest of the world like these places who have banned it:
The Netherlands
Eurpean Union
The city of Millbrae and San Marino
Massachusetts
Salt Lake City
Australia
Israel

There are Native grasses that can hold up to play and require less water.
It's would be a much safer long term investment to have natural grass. New bathrooms are needed anyway why not install sustainable bathrooms that use wather-saving technologies.
Use rainwater harvesting.

It seems like a big waste to have to replace the green plastic every 8-10 years especially since it can not be recycled.

I get it! Kids want to play but this is NOT the right choice for them.

Thanks
Mary Fecher

From:	Klea McKenna
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); FielderStaff
Subject:	Keep Crocker Amazon Natural!
Date:	Saturday, April 18, 2026 8:16:12 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I am writing because today my kids and I learned of the city plans to renovate Crocker Amazon Park and we are alarmed. We use the park often for my daughter's soccer games and I love that while she plays my son can explore and play in the natural parts of the park. I also walk my dog there and I always notice how much bird life there is and how beautiful the old Cypress trees are. Cutting them down will destroy much-needed habitat for birds and insects and will make the park more exposed to wind and sun with no shelter. Your plan sounds like you are treating the park as though it is just a sports facility, but in actuality it is crucial natural space in a neighborhood that has little of it and it is used for many different purposes. The sports fields are important, but when families come for the sports games they also need beauty and nature and open space to play.

My son River is 6 years old and this is his opinion:
I love the park because my friend and I have a fort in the wild part of the park and we play there while our sister's have soccer games. I would feel very sad if the trees were cut down.

My daughter Fiona is 11 years old and here is her opinion:
I love playing soccer and as an athlete I understand how important it is to have a good sports field. However, one of the things I love most about Crocker amazon is that while I play I have nature all around whereas other fields are often just an artificial place. Please don't take the open space, trees and beautiful meadows away.

We feel strongly that some improvements could be made but that a major renovation is not necessary or welcomed by the community. Please respect the needs of the people who already use this park.
Thank you for listening to the community. - Klea, River and Fiona

- Yes to meaningful community input.

- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.

- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.

- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth sports alike.

- Yes to adding picnic tables

- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.

- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-nightly bright field lighting.

- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.

- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.

--

KLEA McKENNA
Art www.kleamckenna.com
Process @klea_mckenna
Contact kleamckenna@gmail.com
Living and working on indigenous land of the Ohlone, Miwok and Pomo people.

From: Diane Mode Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: KEEP CROCKER REAL
Date: Friday, April 17, 2026 5:20:43 PM

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

Please don’t put plastic carpet over our beautiful natural park. Crocker Park has been a beautiful playground for so long and the trees are old growth. Have you ever been there? It smells so good. The air is fresh. Please don’t let them ruin it with plastic. My little dog will be so unhappy with so many others. This is just a sad sad idea on someone’s part.
I’ve lived in the neighborhood for 67 years my whole life and this Park has been an oasis
Sent from my iPhone

From:	Ian Montgomery
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR)
Date:	Sunday, April 19, 2026 7:32:40 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to significantly revise and improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a cherished public space, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. The current proposal—to remove more than 100 mature trees and replace natural grass meadows with a fenced, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex—would dramatically alter the character and accessibility of the park. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been linked to higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass.

I am convinced one day, we will look back at the amount of trees that have been killed by the city in the last few years with much horror.

This plan would also shift a broadly shared, multi-generational, and culturally diverse public space into a specialized facility serving a narrower group of users, limiting access for many who currently rely on the park.

Equally concerning are the environmental justice implications. Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same burdens as synthetic turf. The Recreation and Park Department has already concentrated approximately 85% of artificial turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and longstanding histories of racial and environmental inequities. As proposed, this project would raise that figure to nearly 90% of the city's total artificial turf acreage in historically underserved communities.

San Francisco can—and should—do better. Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid plastic pollution, and maintain an inclusive, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone.

Sincerely,

Ian Montgomery

--
Ian Montgomery

Pre-Future LLC
415.3416351



From:	liza kachko
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; WongStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff
Subject:	No to artificial turf at Crocker Amazon Park.
Date:	Sunday, April 19, 2026 2:37:43 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Commissioners, and Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park. Crocker Amazon is a city treasure enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. I ask that you prevent the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department from removing over 100 mature trees and converting natural grass meadows into a fenced, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and is associated with higher injury rates compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this multi-generational, multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility would fundamentally change the park's character and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Currently, approximately 85% of the city's synthetic turf is concentrated in neighborhoods with high asthma rates and histories of environmental inequity. This project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the city’s total artificial turf acreage within historically disenfranchised communities.

We must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields—similar to the improvements at West Sunset Playground—would preserve trees, avoid plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park.

Please prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone.

Sincerely,

Liza Kachko
San Francisco Resident
Sunset District

From:	Crystal W
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR)
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 1:40:07 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I am writing to urge you to protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced-in artificial turf sports complex.

The plan proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and team owner/Trump donor Charles B. Johnson is being framed as a "gift." However, many neighbors did not ask for this project and do not support paving over meadows, cutting down mature trees, and fencing off large portions of a beloved community park.

Artificial turf also raises serious concerns. Synthetic fields are associated with higher surface temperatures, increased injury rates compared to well-maintained natural grass, and exposure to toxins like PFAS and microplastics. It's particularly troubling that the majority of artificial turf installations have been clustered in neighborhoods already burdened by asthma and environmental justice challenges.

I strongly support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing so the right way:

- Yes to meaningful community input.
- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.
- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.
- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth sports alike.
- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.
- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-nightly bright field lighting.

- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.
- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.

Please stand with neighborhood residents and protect this city treasure. Invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access, not in plastic infrastructure that narrows and intensifies use.

Sincerely,

Crystal Wang

From: Celestina Pearl
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 12:51:26 PM

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

Subject: Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration

to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.

We can and must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

Sincerely,
Celestina Pearl

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Kathy o"brien
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR); ChenStaff
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 12:12:50 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park. I oppose any plan to use artificial turf made of plastics instead of natural turf.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, less well known than GG Park but beloved by so many including me. I live nearby and walk there often alone or with friends and enjoy watching my granddaughters play sports there.

Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.

I support plans that will preserve healthy trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution,

and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages. Again, I urge you to do the same.

I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

Sincerely,

Kathy O’Brien
Irishko9@gmail.com
A park neighbor who lives on Seville St

From:	Lily Wong
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR)
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 9:51:26 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I am writing to urge you to protect Crocker Amazon Park from a proposal that would replace its natural open space with a fenced-in artificial turf sports complex.

The plan proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department in partnership with the San Francisco Giants and team owner/Trump donor Charles B. Johnson is being framed as a "gift." However, many neighbors did not ask for this project and do not support paving over meadows, cutting down mature trees, and fencing off large portions of a beloved community park.

Artificial turf also raises serious concerns. Synthetic fields are associated with higher surface temperatures, increased injury rates compared to well-maintained natural grass, and exposure to toxins like PFAS and microplastics. It's particularly troubling that the majority of artificial turf installations have been clustered in neighborhoods already burdened by asthma and environmental justice challenges.

I strongly support renovating Crocker Amazon Park, but doing so the right way:

- Yes to meaningful community input.
- Yes to natural grass fields and open green space.
- Yes to preserving mature trees and the park's character.

- Yes to space for seniors, families, cricket players, dog walkers, and youth sports alike.
- No to expanding toxic artificial turf.
- No to increased traffic, noise, and late-nightly bright field lighting.
- No to privatization and fencing that limits access.

- No to cutting down the majority of existing trees.
- No to reducing dog walking space

Please stand with neighborhood residents and protect this city treasure. You need to come to the park and witness who all use it and the way it will be impacted. Come in the morning, come in the afternoon. Come on a weekday and a weekend. You'll be surprised to see what you find. Invest in improvements that enhance public health, environmental justice, and shared access, not in plastic infrastructure that narrows and intensifies use.

Sincerely,
Lily Wong

From:	Christian Dixon
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR)
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 7:25:03 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically disenfranchised communities.

We can and must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health,

advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

Sincerely,

Christian Dixon

From:	janet wu
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Commission, Recpark (REC)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR)
Subject:	Opposition to Artificial Turf for Crocker Amazon Ball Field Renovation
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:59:17 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to revise and substantially improve the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park.

Crocker Amazon is a city treasure, enjoyed by generations of San Franciscans. Please do not allow the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to cut down over 100 mature trees and convert natural grass meadows into a fenced-in, 20-acre artificial turf baseball complex. Artificial turf is petroleum-based, sheds microplastics, and has been associated with higher rates of ACL and Achilles injuries compared to well-maintained natural grass. Converting this shared, multi-generational and multi-ethnic public space into a specialized facility serving a narrow user group would fundamentally change the character of the park and limit access for many current users.

Organically managed natural grass fields do not carry the same environmental justice burdens as plastic turf. Rec & Park has already concentrated approximately 85% of its synthetic turf installations in neighborhoods with the highest asthma rates and a documented history of racial and environmental inequities. As currently proposed, this project would increase that concentration to roughly 90% of the City's total artificial turf acreage in historically

disenfranchised communities.

We can and must do better. Investing in high-quality, organically managed natural grass fields, similar to the improvements made at West Sunset Playground, would preserve trees, avoid unnecessary plastic pollution, and maintain a welcoming, multi-use park for residents of all ages.

I ask that you prioritize a renovation plan that protects public health, advances environmental justice, preserves mature trees, and keeps Crocker Amazon a park for everyone, young and old.

i really enjoy to walk around the park with my family. please do not turn the park into a plastic park. people cannot enjoy the nature with the fences.

plus there is already so much traffic and unable to find any parking space in the neighborhood. we already struggles enough for that. we do not want anymore traffic or noise to affect our peacefull neighborhood. thank you

Sincerely,

Janet Wu

From: Justice Alcantar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support the Crocker Amazon Renovation
Date: Thursday, April 23, 2026 9:55:18 AM

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

Hello Supervisors,

My name is Justice Alcantar, current D11 resident/lifetime resident of San Francisco. I am writing today to express my strong support and the extreme need for the proposed renovation at Crocker Amazon not only as a D11 resident, but also as someone who has played on these fields since my chubby toddler hands could pick up a baseball.

I have played baseball at Crocker Amazon my entire life, and have been coaching the country's largest publicly funded girl's baseball program (the San Francisco Bay Sox) at the very fields I have spent countless days and nights at as a player, experiencing the same issues that have just worsened over time. The sports complex has objectively been decaying over the past decade.

The fields are frequently out of commission several days after initial rainfall and closure announcements leading to increasingly more and more missed games and practices that are intrinsic to our players' development. During the 2024 SFYBL season, **we lost 48% (57 days)** of practice & game time at Crocker Amazon due to weather closure. For my all girl's baseball team whose home field has always been Crocker, where we hold year round clinics/practices/games for girls, this was (and is) an absolute detriment to player development and team building. It is difficult enough as it is to be the only girls on the field, so getting objectively less practice time than other teams negatively impacts their confidence even further.

I am currently volunteering 4 days a week coaching two all-girls baseball teams that play in the San Francisco Youth Baseball League (SFYBL) on top of working a full time job because I love how much joy it brings the kids to get out there and be active and social, something that is becoming increasingly difficult to get them to be into in this digital age. It is frustrating for me and the players I coach that at the slightest bit of rainfall we have to continually refresh RPD's field closure website all the way up until game time just to be told that the field is not playable and will continue to not be for several days.

Throughout my entire time using this sports complex (roughly 25 years) I have not only been injured on account of the gopher/pot holes/cracks, but I have also seen countless of my players injured as well. The neglect of Crocker Amazon is something that needs to be

addressed. I am acutely aware that the city's gardeners are spread too thin and do their best with the resources and quality of facilities they have. But we have seen so many successful field renovations across the city (West Sunset/Palega/Kimbell etc.) so it is confusing to me why improving the safety & usability of a massive sports facility that is home to 29 different teams & organizations throughout the city is not an easy decision.

At this point, I frankly do not care if the field is turf or grass because at the end of the day it has needed renovation for decades and the kids just need a safe and reliable place to play. Again, we have seen successful field renovations with both grass and turf fields with facilities like West Sunset and Kimbell, so why not Crocker? I understand the environmental concerns listed out by community organizations but if they used the Crocker Amazon baseball fields for their intended purpose, I strongly believe they would have more empathy for what the youth have to deal with on a daily basis. With respect to the community concerns about the fields being fenced off, they already are and should continue to be to ensure that they are playable. It is unfair to my players that I have to take time out of our already brief 60min practice to ask dog owners not to let their dogs off leash in the middle of our practice.

I would also like to note that there is **13.6 million square feet of McLaren Park** accessible by a 2 minute walk from Crocker Amazon's entrance. This is also an amazing park where the community can gather, enjoy nature, and let their dogs off leash.

Please give this project a fighting chance. The community of District 11 deserve an outdoor space that is not riddled with cracks, holes and decaying facilities, and the youth of San Francisco deserve safe and reliable fields to cultivate their joy for organized sports and community building. Please do not let a loud minority of angry individuals, many of whom are not using the sports complex for its intended purpose, outweigh the needs of our city, its youth, and the 29 athletic programs who rely on this field regularly. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Verdi Building (659 Union Street) - 4 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 1:53:21 PM
Attachments:	PC 13 - Verdi Building_659 Union Street.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 4 Letters from members of the public, regarding the Verdi Building (659 Union Street).

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From:	Jill Bittner
To:	ChanStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; SherrillStaff; WongStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Appeal No. 26-019 at 659 Union Street
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 4:04:04 AM

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

Appeal No. 26-019 at 659 Union Street

The amount of self-enriching, dirty-dealings in North Beach and fleecing of San Francisco that our supervisor has been consistently attempting to shove through, out-of-sight from public scrutiny, is outrageous. The scam he is trying to pull with the historic Verdi building is an incredible injustice to our community and all of San Francisco. The historic Verdi building had 28 rent-controlled units and no construction should be considered for its location that does not include the same affordable housing that allows the fire-displaced tenants to return. And whatever is built should certainly be in character with the neighborhood and not a behemoth 8-story luxury housing development in place of the 2-story Verdi building.

These kinds of backroom, dirty deals, finagling the sale of rent-control properties in our district to the highest paying developer or contributor to his political ambitions have become a pattern for our supervisor. I was just at City Hall 2 weeks ago arguing against the illegal conversion of a 4-unit rent-controlled property into a single-family mansion. And that’s just one of many examples of how he continues to contrive selling off our neighborhood piece by piece to the highest bidder. Our supervisor is a wolf in sheep’s clothing. He pretends to be an affordable housing advocate. Yet he’s repeatedly setting dangerous precedents for destroying affordable rent-controlled housing in North Beach that has precedential implications for all of San Francisco. He is a festering sore actively wounding North Beach and the wounds he is inflicting in our community will have a legacy of destruction for the entire City. He doesn’t care about affordable housing, North Beach or San Francisco. He only cares about real estate, lining his pockets, the pockets of his developer buddies and his bro-mance alliances with Lurie, Weiner and their greedy motivations. IF the back room, dirty deal development he has planned for the Verdi building location is allowed to proceed for any reason, you are setting a very dangerous precedent. Don’t give him what he wants—to tear down all restrictions for development in SF, because that’s his goal. What he has planned for the Verdi building is NOT affordable housing and against what the community has already agreed on for that location. If you approve this project, each of you will be at fault for the ruin of our beloved San Francisco. And we’ll all know where your convictions lie in the next election.

From:	Philip Millenbah
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject:	Appeal of Demolition of Building Façade at 659 Union Street
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 3:05:14 PM

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

April 20, 2026

RE: Appeal of Demolition of Building Façade at 659 Union Street

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to respectfully urge the Board to deny the pending appeal regarding the demolition of the building façade at 659 Union Street. This matter is one of urgent public safety and warrants your immediate action.

The structure, in its current condition, poses a significant and ongoing risk to the health and safety of pedestrians, residents, and visitors who pass through this area daily. The deteriorated façade is at risk of collapse and, as a result, its continued presence is not compatible with the City's commitment to pedestrian safety.

I was present on the night of the fire and, at that time, fully expected that the property would be promptly addressed — both out of necessity for public safety and in recognition of the economic vitality of the North Beach neighborhood. Regrettably, that has not occurred. There is no compelling justification for the façade to remain standing, and further delay only compounds the risk to the surrounding community.

The City has made meaningful strides in recent years to prioritize pedestrian safety. Allowing this hazardous structure to remain undermines those efforts and sends an inconsistent message to residents and business owners who depend on safe, well-maintained streetscapes.

I respectfully request that the Board deny the appeal and authorize the prompt demolition of the façade at 659 Union Street. Doing so is consistent with the City's obligations to protect public safety and to honor the trust of the residents it serves.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Millenbah

829 Lombard St., San Francisco

From:	Kathy Howard
To:	BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Cc:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); SauterStaff; CPC-Commissions Secretary; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support - Appeal No.: 26-019
Date:	Monday, April 20, 2026 2:08:28 PM

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

Dear President Trasvina and Board Members,

Please revoke the demolition permit for 659 Union Street/1636 Powell Street and require the Project Sponsor to preserve the building facade that faces the intersection at Washington Square, as outlined in the Appeal.

It is a sad comment on our current City government that public was kept in the dark over the plans to demolish this building. It is shameful that the people who are supposed to fight for and protect the beauty of San Francisco seem to be so intent on destroying the very features that make our City attractive not only to those of us who live here but also to visitors, who come to enjoy the uniqueness of our architecture and, incidentally, help to shore up our economy with their dollars.

The Board of Appeals is our defense against this kind of destruction and wonton disregard of the process that is in place to support sensible and fair planning practices.

Please support this appeal and revoke the misleading demolition permit. Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Howard
Outer Sunset

From:	Daniel Ma
To:	BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Stuart Watts; Aaron Peskin; Aaron Peskin
Subject:	Support for Appeal to SAVE THE VERDI BUILDING!
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 2:23:06 PM

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

Attention SF Board Of Appeals,

Please be aware that several years ago in 2023 owners along with their developers of the burned out Verdi Building requested to attend one of our North Beach Business Association Board Meetings and make a presentation about rebuilding the Verdi Building. At that time and in our meeting they presented their plans which also included the addition of a small restaurant on the roof in an area of the building which would have no negative impact on surrounding views nor cast any shadows on Washington Square park. The plan looked very good. We welcomed their commitment to restore the historic character of the building, re-establish both former tenants and businesses in it particularly since the building has been a burned out shell for many years since the fire that destroyed its interior in 2013. We voted unanimously to support their plan as they said they needed community support to go forward with various city departments to permit and begin work as soon as possible.

However, years have now passed without any action to actually rebuild the building. Now they are claiming, without any proof, that the outer facade of the building is “unsafe” so they want to tear it down destroying the original historic architecture and build a high-rise high cost condo building excluding former rent controlled units and their tenants along with the original small businesses in it. It is now clear that the owners and their developer were and are disingenuous and have betrayed their original reconstruction plans for new ones which are based upon greed, excluding former neighborhood and commercial tenants along with any pretense of preserving the character and culture of our North Beach Commercial district and neighborhood as seen in our existing neighborhood architecture.

Please support the Appeal before you to stop the complete demolition of our Verdi Building and preservation the culture and character of our North Beach reflected in our historic architecture.

Thank You,

Daniel Macchiarini
Macchiarini Creative Design
SF Legacy Business in our 78th year
Board Member and Passed President
North Beach Business Association

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: URGENT: Severe Safety Loophole & E-Bike Fleet Accountability (Hit-and-Run Incident)
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:39:21 PM
Attachments:	HMP_Bikes_Refusal_to_Cooperate_2.png HMP_BIikes_Refusal_to_Cooperate_1.png

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and the below communication from Tim Zhang and Alice Kim, regarding E-Bike traffic safety.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Kim Chungji <alicekim0327@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 9:14 AM
To: VisionZeroSF@sfmta.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: info@sfbike.org; metrodesk@sfchronicle.com
Subject: URGENT: Severe Safety Loophole & E-Bike Fleet Accountability (Hit-and-Run Incident)

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

To Whom It May Concern at SFMTA Vision Zero, SF Board of Supervisors, and SF Bicycle Coalition,

I am writing to urgently bring your attention to a critical public safety and regulatory loophole regarding commercial e-bike rental fleets operating in San Francisco.

On April 12, 2026, around 2:43 PM, our parked vehicle was sideswiped by a delivery rider operating a 415 E-Bikes fleet moped near the Chinatown Tunnel (Stockton St). The entire incident, including the rider fleeing the scene without leaving any information, was clearly captured on our vehicle's Sentry Mode camera.

We contacted SFPD, but without a visible license plate or ID on the e-bike, they advised us to

resolve it with the fleet operator. However, when we contacted 415 E-Bikes with the exact time, location, and a clear description of the rider, they flatly refused to cooperate. Their response stated that because they are "merely a rental provider," they do not track their riders, hold no liability, and will hide behind privacy laws unless legally forced by a subpoena.

What makes this even more distressing is that this vehicle had just been repaired following a separate rear-end incident two months ago. Now, due to the complete lack of accountability from fleet operators, we are forced to pay another deductible and lose more time for repairs that were no fault of our own. This is not just a personal financial burden; it is a clear example of how innocent citizens are paying the price for the city's failure to regulate these unidentified commercial e-bikes.

However, this goes beyond just property damage.
This is where our deepest concern lies, and why we are reporting this to you: If this hit-and-run had involved a pedestrian, a child, or an elderly person resulting in severe injury or even death, this rental company would use the exact same excuse to wash their hands of any responsibility.

This means that fleet operators are putting unidentifiable, fast-moving motor vehicles on our city streets without any accountability mechanism. Delivery riders know that since the bikes lack visible license plates and the rental companies shield their identities, they can flee any accident scene with impunity. **This is a tragedy waiting to happen, and it could happen to anyone: your family, your friends, or yourself.**

As long as rental companies are allowed to operate under these zero-accountability policies, SF's Vision Zero goals cannot be achieved. We strongly urge the city to mandate that:

1. All commercial e-bike rental fleets must display visible, unique identification numbers (like license plates).
2. Fleet operators must be legally required to cooperate with law enforcement and insurance requests in the event of a hit-and-run.

We have attached the video footage of the incident and the email correspondence with 415 E-Bikes for your review. We hope this incident serves as a wake-up call to close this dangerous loophole before it costs human lives.

Thank you for your time and dedication to keeping San Francisco streets safe.

Sincerely,

Tim Zhang & Alice Kim
timmyzhang8@gmail.com

Hit_And_Run_Video_Evidence.mp4

HMP BIKES 9:30 AM (3 hours ago)

to me

Hello,

Thank you for your message. We have reviewed the situation you described.

Regarding the nature of our business: 415 E-Bikes operates solely as a retailer and short-term rental provider of electric bicycles. Once an e-bike is rented out, it is managed and operated entirely by the renter. We do not participate in renters' activities, do not operate any delivery services, and do not employ, dispatch, or manage riders.

Regarding your information request: We do not operate a delivery dispatch system and have no rider shift records or related operational management mechanisms. Based solely on the time, location, and general appearance described, we are unable to identify a specific e-bike or individual within our existing records, nor can we confirm any relationship between the person described and our company.

Regarding privacy: All customer information is protected under applicable privacy laws. Should the relevant law enforcement authority or your insurance carrier submit a formal request through proper legal channels, we will cooperate in accordance with the law.

Additionally, if the rider was operating through a third-party delivery platform such as DoorDash or Uber Eats at the time of the incident, those platforms may have records of active deliveries in that area. You may wish to contact them directly as an additional avenue of inquiry.

Otherwise, we recommend resolving this matter through your insurance carrier, and we will respond accordingly upon receipt of any formal request.


[DISCLAIMER] The contents of this communication are provided as factual information only and do not constitute an admission of liability or a waiver of any legal rights.


Best regards,

HMP BIKES

Get Outlook for Mac

...


Sun, Apr 12, 2026 14:43:29
Sun, Apr 12, 2026
2KLX579
SFMTA
15
1x
15


PASSENGER
AIRBAG ON
Sun, Apr 12, 2026

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Formal Notice: Disparagement of Non-HVNA/MC Members
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 2:31:13 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Hayes Valley Safe (HVS), regarding the proposed weekly farmers market on the 400 block of Hayes Street.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: HVS <team@hvsafe.com>
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2026 2:59 PM
To: Tang, Katy (ECN) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; DPW, (DPW) <dpw@sfdpw.org>; FireAdministration, FIR (FIR) <fireadministration@sfgov.org>; McCormick, Patrick (POL) <Patrick.McCormick@sfgov.org>; SFPD Northern Station, (POL) <sfpdnorthernstation@sfgov.org>; Silva, Christine (MTA) <Christine.Silva@sfmta.com>; Simpliciano, Sophia (MTA) <Sophia.Simpliciano@sfmta.com>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; MTABoard <MTABoard@sfmta.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Polselli, Angelina (MYR) <angelina.polselli@sfgov.org>; Sider, Dan (CPC) <dan.sider@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; True, Judson (MTA) <Judson.True@sfmta.com>; Thompson, Marianne (ECN) <marianne.thompson@sfgov.org>; MYR Comm Affairs Staff <moca@sfgov.org>; Garcia, Moises (MYR) <moises.garcia@sfgov.org>; Jones, Ej (MYR) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>; Mayor, MYR (MYR) <mayor@sfgov.org>
Cc: team <team@hvsba.org>
Subject: Re: Formal Notice: Disparagement of Non-HVNA/MC Members

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

Attention: City Agencies and Staff

We are writing to provide a brief supplemental update to our February 5, 2026 notice regarding patterns of exclusionary engagement and overreliance on HVNA/HVMC affiliated channels in neighborhood decision-making.

A newly proposed weekly farmers market on the 400 block of Hayes Street, currently under review through the ISCOTT process, reflects the same concerns previously raised. Specifically, this proposal is being actively advanced through HVNA/HVMC channels, as reflected in recent merchant communications circulated yesterday, rather than through a broad, corridor-wide engagement process. Many affected businesses and residents were not aware of the proposal until public notice was posted.

Concerns raised by multiple corridor businesses indicate that the existing closure has already created challenges, and that this proposal would further compound those impacts. This follows the pattern described in our prior notice, where a narrow set of affiliated actors function as de facto intermediaries in shaping neighborhood initiatives, while other stakeholders are excluded from early-stage input and decision-making.

We provide this as a supplemental record to ensure that City agencies are aware that the concerns outlined in our February notice remain active and are continuing to manifest in current proposals affecting Hayes Valley.

We would expect that any proposal of this scale, particularly one affecting an active commercial corridor and layered onto existing conditions, be evaluated with broader stakeholder input and independent consideration beyond a single affiliated channel.

Participation in matters related to the Hayes Street closure has, in at least one instance, escalated into legal action initiated by parties involved in the closure's operation that was not sustained, contributing to a chilling effect on broader public participation. At the same time, ISCOTT approvals do not provide a meaningful avenue for appeal. In that context, ensuring inclusive, balanced stakeholder input at the outset is particularly important.

The existing Hayes Street closure is currently under formal administrative complaint with SFMTA, and advancing additional recurring uses during that process further compounds those impacts without a resolution. There has been no visible broader engagement or response from City agencies following the concerns raised in our February 5 notice. This lack of coordination or outreach, combined with continued reliance on a narrow set of affiliated channels, raises further concerns about whether stakeholder input is being gathered and considered in a balanced manner.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
-HVS

On Thursday, February 5th, 2026 at 3:25 PM, HVS <team@hvsafe.com> wrote:

> Hayes Valley Community - Formal Notice
> Regarding: Pattern of Disparaging and Delegitimizing Communications by HVNA/MC

Affiliated Actors to City Agencies

This notice is shared for record and awareness; no response is required.

This notice is issued on behalf of Hayes Valley Safe (HVS) and affected residents and small businesses in Hayes Valley.

For several years, City agencies have engaged with the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association and related merchant entities (HVNA/MC) as primary and often exclusive interlocutors for neighborhood matters. During this period, we have documented a recurring and escalating pattern in which individuals affiliated with HVNA/MC have transmitted disparaging, accusatory, and delegitimizing characterizations of non-HVNA/MC residents, merchants, and civic participants to City officials and staff.

These communications have included, but are not limited to:

- portraying non-HVNA/MC stakeholders as “negative,” “failing,” or acting in “bad faith”
- characterizing routine civic participation, documentation, or inquiry as “harassment” or “obstruction”
- questioning the legitimacy or motives of residents and businesses who do not align with HVNA/MC positions
- framing parallel civic organizing as improper or harmful rather than as protected participation

This notice follows a formal communication sent to City agencies in March 2021 that raised concerns about exclusionary engagement practices and the treatment of non-HVNA stakeholders. At that time, we requested broader, more balanced engagement. The issues identified then have not only persisted, but intensified.

This pattern is not speculative. It is documented through contemporaneous emails, disclosures, and correspondence now in the public domain. In multiple instances, the same individuals have communicated with City agencies while representing or speaking on behalf of HVNA/MC, reinforcing a consolidated and exclusionary gatekeeping role rather than distinct or independent stakeholder representation. The effect has been cumulative and damaging.

This conduct crosses an important line.

When disparaging characterizations are conveyed privately to City agencies by a favored neighborhood organization, they do not remain mere opinion.

They shape:

- access to meetings and decision-makers
- whose input is treated as credible or dismissible

- which stakeholders are included or excluded from public process

- how opposition is framed and discounted before it is heard

City agencies have an independent obligation to ensure fair, inclusive, and evidence-based engagement. Allowing one private organization to repeatedly undermine the standing of other community members without independent judgment or balance compromises that obligation and corrodes public trust.

For context, during the prior supervisory administration, concerns raised by HVS and non-HVNA/MC stakeholders were met with direct, respectful engagement, demonstrating that inclusive and balanced process was both possible and practiced. Under the current supervisory administration, by contrast, exclusionary practices have been tolerated and, in some instances, reinforced through continued reliance on disparaging representations from HVNA/MC-affiliated actors.

We are therefore formally placing City agencies on notice of the following:

1. **This pattern exists and is documented**. It is not an isolated incident. It reflects a sustained governance failure affecting representation and process integrity.
2. **Disparagement transmitted to City staff has real consequences**. These communications have influenced participation, access, and outcomes in matters of public policy, permitting, and neighborhood planning.
3. **Continued reliance on HVNA/MC as a singular or privileged voice is no longer tenable**. Doing so in the face of documented exclusionary and delegitimizing behavior is reckless and inconsistent with public-interest obligations.
4. **City agencies must exercise independent judgment**. Assertions about community consensus, stakeholder legitimacy, or motive must be evaluated critically and corroborated, not accepted at face value based on organizational proximity or convenience.

5.

This notice is issued to document and correct an ongoing governance failure that has distorted civic process in Hayes Valley for years. The resulting harm to small businesses, residents, and public trust has been significant and preventable.

We expect City agencies to:

- cease treating HVNA/MC communications as presumptively representative

- ensure equitable engagement with all affected stakeholders

- refrain from relying on disparaging characterizations in decision-making

- and take active steps to restore fair process going forward

This notice is public because the consequences have been public.

Final note:
It is particularly important to note that HVNA/MC operate as funded nonprofit entities, supported through grants, sponsorships, memberships, and event revenues. By contrast, many affected residents and small business stakeholders including HVS participate without compensation, funding, or institutional support, engaging in civic advocacy on a volunteer basis and at personal cost. HVS emerged during COVID as exclusionary decision-making intensified across neighborhood governance, leaving everyday residents and small businesses without any independent, unfunded civic voice willing or able to question process, representation, and accountability. What began as a response to exclusion has grown into sustained, policy-focused civic participation centered on process integrity and fair representation. When City agencies rely primarily on funded nonprofit intermediaries as the default or preferred community voice, they risk entrenching a structural imbalance that excludes unpaid participants from meaningful representation. Fair process requires heightened care to ensure that access, credibility, and participation are not determined by organizational funding or proximity to City resources.

Respectfully,
Hayes Valley Safe (HVS)

Item 22

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	Hargobind Khlasa - 2 Letters
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 1:40:54 PM
Attachments:	Hargobind Khalsa - 2 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from Hargobind Khalsa, regarding various subjects.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Hargobind Khalsa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 12:01:29 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://eBikeSF.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzphNmVlZmE2MmYxZDJhMGU3ZDYwYjk4ZTYyOWUxNDFlZDo3OjRkNTk6ZGI1ZjAwNWUyNDhlNWE5MTZjZTY2NzBiZTA0ZWMxYTg4MTU0YTlmZmEwN2JkZTliMWE0OWY3NGFmNTE0ZWM2YTp0OlQ6Tg.

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Hargobind Khalsa
khalsa.h.1112@gmail.com
750A Central Ave
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Hargobind Khalsa
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please install protected bike lanes on Arguello Boulevard immediately alongside other sustainable transportation infrastructure improvements…
Date:	Sunday, April 19, 2026 12:02:09 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support the installation of protected bike lanes on Arguello Boulevard between Fulton Street and Washington Boulevard immediately, alongside other sustainable transportation infrastructure improvements. Protected bike lanes are proven to increase safety for all people, including drivers and especially people on bikes, and will help San Francisco address our roadway safety crisis and the climate crisis while moving the City towards its goals for Vision Zero and sustainable mode share.

The tragic death of USA Cycling champion Ethan Boyes and the critical injury of a 16-year-old boy on Arguello Boulevard are a stark reminder of what can — and will — happen on streets without protected bike lanes and why we need to install protected bike lanes across our city to reduce roadway deaths, car traffic, and pollution and increase sustainable mode share and climate action.

I urge you to support the installation of protected bike lanes and other sustainable transportation infrastructure improvements on Arguello Boulevard and do everything within your power to ensure these improvements are installed immediately.

Thank you,

Hargobind Khalsa
khalsa.h.1112@gmail.com
750A Central Ave
San Francisco, California 94117

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Formal Complaint: Public Exposure Near Ferry Building – Family Safety Concerns
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 10:01:48 AM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Lamia Elkhatib, regarding recreational use of bikes.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Lamia Elkhatib <lamia.elkhatib.coach@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 18, 2026 10:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Formal Complaint: Public Exposure Near Ferry Building – Family Safety Concerns

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 writing to express my deep concern and disappointment regarding an incident I witnessed today, Saturday, April 18th, around 12:30 PM near the Ferry Building.

While I was enjoying a weekend outing with my young children, we were suddenly confronted by a large group of completely naked cyclists. This was a shocking and distressing experience for my children, who should be able to visit San Francisco's historic landmarks and family-friendly areas without being exposed to such inappropriate displays.

While I understand the city's commitment to freedom of expression, there

must be a balance that protects families and children. Allowing such events to take place in broad daylight in high-traffic, family-oriented tourist zones is unacceptable.

I urge the city to reconsider the routing and timing of these demonstrations to ensure they do not overlap with areas frequented by families. Our children deserve to feel safe and comfortable in public spaces.

I look forward to hearing how the city plans to address these concerns and better regulate such displays in the future.

Sincerely,
Lamia Elkhatib

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Request for Car Safety in SF and SoMa
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 10:33:32 AM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Try Suddaby, regarding pedestrian safety.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Trey Suddaby <wesuddaby@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 18, 2026 1:28 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Request for Car Safety in SF and SoMa

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

Dear SF Supervisors,

I'm writing as a resident of SoMa to raise a pedestrian safety concern that feels increasingly urgent.

I think all areas in SoMa need wider sidewalks and much wider crosswalks. Many of our streets prioritize vehicle throughput over pedestrian safety. It's common to see four lanes dedicated to cars, while sidewalks remain narrow and crosswalks are so tight that vehicles routinely block them while trying to make lights.

This creates a daily safety hazard. Especially for our families Drivers frequently stop in the middle of crosswalks, forcing pedestrians into traffic and reducing visibility for everyone. The current design effectively encourages this behavior.

I would strongly encourage the City to prioritize:

Wider sidewalks throughout SoMa

- Significantly wider, more visible crosswalks
- Daylighting and curb extensions to prevent vehicles from encroaching into crossings

These changes would not require heavy enforcement but would instead use street design to naturally slow traffic and create safer separation between people and cars.

San Francisco has committed to Vision Zero, and this feels like a clear opportunity to align street design with that goal. Even incremental changes throughout SoMa would make a meaningful difference.

I would appreciate information on any planned improvements, and how residents can support prioritizing these upgrades.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Trey Suddaby

SF Homeowner will a Family

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); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Public Comment for BOS File No. 260407
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 11:14:59 AM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Angellynn Tam with the San Francisco Asian Women's Shelter (SFAWS), regarding:

> **File No. 260407:** Resolution recognizing the month of April 2026 as "National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month" in the City and County of San Francisco.

Sincerely,

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

From: angellynn t <angellynn@sfaws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:36 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment for BOS File No. 260407

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 angellynn tam and I am the Youth Intimate Partner Violence Prevention Coordinator at San Francisco Asian Women's Shelter (SFAWS). I am writing to express my strong support for BOS File No. 260407, the resolution in recognizing April 2026 as National Sexual Assault and Prevention Month.

At SFAWS, we see firsthand the critical importance of city-wide recognition. Formally acknowledging this month sends a powerful message to survivors of all ages -- especially our youth between ages 12-25 -- that they are seen, supported, and their safety is a priority for the City and County of San Francisco.

However, recognition is only the first step. Prevention work is rooted in education. To truly address sexual assault and the many forms of violence, we must ensure that educators and community organizations have the resources to foster long-term awareness and safety.

I urge the Board to ensure that this commitment to survivors is reflected through concrete support in the city's budget and funding. Ultimately, investing in prevention is an investment in our youth and community members, ensuring they are protected from experiencing violence before it ever begins.

Thank you for your leadership and for your dedication to a safer, more proactive San Francisco.

in community,
angellynn tam (she/her) || 譚依琳
youth intimate partner violence prevention coordinator
San Francisco Asian Women's Shelter (SFAWS)
Office: 415-751-7110 ext. 335. **Crisis**: 415-751-0880
www.sfaws.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication, including any attachments, is privileged and/or confidential information and is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, interception, review, disclosure, distribution, or other use is strictly prohibited and may violate applicable laws. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender and promptly delete all copies, electronic or otherwise that you may have. The foregoing applies even if this notice is embedded in a message that is forwarded or attached. Thank you.

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	File No. 260281 - Cannabis Cafes - 3 Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 1:58:54 PM
Attachments:	PC 20 - 260281 Cannabis Cafe - 3 Letters.pdf

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 Letters from members of the public, regarding:

> **File No. 260281:** Ordinance amending the Health, Planning, Police, and Business and Tax Regulations Codes to establish a new permit type for cannabis cafés to be administered by the Office of Cannabis that will authorize the permittee to sell cannabis and cannabis products only for consumption on the premises of the café; exempt cannabis cafés from the prohibition on smoking in business establishments; eliminate the prohibition on establishments with a cannabis consumption permit requiring employees to enter a designated smoking room as a condition of employment; exempt cannabis cafés in certain circumstances from the 600-foot buffer rule that applies to cannabis retail establishments; restrict eligibility for cannabis café permits for one year to businesses that currently hold a cannabis storefront retailer permit or that have the same owners as such a business; require Equity Applicants that apply for a cannabis café permit to pay the $2,000 application fee, any permit amendment processing costs, and the $3,000 license fee for the first year of operation, associated with the cannabis café permit; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From:	Kevin Reed
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; WongStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Subject:	Clarification to Prior Comments on Cannabis Café Proposal
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 11:26:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing briefly to clarify one point from my previous email to ensure the record is accurate.

In referencing recent news coverage, I noted what appeared to be a shift in perspective from another operator. That individual has since clarified that he remains supportive of the cannabis café proposal. I want to make sure his position is accurately reflected.

This clarification does not change my concerns.

My position remains that, given current market conditions, expanding into additional license types risks further destabilizing an already saturated and fragile cannabis retail environment—particularly for small and equity operators.

I appreciate your consideration and continued attention to the broader impacts of this proposal.

Respectfully,

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026 at 5:16 PM Kevin Reed <kevinreed@thegreencross.org> wrote:

> Dear Supervisors,
>
> I'm writing again—and I know you're likely as tired of hearing from me as I am of having to send these—but this café issue is too important, and affects too many people, for me to stay quiet.
>
> I'm reaching out specifically because of the news coverage yesterday. In it, you can see what appears to be a once-supportive dispensary owner now expressing concern about this proposal. That shift should matter. It reflects a deeper realization happening across the industry.
>
> There is also a misunderstanding being amplified: State law already allows dispensaries to sell non-cannabis items like water, snacks, and similar products—they simply need to be labeled and handled correctly. The idea that this café

proposal is needed to “unlock” that kind of offering is not accurate.

Which brings us back to the bigger issue.

The headline sounds great. “Cannabis cafés” feels progressive and easy to support. But this is not Amsterdam. In Amsterdam, those cafés work because they are the primary access point for cannabis. They are not layered on top of an already oversaturated retail market—they *are* the market.

San Francisco already has more than 70 licensed dispensaries. Many are struggling. Many have closed. Equity operators are especially vulnerable.

This proposal does not create new demand—it divides existing demand.

From where we stand, this will:

- Pull revenue away from existing licensed operators
- Accelerate closures
- Undermine equity businesses
- Further destabilize an already fragile market

I’ll say it plainly: this is not the moment to expand the number of licensees. It’s the moment to stabilize the ones we already have.

There are far more urgent priorities that would actually support the cannabis ecosystem in San Francisco:

- Enforcement against illegal operators
- Reducing the tax burden
- Supporting struggling equity businesses
- Completing the Controller’s economic impact analysis before introducing new market pressures

I urge you to take a step back and fully consider the downstream impact here. The small businesses on the ground are telling you clearly—this will do more harm than good.

Respectfully,

--

Kevin Reed
Founder & President
The Green Cross

415.846.7671
KevinReed@TheGreenCross.org
TheGreenCross.org



Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing again—and I know you're likely as tired of hearing from me as I am of having to send these—but this café issue is too important, and affects too many people, for me to stay quiet.

I'm reaching out specifically because of the news coverage yesterday. In it, you can see what appears to be a once-supportive dispensary owner now expressing concern about this proposal. That shift should matter. It reflects a deeper realization happening across the industry.

There is also a misunderstanding being amplified: State law already allows dispensaries to sell non-cannabis items like water, snacks, and similar products—they simply need to be labeled and handled correctly. The idea that this café proposal is needed to "unlock" that kind of offering is not accurate.

Which brings us back to the bigger issue.

The headline sounds great. "Cannabis cafés" feels progressive and easy to support. But this is not Amsterdam. In Amsterdam, those cafés work because they are the primary access point for cannabis. They are not layered on top of an

already oversaturated retail market—they *are* the market.

San Francisco already has more than 70 licensed dispensaries. Many are struggling. Many have closed. Equity operators are especially vulnerable.

This proposal does not create new demand—it divides existing demand.

From where we stand, this will:

- Pull revenue away from existing licensed operators
- Accelerate closures
- Undermine equity businesses
- Further destabilize an already fragile market

I'll say it plainly: this is not the moment to expand the number of licensees. It's the moment to stabilize the ones we already have.

There are far more urgent priorities that would actually support the cannabis ecosystem in San Francisco:

- Enforcement against illegal operators
- Reducing the tax burden
- Supporting struggling equity businesses
- Completing the Controller's economic impact analysis before introducing new market pressures

I urge you to take a step back and fully consider the downstream impact here. The small businesses on the ground are telling you clearly—this will do more harm than good.

Respectfully,

On Thu, Mar 19, 2026 at 3:50 AM Kevin Reed <kevinreed@thegreencross.org> wrote:

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I hope you are well.

I am writing to respectfully urge caution as the City considers introducing a new cannabis café license category.

San Francisco's regulated cannabis market is not in a position to absorb additional expansion. Over the past several years, we have seen a steady pattern of closures, declining margins, and increasing financial pressure across the industry. Many operators are no longer growing — they are simply trying to survive.

At the same time, the City is still awaiting a comprehensive economic impact report from the Controller's Office, which, due to staffing constraints, is not expected until June 2027. Moving forward with a new license category before understanding the current state of the market is not a measured policy approach — it is a speculative one.

Introducing cannabis cafés at this moment risks accelerating the very problems the City has yet to fully quantify.

Real-World Impacts to Consider:

Market Fragmentation:
Cannabis cafés would introduce a new "experience-based" vertical that competes directly with existing retailers for the same limited customer base. In a market that is already oversaturated, this does not create new demand — it redistributes it.

In addition, this model is likely to attract well-capitalized entrants from adjacent industries such as hospitality, entertainment, and lifestyle retail. These sectors are structurally better positioned to scale experience-based concepts quickly, further intensifying competition and accelerating market fragmentation beyond what currently exists.

Capital Disparity:
Cafés will require significant investment to build and operate. Well-capitalized operators will be positioned to participate, while smaller, independent businesses — many of which are already struggling — will be left behind.

Revenue Cannibalization:
In an already saturated market, consumer spending is more likely to be redistributed across formats than meaningfully increased. As a result, dollars will shift from traditional retail purchases into café settings, further weakening existing storefronts.

Regulatory Workarounds and Practical Reality:
While the proposed framework may attempt to limit take-home sales or define narrow consumption parameters, in practice, operators adapt quickly in ways that functionally expand those limits. In other jurisdictions, businesses have implemented systems such as on-site storage or "locker" models that allow customers to make larger purchases and return to consume them over time.

While these approaches may technically comply with the letter of the law, they effectively recreate a broader retail-plus-consumption model in practice. This results in a level of

competition that goes beyond what is currently being contemplated and further amplifies the risk of revenue diversion from existing dispensaries.

Enforcement and Compliance Risk:
The City already faces ongoing challenges in enforcing existing cannabis regulations, including unlicensed operators and compliance oversight. Introducing a new, more complex license category—particularly one that blends retail, hospitality, and consumption—will significantly increase the enforcement burden.

Without clear and scalable enforcement mechanisms in place, there is a high risk that real-world operations will diverge from the intended regulatory structure, further undermining the integrity of the legal market.

Impact on Equity Operators:
San Francisco has made a strong commitment to its Cannabis Equity Program. However, the capital-intensive nature of café-style businesses may unintentionally exclude many equity operators, who are already navigating significant financial barriers.

Without deliberate safeguards, this new license category risks favoring well-capitalized entrants over the very communities the City has prioritized supporting.

Premature Policy Expansion:
The City has already paused new retail licenses and commissioned a Controller's report to better understand market conditions. Advancing a new license category before that analysis is complete undermines that effort.

Increased Risk of Closures:
For many operators, margins are already thin. Even a modest shift in customer behavior or revenue could push additional businesses to close, resulting in job losses, vacant storefronts, and reduced tax revenue for the City.

San Francisco has long been a leader in thoughtful cannabis policy. That leadership has been rooted in balancing innovation with responsibility. At this moment, responsibility requires acknowledging the current instability of the market and avoiding actions that could deepen it.

This is not an argument against evolving the cannabis experience. It is an argument for sequencing.

A More Immediate, Lower-Risk Alternative

If the goal is to thoughtfully evolve consumption opportunities, there are more practical and less disruptive approaches available within the existing framework.

One example would be a targeted amendment to San Francisco's Cannabis Consumption Permit rules (Health Code Article 8A) to remove the current requirement that consumption occur within a designated "room." Allowing more flexibility in how consumption areas are configured — while still maintaining all state-level requirements around licensed premises, visibility, and access control — would enable existing retailers to modestly enhance the consumer experience without requiring a new license category.

This type of change would:

- Support existing permitted operators rather than introducing new competitors
- Require significantly less capital investment than a café model
- Allow for incremental, compliant evolution of consumption spaces
- Provide the City with real-world data on demand and impacts before expanding further

Before introducing new and potentially disruptive license categories, the City should first:

- Receive and evaluate the Controller's economic impact report
- Assess the true level of market saturation and business viability
- Identify targeted policies that stabilize and support existing operators

Only with that foundation can future policy decisions be made in a way that strengthens — rather than fragments — the legal cannabis ecosystem.

I respectfully ask that the Board pause consideration of cannabis café legislation until this data is available and the current market conditions are fully understood.

--

Kevin Reed
Founder & President
The Green Cross

415.846.7671
KevinReed@TheGreenCross.org
TheGreenCross.org



--

Kevin Reed
Founder & President
The Green Cross

415.846.7671
KevinReed@TheGreenCross.org

TheGreenCross.org



From:	DR. J
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; WongStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Patel, Nikesh (ADM); Wagner, Greg (CON); CON, Controller (CON); David Goldman
Subject:	Cannabis Café legislation
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 7:57:23 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing in support of the concerns raised by Kevin Reed regarding the proposed cannabis café expansion.

From my position as an operator in San Francisco, I want to be clear: this is not a demand-creation opportunity—it's demand fragmentation in an already oversaturated market.

San Francisco has over 70 licensed dispensaries, many of which are struggling to stay afloat. Expanding license types at this moment will not grow the pie—it will divide it further, putting additional pressure on compliant operators, particularly equity businesses.

There also appears to be confusion around existing allowances. Dispensaries are already permitted under state law to sell non-cannabis items when properly handled. This proposal does not unlock something fundamentally new—it shifts how revenue is distributed.

Before introducing new market dynamics, the priority should be stabilizing the current ecosystem:

- Enforcing against illegal operators
- Addressing the tax burden
- Supporting existing equity licensees
- Completing a full economic impact analysis

For context, I operate a San Francisco-based cannabis brand with distribution across hundreds of retail doors and consistent sales growth. I have also served as Chair of the Cannabis Oversight Committee and as an advisor to the California Department of Cannabis Control Advisory Board, giving me direct insight into how policy decisions impact operators on the ground.

I urge you to proceed with caution and prioritize the sustainability of the operators already serving this city.

Best,

Ali Jamalian

Founder / Chief Cannabis Officer
Sunset Connect
415.900.6868

www.sunsetconnect.co

When in doubt. Roll one up. Keep it classy.

From:	Kevin Reed
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; WongStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Patel, Nikesh (ADM); Wagner, Greg (CON); CON, Controller (CON)
Subject:	Cannabis Café Proposal – Ongoing Concerns Following Recent Coverage
Date:	Tuesday, April 21, 2026 5:17:13 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing again—and I know you're likely as tired of hearing from me as I am of having to send these—but this café issue is too important, and affects too many people, for me to stay quiet.

I'm reaching out specifically because of the news coverage yesterday. In it, you can see what appears to be a once-supportive dispensary owner now expressing concern about this proposal. That shift should matter. It reflects a deeper realization happening across the industry.

There is also a misunderstanding being amplified: State law already allows dispensaries to sell non-cannabis items like water, snacks, and similar products—they simply need to be labeled and handled correctly. The idea that this café proposal is needed to "unlock" that kind of offering is not accurate.

Which brings us back to the bigger issue.

The headline sounds great. "Cannabis cafés" feels progressive and easy to support. But this is not Amsterdam. In Amsterdam, those cafés work because they are the primary access point for cannabis. They are not layered on top of an already oversaturated retail market—they *are* the market.

San Francisco already has more than 70 licensed dispensaries. Many are struggling. Many have closed. Equity operators are especially vulnerable.

This proposal does not create new demand—it divides existing demand.

From where we stand, this will:

- Pull revenue away from existing licensed operators

- Accelerate closures
- Undermine equity businesses
- Further destabilize an already fragile market

I'll say it plainly: this is not the moment to expand the number of licensees. It's the moment to stabilize the ones we already have.

There are far more urgent priorities that would actually support the cannabis ecosystem in San Francisco:

- Enforcement against illegal operators
- Reducing the tax burden
- Supporting struggling equity businesses
- Completing the Controller's economic impact analysis before introducing new market pressures

I urge you to take a step back and fully consider the downstream impact here. The small businesses on the ground are telling you clearly—this will do more harm than good.

Respectfully,

--

Kevin Reed
Founder & President
The Green Cross

415.846.7671
KevinReed@TheGreenCross.org
TheGreenCross.org

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing again—and I know you're likely as tired of hearing from me as I am of having to send these—but this café issue is too important, and affects too many people, for me to stay quiet.

I'm reaching out specifically because of the news coverage yesterday. In it, you can see what appears to be a once-supportive dispensary owner now expressing concern about this proposal. That shift should matter. It reflects a deeper realization happening across the industry.

There is also a misunderstanding being amplified: State law already allows dispensaries to sell non-cannabis items like water, snacks, and similar products—they simply need to be labeled and handled correctly. The idea that this café proposal is needed to "unlock" that kind of offering is not accurate.

Which brings us back to the bigger issue.

The headline sounds great. "Cannabis cafés" feels progressive and easy to support. But this is not Amsterdam. In Amsterdam, those cafés work because they are the primary access point for cannabis. They are not layered on top of an already oversaturated retail market—they *are* the market.

San Francisco already has more than 70 licensed dispensaries. Many are struggling. Many have closed. Equity operators are especially vulnerable.

This proposal does not create new demand—it divides existing demand.

From where we stand, this will:

- Pull revenue away from existing licensed operators
- Accelerate closures
- Undermine equity businesses
- Further destabilize an already fragile market

I'll say it plainly: this is not the moment to expand the number of licensees. It's the moment to stabilize the ones we already have.

There are far more urgent priorities that would actually support the cannabis ecosystem in San Francisco:

- Enforcement against illegal operators
- Reducing the tax burden
- Supporting struggling equity businesses
- Completing the Controller's economic impact analysis before introducing new market pressures

I urge you to take a step back and fully consider the downstream impact here. The small businesses on the ground are telling you clearly—this will do more harm than good.

Respectfully,

On Thu, Mar 19, 2026 at 3:50 AM Kevin Reed <kevinreed@thegreencross.org> wrote:

> **Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,**
>
> I hope you are well.
>
> I am writing to respectfully urge caution as the City considers introducing a new cannabis café license category.
>
> San Francisco's regulated cannabis market is not in a position to absorb additional expansion. Over the past several years, we have seen a steady pattern of closures, declining margins, and increasing financial pressure across the industry. Many operators are no longer growing — they are simply trying to survive.
>
> At the same time, the City is still awaiting a comprehensive economic impact report from the Controller's Office, which, due to staffing constraints, is not expected until June 2027. Moving forward with a new license category before understanding the current state of the market is not a measured policy approach — it is a speculative one.
>
> Introducing cannabis cafés at this moment risks accelerating the very problems the City has yet to fully quantify.
>
> **Real-World Impacts to Consider:**

Market Fragmentation:
Cannabis cafés would introduce a new "experience-based" vertical that competes directly with existing retailers for the same limited customer base. In a market that is already oversaturated, this does not create new demand — it redistributes it.

In addition, this model is likely to attract well-capitalized entrants from adjacent industries such as hospitality, entertainment, and lifestyle retail. These sectors are structurally better positioned to scale experience-based concepts quickly, further intensifying competition and accelerating market fragmentation beyond what currently exists.

Capital Disparity:
Cafés will require significant investment to build and operate. Well-capitalized operators will be positioned to participate, while smaller, independent businesses — many of which are already struggling — will be left behind.

Revenue Cannibalization:
In an already saturated market, consumer spending is more likely to be redistributed across formats than meaningfully increased. As a result, dollars will shift from traditional retail purchases into café settings, further weakening existing storefronts.

Regulatory Workarounds and Practical Reality:
While the proposed framework may attempt to limit take-home sales or define narrow consumption parameters, in practice, operators adapt quickly in ways that functionally expand those limits. In other jurisdictions, businesses have implemented systems such as on-site storage or "locker" models that allow customers to make larger purchases and return to consume them over time.

While these approaches may technically comply with the letter of the law, they effectively recreate a broader retail-plus-consumption model in practice. This results in a level of competition that goes beyond what is currently being contemplated and further amplifies the risk of revenue diversion from existing dispensaries.

Enforcement and Compliance Risk:
The City already faces ongoing challenges in enforcing existing cannabis regulations, including unlicensed operators and compliance oversight. Introducing a new, more complex license category—particularly one that blends retail, hospitality, and consumption—will significantly increase the enforcement burden.

Without clear and scalable enforcement mechanisms in place, there is a high risk that real-world operations will diverge from the intended regulatory structure, further undermining the integrity of the legal market.

Impact on Equity Operators:
San Francisco has made a strong commitment to its Cannabis Equity Program. However, the capital-intensive nature of café-style businesses may unintentionally exclude many equity operators, who are already navigating significant financial barriers.

Without deliberate safeguards, this new license category risks favoring well-capitalized entrants over the very communities the City has prioritized supporting.

Premature Policy Expansion:

The City has already paused new retail licenses and commissioned a Controller's report to better understand market conditions. Advancing a new license category before that analysis is complete undermines that effort.

Increased Risk of Closures:
For many operators, margins are already thin. Even a modest shift in customer behavior or revenue could push additional businesses to close, resulting in job losses, vacant storefronts, and reduced tax revenue for the City.

San Francisco has long been a leader in thoughtful cannabis policy. That leadership has been rooted in balancing innovation with responsibility. At this moment, responsibility requires acknowledging the current instability of the market and avoiding actions that could deepen it.

This is not an argument against evolving the cannabis experience. It is an argument for sequencing.

A More Immediate, Lower-Risk Alternative

If the goal is to thoughtfully evolve consumption opportunities, there are more practical and less disruptive approaches available within the existing framework.

One example would be a targeted amendment to San Francisco's Cannabis Consumption Permit rules (Health Code Article 8A) to remove the current requirement that consumption occur within a designated "room." Allowing more flexibility in how consumption areas are configured — while still maintaining all state-level requirements around licensed premises, visibility, and access control — would enable existing retailers to modestly enhance the consumer experience without requiring a new license category.

This type of change would:

- Support existing permitted operators rather than introducing new competitors
- Require significantly less capital investment than a café model
- Allow for incremental, compliant evolution of consumption spaces
- Provide the City with real-world data on demand and impacts before expanding further

Before introducing new and potentially disruptive license categories, the City should first:

- Receive and evaluate the Controller's economic impact report
- Assess the true level of market saturation and business viability
- Identify targeted policies that stabilize and support existing operators

Only with that foundation can future policy decisions be made in a way that strengthens — rather than fragments — the legal cannabis ecosystem.

I respectfully ask that the Board pause consideration of cannabis café legislation until this

> data is available and the current market conditions are fully understood.

--

Kevin Reed
Founder & President
The Green Cross

415.846.7671
KevinReed@TheGreenCross.org
TheGreenCross.org



From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Flying the Israel flag at City Hall
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 2:02:04 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Tracey Simmons, regarding the flying of the Israeli flag at City Hall.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

-----Original Message-----
From: Tracey Simmons <traceyssimmons@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 5:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Flying the Israel flag at City Hall

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

Why are you flying the flag of Israel at city hall? You aren't flying the flags of any other countries. You aren't flying a pride flag. You are just flying the flag of a country on the opposite side of the globe, actively committing genocide.

That flag being on city hall makes it look like the city of San Francisco is proud of child murder. It makes it look like we support blowing up schools and hospitals. It makes us look disgusting. Why are we aligning ourselves with Israel? The city of San Francisco should have absolutely nothing to do with Israel. I will continue to follow up until I receive an explanation.

Shame on you for tarring the reputation of our city.

Item 28

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: URGENT: Public Comment - Veteran Displacement & Failure of DV Protections at Edwin M. Lee Apartments (April 22 Meeting)
Date:	Wednesday, April 22, 2026 9:10:40 AM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below communication from Darius Banks regarding:

> **File No. 260385:** Hearing to examine workforce programming across City departments, including any potential cuts to workforce training and employment programs that help San Francisco residents get to work, including programming for youth through adults, as well as ambassador programs; and requesting the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, Human Services Agency, Human Rights Commission, and the People's Budget Coalition to report.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Darius Banks <espanasuave@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 10:10 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>
Subject: URGENT: Public Comment - Veteran Displacement & Failure of DV Protections at Edwin M. Lee Apartments (April 22 Meeting)

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

To the Members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
Please include this statement in the official record for the Wednesday, April 22, 2026, meeting regarding the Human Services Agency and Department of Disability and Aging Services budgets.

My name is Darius Ramon Banks. I am a 52-year-old veteran and a 6-year resident of the Edwin M. Lee Apartments (1150 3rd Street). I am currently displaced in the Tenderloin because I was illegally evicted from a building specifically dedicated to ending veteran homelessness.
I am writing to oppose the $10.5 million in proposed cuts to the HSA and legal CBOs for the following reasons:
Failure of the Legal Safety Net: When I was targeted for an illegal eviction, I sought help from both the EDC and JDC; both were at capacity. I have been forced to act as my own litigation attorney from a shelter bed, navigating technical and human errors that have stalled my day in court.
Illegal Pretext & Victim Blaming: My landlord was served a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) two weeks before my eviction. They knowingly ignored California Civil Code § 1946.7 and CCP § 1161.3, using the illegal presence of my abuser as a pretext for "nuisance."
Administrative Failure: At a building named after Mayor Edwin Lee—a site intended to be a sanctuary for veterans—I was "victim-blamed" for an abuser's actions. Because I had no counsel to voice these protections in February, a judge accepted the landlord's narrative.
My Demand:
I am currently filing a Regular Motion to Vacate with an Order Shortening Time to fix this. I urge this committee to restore funding to the legal services that were too full to help me. It is a disgrace that a veteran can be pushed into the streets from the Edwin M. Lee Apartments for being the victim of a crime.
Sincerely,
Darius Ramon Banks
Veteran & San Francisco Resident

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Public Comment on File No. 251211
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 11:13:07 AM
Attachments:	Duboce Triangle and Lower Haight April 2026.docx

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached and below communication from the San Francisco Tree Campaign, regarding:

> **File No. 251211:** Ordinance amending the Public Works Code to allow development projects to satisfy street tree planting requirements through payment of an in lieu fee or providing alternative landscaping; exempt accessory dwelling units from street tree planting requirements; eliminate appeals to the Board of Appeals for tree removals undertaken by City departments and commissions; and update in lieu fee reporting requirements; amending the Administrative Code to create a separate account within the Adopt-A-Tree Fund to receive in lieu fees for street tree requirements; and amending the Planning Code to update street tree applicability requirements.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: San Francisco Tree Campaign <sftreecampaign@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 3:54 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment on File No. 251211

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

Public Comment - OBJECTION

File 251211: Street Tree Planting Requirements Ordinance

To the Board of Supervisors:

I **object to and oppose** File 251211.

Primary Concerns

1. Urban Canopy Loss

- In-lieu fees cannot replace mature trees already lost
- San Francisco's canopy coverage is insufficient; this ordinance reduces planting requirements
- Financial payments do not equal environmental benefits

2. Equity Issues

- Wealthy developments can pay to avoid planting obligations
- Low-income neighborhoods receive fewer street trees
- Creates two-tier system based on developer ability to pay

3. Removal of Public Oversight

- Eliminating Board of Appeals authority over city tree removals reduces transparency
- Citizens lose right to challenge questionable removals
- Lacks accountability mechanism

4. ADU Exemption Problematic

- ADUs are supposed to increase housing sustainability
- Exempting them from tree requirements contradicts climate goals
- Cumulative impact of many small exemptions

5. In-Lieu Fee Adequacy

- No evidence fee amount equals actual tree replacement costs
- No guarantee funds will be spent within affected neighborhoods
- History shows fees often insufficient for stated purposes

Request

I urge the Board to:

- Reject this ordinance
- Require actual street tree planting, not fees
- Restore appeals process
- Remove ADU exemptions

San Francisco Tree Campaign

Duboce Triangle and Lower Haight April 2026

(1) 55 Laguna on Herman side of the property empty plot
(1) 119 Buchanan plot with stump
(1) 236 Herman empty plot
(2) 20 Church two empty plots
(1) 124-126 Church empty plot
(1) 2020 Market on Church side of the property empty plot
(1) 178 Church empty plot
(1) 751-14th Street empty plot
(1) 747-14th Street empty plot
(1) 66 Belcher empty bed no tree
(1) 68 Belcher empty bed not tree
(1) 49 Belcher empty plot
(1) 44 Belcher empty plot
(1) 49 Belcher empty plot
(1) 39-41 Sanchez empty plot
(1) 85 Sanchez empty plot
(1) 785 – 14th Street empty plot
(1) 69 Henry empty plot
(1) 78-82 Henry empty plot
(1) 114a Noe empty plot
(1) 905 – 14th Street empty plot
(1) 545 Duboce empty plot
(1) 74-76 Walter no tree in planting bed
(1) 70-72 Walter not tree in planting bed
(1) 79-81 Walter not tree in planting bed
(1) 65 Walter empty plot
(1) 42 Walter empty plot
(1) 34 Walter empty plot
(1) 27 Walter empty plot
(1) 23 Walter empty plot

(1) 841-845 -14th Street empty plot
(1) 111 Noe empty plot
(1) 228 Noe with stump
(1) 221 Noe empty no tree in planting bed
(1) 235-239 Noe empty plot
(3) 2306 Market on 16th Street side of the property three empty planting beds
(1) 2262-2264 15th Street small stem in plot
(1) 161-167 Castro with stump
(1) 149-151 Henry empty plot with plant box covering plot
(1) 101-109 Castro empty plot on 14th Street side of the property
(1) 1 Scott empty plot on Duboce side of the property
(1) 52-98 Scott plot with stump
(3) 95-97 Scott three empty tree boxes on the Waller side of the property
(1) 65 Carmelita empty plot with flowers
(1) 627 Waller planter bed with no tree
(1) 71-75 Potomac with stump
(1) 65 Potomac empty plot
(1) 212 Steiner on Lausset side of the property empty plot
(1) 220 Divisadero empty plot with plants
(1) 722 Waller empty plot
(1) 9-11 Castro empty plot with pot covering plot
(1) 214-216 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 254 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 272 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 286 Divisadero empty plot
(1) 963 Page plant vs. tree in plot
(1) 940 Page empty planting bed no tree
(1) 301-303 Scott empty plot
*** 401-499 Page entrances to each property missing trees**
(1) 400 Page dead tree

THE ABOVE SURVEY IS THE PROPERTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TREE CAMPAIGN

https://sanfranciscotreecampaign.blogspot.com

Item 30

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: A member of the Latino community requires urgent support. Adrienne Pacheco Valera, 27, resides in San Francisco and is currently facing a critical, life-threatening medical condition. We respectfully request the community"s attention and support in li
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 11:19:21 AM
Attachments:	1305.png 1309.png

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached communication from Daniel Abrams, regarding Adrienne Pacheco Valera.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | sf.gov/bos

From: Daniel Abrams <danielabramss@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2026 10:49 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: A member of the Latino community requires urgent support. Adrienne Pacheco Valera, 27, resides in San Francisco and is currently facing a critical, life-threatening medical condition. We respectfully request the community's attention and support in lig...

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

Updated****

URGENT: HELP SAVE ADRIENNE PACHECO VALERA

SITUATION
Adrienne is at CPMC Van Ness with terminal liver disease. She has been verbally denied a transplant. The hospital is refusing to transfer her for a second opinion and has not provided the legally required written denial. She has hepatic encephalopathy and is often unable to advocate for herself.

GOAL
Generate immediate public pressure. High call volume can push agencies to act and may trigger an expedited review within 72 hours.

STEP 1: CALL ELECTED OFFICIALS
Catherine Stefani — (415) 557-2312
Scott Wiener — (415) 557-1300
Nancy Pelosi — (415) 556-4862

Say:
"I'm calling about Adrienne Pacheco Valera at CPMC Van Ness. She is being denied life-saving care. The hospital is refusing to provide written documentation or allow a transfer for a second opinion. Please intervene immediately and ensure her case is reviewed within 72 hours."

STEP 2: CALL STATE AGENCIES
DMHC — 1-888-466-2219
Med-Cal Ombudsman — 1-888-452-8609
State Hearing Division — 1-800-743-8525

Say:
"I am reporting a denial of life-saving care and refusal to transfer for Adrienne Pacheco Valera at CPMC Van Ness. No written Notice of Action has been provided. She is terminal, on dialysis, and has hepatic encephalopathy. We request an expedited external review immediately."

STEP 3: REQUEST IN WRITING
Transfer Summary
Written Notice of Action (denial)
Records for second opinion (UCSF or Stanford)

IMPORTANT
Log all calls (date, time, name). This may support legal action.

PLEASE SHARE — TIME IS CRITICAL

PLEASE FRIENDS, MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY

Please help my girlfriend

ACTUALIZADO

URGENTE: AYUDA A SALVAR A ADRIENNE PACHECO VALERA

SITUACIÓN
Adrienne está en CPMC Van Ness con enfermedad hepática terminal. Se le ha negado verbalmente un trasplante. El hospital se niega a transferirla para una segunda opinión y no ha proporcionado la negación por escrito que exige la ley. Tiene encefalopatía hepática y a menudo no puede abogar por sí misma.

OBJETIVO
Generar presión pública inmediata. Un alto volumen de llamadas puede impulsar a las agencias a actuar y podría activar una revisión acelerada dentro de 72 horas.

PASO 1: LLAMAR A FUNCIONARIOS ELECTOS
Catherine Stefani — (415) 557-2312
Scott Wiener — (415) 557-1300
Nancy Pelosi — (415) 556-4862

Diga:
"Estoy llamando por Adrienne Pacheco Valera en CPMC Van Ness. Se le está negando atención que le puede salvar la vida. El hospital se niega a proporcionar documentación por escrito o permitir una transferencia para una segunda opinión. Por favor intervengan de inmediato y aseguren que su caso sea revisado dentro de 72 horas."

PASO 2: LLAMAR A AGENCIAS ESTATALES
DMHC — 1-888-466-2219
Defensor del Medi-Cal — 1-888-452-8609
División de Audiencias Estatales — 1-800-743-8525

Diga:
"Estoy reportando una negación de atención que salva vidas y la negativa de transferir a Adrienne Pacheco Valera en CPMC Van Ness. No se ha proporcionado una Notificación de Acción por escrito. Ella es terminal, está en diálisis y tiene encefalopatía hepática. Solicitamos una revisión externa acelerada de inmediato."

PASO 3: SOLICITAR POR ESCRITO
Resumen de transferencia
Notificación de Acción por escrito (denegación)
Registros para segunda opinión (UCSF o Stanford)

IMPORTANTE
Registre todas las llamadas (fecha, hora, nombre). Esto puede respaldar acciones legales.

POR FAVOR COMPARTA — EL TIEMPO ES CRÍTICO

POR FAVOR AMIGOS, MIEMBROS DE LA COMUNIDAD
Por favor ayuden a mi novia