

FILE NO. 260707

Petitions and Communications received from June 11, 2026, through June 17, 2026, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 23, 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 Matt Dorsey as Acting-Mayor effective Thursday, June 11, 2026 at 7:00 PM until Friday, June 12, 2026 at 11:59 PM; Supervisor Bilal Mahmood as Acting-Mayor effective Saturday, June 13, 2026 at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Connie Chan as Acting-Mayor effective Sunday, June 14, 2026 at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and Board President Mandelman as Acting-Mayor effective Monday, June 15, 2026 at 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM . Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the Department of Elections (REG), submitting the certification for the initiative measure entitled "Parcel Tax to Fund Public Transportation." Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (TTX), pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Monthly Pooled Investment Report for the month of May 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 96A, submitting First Quarter (Q1) of Calendar Year (CY) 2026 Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR). Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Sheriff's Office (SHF), regarding the Resolution authorizing the Sheriff's Office to contract with the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial) for Pretrial Services for a three year period from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2029, for a contract total not to exceed amount of \$22,532,145, with two one-year options to extend. File No. 260442. Resolution No. 334-26. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From members of the public, regarding District 9. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco Budget. File Nos. 260616, 260596, and 260597. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From members of the public, regarding the renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco Giants. 10 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From members of the public, regarding banning retail animal sales. 17 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Barklee Sanders, regarding the Health Care Security Ordinance (HCSO). Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Katherine Mendonca, regarding taxes on small businesses. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From John Bove, regarding Capp Street and Shotwell Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From George Soler, regarding emergency vehicles. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Holly Gustafson, regarding illegal refuse dumping. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Beth Muzzy, regarding the North of Panhandle and Western Addition Districts. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Bill Lo, regarding the San Francisco Public Library. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Thomas Luchini, regarding Resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to implement red zones for daylighting at all crosswalks and intersections to comply with the Daylighting to Save Lives Bill. File No. 241180. Resolution No. 632-24. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Bruce Sanchez, regarding parking. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Todd Greenberg, regarding Municipal Elections Code - Ballot Argument Fees and Municipal Elections Code - Voter Information Pamphlets. File Nos. 260603 and 260604. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding banning plastic cigarette filters. 21 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding Planning Code - Transit-Oriented Residential Development. File No. 260132 Ordinance No. 82-26. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding the Resolution authorizing the Sheriff's Office to contract with the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial) for Pretrial Services for a three year period from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2029, for a contract

total not to exceed amount of \$22,532,145, with two one-year options to extend. File No. 260442. Resolution No. 334-26. 31 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding the Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., to consider the Department of Public Health's budget reducing medical and health care services provided by the City and County of San Francisco for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2026-2027 and 2027-2028, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code, Section 1442.5(a) (The Beilenson Act). File No. 260565. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From a member of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; eliminate 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; and repeal suspended and superseded provisions regulating smoking in certain locations. File No. 260361. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From the Planning Department (CPC), submitting an Interim Zoning Controls – Conditional Use Authorization for Outdoor Laboratory Uses in PDR-1-G post-passage report for File No. 251116. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [RUSSI, BRAD \(CAT\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: Fw: Acting-Mayor Memo | June 11-15, 2026
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:13:33 PM
Attachments: [1077_001 \(1\).pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

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

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Board of Supervisors

From: Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:03 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>; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; PRADHAN, MANU (CAT) <Manu.Pradhan@sfcityatty.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Donovan, Dominica (BOS) <dominica.donovan@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Logan, Samantha (BOS) <sam.logan@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Burke, Robyn (BOS) <robyn.burke@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Marie, Sophie (BOS) <sophie.marie@sfgov.org>
Subject: Acting-Mayor Memo | June 11-15, 2026

Dear Madam Clerk,

Please see the attached memo designating Supervisor Matt Dorsey as Acting Mayor effective Thursday, June 11, 2026, from 7:00 PM until 11:59 PM on Friday, June 12th, 2026; Supervisor Bilal Mahmood as Acting Mayor effective Saturday, June 13, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Connie Chan as Acting Mayor effective Sunday, June 14, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and Board President Rafael Mandelman as Acting Mayor effective Monday, June 15, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM.

In the event that the Mayor is delayed, he designates Board President Mandelman to continue to be the Acting Mayor until his 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

June 11, 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 Supervisor Matt Dorsey as Acting Mayor effective Thursday, June 11, 2026, from 7:00 PM until 11:59 PM on Friday, June 12th, 2026; Supervisor Bilal Mahmood as Acting Mayor effective Saturday, June 13, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; Supervisor Connie Chan as Acting Mayor effective Sunday, June 14, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and Board President Rafael Mandelman as Acting Mayor effective Monday, June 15, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Lurie".

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

cc: Mr. David Chiu, City Attorney

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Parcel Tax Fund For Public Transportation
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:29:32 AM
Attachments: [0423_001.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached submitted by the Department of Elections (REG), regarding the certification for the initiative measure entitled “Parcel Tax To Fund Public Transportation.”

Regards,

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

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



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

John Arntz, Director

HAND DELIVERED

June 12, 2026

JB

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUN 12 AM09:28

ANGELA CALVILLO, CLERK OF THE BOARD

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Certification for the initiative measure entitled **PARCEL TAX TO FUND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

Enclosed is a copy of the letter sent to the proponent of the above-named petition, certifying that the petition did contain sufficient valid signatures to qualify for the next general, municipal, or statewide election occurring in the City and County of San Francisco at any time after 90 days from the date of this certificate of sufficiency.

If you should have any questions or need additional information, please call (415) 554-4375.

Sincerely,

John Arntz
Director of Elections

Encl. Copy of certified letter to proponent

cc: Daniel Lurie, Mayor
David Chiu, City Attorney



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

John Arntz, Director

Certified Mail: 7017 0530 0000 4140 2028

June 12, 2026

Kat Siegal

6 Carl St
San Francisco, CA 94117

RE: Certification for the initiative measure entitled **PARCEL TAX TO FUND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**


As prescribed under *California Elections Code* §9115(a), the San Francisco Department of Elections has completed its review of a random sampling of 554 out of the 18,469 signatures submitted for the initiative measure **PARCEL TAX TO FUND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**.

Based on this statistical sampling, the total number of valid signatures was determined to be greater than the 10,615 valid signatures required for qualification. The number of valid signatures required to qualify this initiative measure was determined by calculating 2% of the number of registered voters in the City and County of San Francisco (S.F. Charter §14.101).

I hereby certify that the following initiative measure, **PARCEL TAX TO FUND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**, is sufficient and qualifies for the next general, municipal, or statewide election in the City and County of San Francisco at any time after 90 days from the date of this certification of sufficiency.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call (415) 554-6100.

Respectfully,



John Arntz
Director of Elections

cc: Daniel Lurie, Mayor
David Chiu, City Attorney
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for May 2026
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 2:28:35 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for May 2026.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the Pooled Investment Report for the month of May 2026.

Regards,

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

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

From: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2026 2:25 PM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for May 2026

All-

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

Regards,



Ichieh C. Dion

*Investment Settlement Operations/Reporting
Investments*

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

Office: 628.652.6404

San Francisco only, **call 311**

sftreasurer.org



Investment Report for the month of May 2026

June 15, 2026

The Honorable Daniel L. Lurie
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of May 31, 2026. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of May 2026 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Earnings Statistics

Description	Current Month Fiscal YTD	Current Month May 2026	Prior Month Fiscal YTD	Prior Month April 2026
Average Daily Balance (in \$ millions)	17,647.2	18,924.9	17,516.9	18,815.6
Net Earnings (in \$ millions)	607.9	59.4	548.5	57.6
Earned Income Return	3.75%	3.70%	3.76%	3.72%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics: May 31, 2026

Investment Type	% of Portfolio	Book Value (in \$ millions)	Market Value (in \$ millions)	Wtd. Avg. CPN	Wtd. Avg. YTM	WAM
U.S. Treasuries	28.4%	5,432	5,408	3.35%	3.45%	765
Federal Agencies	45.0%	8,595	8,568	3.54%	3.81%	706
Negotiable CDs	11.5%	2,195	2,195	4.03%	4.03%	118
Commercial Paper	5.1%	972	972	0.00%	3.94%	92
Medium Term Notes	0.9%	163	163	3.98%	4.20%	298
Money Market Funds	7.5%	1,426	1,426	0.00%	0.00%	0
Supranationals	0.7%	141	142	3.32%	4.10%	620
Secured Bank Deposit	0.9%	167	167	0.00%	0.00%	0
Totals	100.0%	19,092	19,041	3.07%	3.43%	561

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

Respectfully,

José Cisneros
Treasurer

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

Portfolio Summary

Pooled Fund

Security Type	Par Value (in \$ millions)	Book Value (in \$ millions)	Market Value (in \$ millions)	Market Price / Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 5,434.0	\$ 5,432.3	\$ 5,407.8	99.55	28.45%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	8,602.4	8,595.4	8,567.9	99.68	45.02%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government							
Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	-	-	-	-	0.00%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	2,195.0	2,195.0	2,195.4	100.02	11.50%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	981.7	971.8	971.5	99.97	5.09%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	162.8	162.7	162.8	100.11	0.85%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds	1,426.3	1,426.3	1,426.3	100.00	7.47%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	142.3	141.5	141.8	100.20	0.74%	30%	Yes
Secured Bank Deposit	167.2	167.2	167.2	100.00	0.88%	N/A	Yes
TOTAL	\$ 19,111.8	\$ 19,092.2	\$ 19,040.8	99.73	100.00%	-	Yes

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



Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution.

The full Investment Policy can be found at <https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments>



Totals may not add due to rounding.

Portfolio Analysis

Pooled Fund



Yield Curves



Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	912797UA3	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/27/2026	6/16/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,728,787	24,962,677	24,955,288
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/2/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,931,641	49,998,913	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,070,313	50,001,125	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,345,703	50,005,557	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,328,125	50,005,275	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/6/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,406,250	50,006,585	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	8/10/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,240,234	50,003,903	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	9/24/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,937,500	49,998,958	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	10/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,593,750	49,993,150	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	U.S. Treasury Note	1/4/2022	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,027,344	49,982,780	49,888,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKY6	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	6/30/2026	4.63	100,000,000	100,546,875	100,080,915	100,074,220
U.S. Treasuries	912797TX5	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/19/2026	8/20/2026	0.00	100,000,000	98,230,556	99,222,222	99,171,700
U.S. Treasuries	912797TY3	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/26/2026	8/27/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,554,226	24,786,910	24,780,378
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	U.S. Treasury Note	9/28/2021	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,972,124	49,634,765
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,979,331	49,539,065
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,978,161	49,539,065
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/19/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,954,356	49,539,065
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/3/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,007,215	49,382,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,011,725	49,382,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	49,688,470	49,382,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	49,645,501	49,277,345
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	U.S. Treasury Note	4/6/2022	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,959,680	24,733,398
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	6/26/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,199,219	50,069,653	50,367,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,292,969	50,103,674	50,367,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,906,250	50,350,478	50,367,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,603,516	50,300,568	50,367,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/8/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,667,969	50,358,077	50,367,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,654,297	50,351,244	50,367,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,632,813	50,347,588	50,367,200
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/21/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,203,125	49,408,053	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/3/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,113,281	49,371,625	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	9/26/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,683,594	49,876,203	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,398,438	49,663,808	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	11/12/2025	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,728,516	49,820,227	49,656,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	8/31/2027	3.63	50,000,000	50,035,156	50,024,701	49,806,640
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	U.S. Treasury Note	11/21/2025	8/31/2027	3.63	75,000,000	75,058,594	75,041,233	74,709,960
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	9/15/2027	3.38	50,000,000	49,785,156	49,906,217	49,644,530
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	10/15/2027	3.88	50,000,000	50,273,438	50,197,395	49,927,735
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	U.S. Treasury Note	11/18/2025	10/15/2027	3.88	75,000,000	75,363,281	75,261,500	74,891,603
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPE5	U.S. Treasury Note	11/18/2025	10/31/2027	3.50	75,000,000	74,835,938	74,880,870	74,496,075
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	2/12/2025	11/15/2027	4.13	61,000,000	60,692,617	60,837,448	61,119,139
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	11/12/2025	11/15/2027	4.13	70,000,000	70,738,281	70,535,833	70,136,717
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,855,519	50,007,900
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,712,891	49,852,509	50,007,900
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	50,425,781	50,324,680	50,007,900
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	U.S. Treasury Note	11/14/2025	2/15/2028	4.25	50,000,000	50,714,844	50,541,996	50,197,265
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	2/15/2028	4.25	90,000,000	91,321,875	91,009,608	90,355,077

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/20/2026	3/15/2028	3.88	40,000,000	40,018,750	40,016,865	39,912,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/20/2026	3/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,021,484	50,019,324	49,890,625
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/9/2024	5/15/2028	2.88	65,000,000	61,082,227	63,131,403	63,616,209
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	5/15/2028	3.75	70,000,000	69,485,938	69,665,109	69,650,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/21/2025	6/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,404,297	50,321,453	49,859,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/14/2026	6/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,375,000	50,316,393	49,859,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/5/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,974,609	49,988,219	49,976,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,966,202	49,976,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,904,297	49,955,240	49,976,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/6/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,677,734	49,847,496	49,976,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/27/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,663,791	49,976,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	48,939,453	49,465,861	49,976,565
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	12/12/2023	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,115,234	50,054,944	50,359,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/14/2025	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,550,781	50,375,720	50,359,375
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNY3	U.S. Treasury Note	12/19/2025	9/15/2028	3.38	55,000,000	54,817,383	54,847,302	54,200,784
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJF9	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2026	10/31/2028	4.88	50,000,000	50,832,031	50,822,714	50,939,455
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPK1	U.S. Treasury Note	1/27/2026	11/15/2028	3.50	62,000,000	61,752,969	61,783,153	61,208,049
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	1/27/2026	1/31/2029	4.00	55,000,000	55,524,219	55,464,648	54,911,912
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	1/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,927,344	59,947,874	59,903,904
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	1/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,266,602	65,164,934	64,895,896
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2024	2/15/2029	2.63	50,000,000	45,710,938	47,602,387	48,173,830
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	4/8/2024	2/28/2029	4.25	50,000,000	49,773,438	49,872,836	50,240,235
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	2/28/2029	4.25	75,000,000	75,568,359	75,411,005	75,360,353
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	50,000,000	51,171,875	50,756,140	50,755,860
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	12/20/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	51,000,000	51,448,242	51,299,579	51,770,977
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	U.S. Treasury Note	10/23/2024	5/31/2029	4.50	50,000,000	51,039,063	50,676,843	50,595,705
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	51,046,875	50,686,047	49,859,400
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	49,888,672	49,926,080	49,859,400
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/7/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,563,672	65,370,651	64,817,220
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	50,000,000	49,041,016	49,365,842	48,550,780
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/3/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	65,000,000	63,664,453	64,115,843	63,116,014
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/30/2025	10/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,988,281	59,990,944	59,833,596
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/25/2024	10/31/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,611,328	49,730,670	50,046,875
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2026	10/31/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,869,141	49,870,181	50,046,875
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	4/10/2025	2/28/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,944,617	49,816,405
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	12/10/2025	2/28/2030	4.00	75,000,000	75,785,156	75,697,011	74,724,608
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2025	4/30/2030	3.88	50,000,000	49,468,750	49,579,182	49,572,265
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	4/30/2030	3.88	60,000,000	60,478,125	60,425,960	59,486,718
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHF1	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	5/31/2030	3.75	65,000,000	65,192,969	65,172,315	64,131,639
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,267,578	50,240,110	49,509,550
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,257,813	50,231,347	49,509,550
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/10/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,251,953	50,226,222	49,509,550
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,367,188	50,330,860	49,509,550
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,343,750	50,309,742	49,509,550
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/22/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,160,156	50,140,447	49,007,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,097,656	50,085,734	49,007,815
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,054,688	50,048,011	49,007,815

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPD7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	10/31/2030	3.63	60,000,000	59,779,688	59,801,251	58,774,218
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/16/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	50,000,000	49,703,125	49,725,432	48,933,595
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/20/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	50,000,000	49,562,500	49,594,477	48,933,595
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/7/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	60,000,000	59,737,500	59,758,425	58,720,314
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQG9	U.S. Treasury Note	4/8/2026	3/31/2031	3.88	100,000,000	99,433,594	99,450,418	98,824,220
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQK0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/5/2026	4/30/2031	3.88	55,000,000	54,484,375	54,492,020	54,340,429
Subtotals					3.35	5,434,000,000	5,419,600,171	5,432,283,516	5,407,833,397
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/10/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	17,045,000	16,991,479	17,044,479	17,042,784
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/17/2023	6/12/2026	3.75	20,000,000	19,939,200	19,999,404	19,997,400
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	10,000,000	9,934,300	9,999,347	9,999,600
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/1/2023	6/12/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,899,350	14,999,000	14,999,400
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2023	6/12/2026	4.75	50,000,000	49,856,000	49,998,517	50,011,500
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	13,485,000	13,505,093	13,485,305	13,488,506
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	20,000,000	20,030,400	20,000,462	20,005,400
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2024	6/12/2026	4.88	32,000,000	32,051,200	32,000,778	32,008,640
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	20,000,000	19,969,200	19,999,607	20,001,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	24,700,000	24,640,226	24,699,236	24,702,223
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2026	4.25	30,000,000	29,951,400	29,999,379	30,002,700
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,999,734	25,006,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	25,000,000	24,986,750	24,999,734	25,006,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2023	6/23/2026	4.38	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,999,468	50,013,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,999,703	10,009,300
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	19,000,000	18,984,800	18,999,456	19,017,670
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	21,000,000	20,982,780	20,999,384	21,019,530
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,916,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,916,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,916,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,916,000
Federal Agencies	313385ZG4	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/6/2026	7/13/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,729,358	14,939,537	14,930,850
Federal Agencies	313385ZL3	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	5/26/2026	7/17/2026	0.00	35,000,000	34,817,494	34,838,553	34,824,650
Federal Agencies	313385ZS8	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/6/2026	7/23/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,715,375	14,925,250	14,915,700
Federal Agencies	313385ZT6	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/6/2026	7/24/2026	0.00	50,000,000	49,043,694	49,745,306	49,714,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,889,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,889,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,889,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,889,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	3,000,000	2,991,930	2,999,526	3,006,060
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	9,615,000	9,589,136	9,613,480	9,634,422
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	16,000,000	15,956,960	15,997,471	16,032,320
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	25,000,000	24,936,750	24,996,283	25,050,500
Federal Agencies	313385A97	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/13/2026	8/7/2026	0.00	10,000,000	9,800,867	9,935,233	9,928,900
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,864,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,864,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,864,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,864,000
Federal Agencies	313385B47	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/13/2026	8/10/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,495,642	24,831,076	24,814,750

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	313385B62	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/13/2026	8/12/2026	0.00	51,000,000	49,961,265	50,645,550	50,611,890
Federal Agencies	313385B88	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/17/2026	8/14/2026	0.00	22,900,000	22,500,872	22,734,070	22,721,151
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/14/2023	8/14/2026	4.50	50,000,000	49,885,000	49,992,235	50,070,000
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,734,875	14,876,275	14,867,850
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,558,125	24,793,792	24,779,750
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,558,125	24,793,792	24,779,750
Federal Agencies	313385D45	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/2/2026	8/26/2026	0.00	51,000,000	50,112,345	50,568,710	50,540,490
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,818,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,818,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,818,750
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	19,000,000	18,974,730	18,996,670	18,992,210
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,966,750	24,995,619	24,989,750
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,900,000	25,865,553	25,895,461	25,889,381
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	50,000,000	49,933,500	49,991,238	49,979,500
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/12/2023	9/10/2026	0.80	28,975,000	26,174,277	28,692,973	28,729,292
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/18/2023	9/11/2026	4.88	11,895,000	11,821,965	11,887,965	11,929,733
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/16/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	15,585,000	15,292,898	15,411,903	15,404,214
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,535,875	24,723,500	24,710,000
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	40,000,000	39,257,400	39,557,600	39,536,000
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	50,000,000	49,071,750	49,447,000	49,420,000
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,720,087	24,702,500
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,720,087	24,702,500
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,720,087	24,702,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,996,850	14,999,438	15,012,000
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,999,063	25,020,000
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,999,063	25,020,000
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	50,000,000	49,989,500	49,998,125	50,040,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,764,500
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,764,500
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,764,500
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,764,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	14,000,000	13,904,940	13,987,771	14,052,080
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	30,000,000	29,834,100	29,978,657	30,111,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/29/2025	11/10/2026	4.00	12,600,000	12,581,352	12,594,300	12,601,890
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,736,000
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/17/2023	11/17/2026	4.63	50,000,000	49,911,500	49,986,354	50,203,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,698,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,698,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,698,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,698,500
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	15,000,000	14,993,850	14,996,563	14,970,750
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	37,000,000	36,984,830	36,991,521	36,927,850
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	45,000,000	44,981,550	44,989,688	44,912,250

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/8/2024	1/7/2027	3.50	12,500,000	12,373,750	12,466,169	12,468,250
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	12,000,000	11,973,000	11,994,311	12,023,280
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/9/2025	1/15/2027	4.13	20,000,000	20,101,800	20,057,737	20,038,800
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,988,147	25,048,500
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	29,350,000	29,283,963	29,336,085	29,406,939
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,887,500	49,976,294	50,097,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,992,850	4,998,447	5,008,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,986,600	9,997,090	10,017,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,968,500	24,993,160	25,042,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	35,000,000	34,955,900	34,990,424	35,059,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,933,000	49,985,451	50,085,000
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	2,000,000	1,997,860	1,999,232	2,007,080
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	25,000,000	24,974,250	24,990,758	25,088,500
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,967,600	29,988,372	30,106,200
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2024	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,983,500	29,994,741	30,067,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	15,000,000	14,980,050	14,990,334	14,986,950
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	25,000,000	24,967,500	24,984,253	24,978,250
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	35,000,000	34,950,650	34,976,089	34,969,550
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	40,000,000	39,946,800	39,974,224	39,965,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	10,000,000	9,993,800	9,997,417	9,998,900
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	45,000,000	44,972,100	44,988,379	44,995,050
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,709,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,709,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,709,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,709,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/16/2022	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	48,396,211	47,784,174
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/2/2024	3/26/2027	4.50	50,000,000	49,910,000	49,975,349	50,226,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	22,500,000	22,392,338	22,481,830	22,263,300
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	24,500,000	24,377,010	24,479,243	24,242,260
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	25,000,000	24,804,000	24,966,922	24,737,000
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	17,000,000	16,955,120	16,987,189	17,113,220
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	20,000,000	19,947,200	19,984,928	20,133,200
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	40,000,000	39,894,400	39,969,856	40,266,400
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	48,000,000	47,873,280	47,963,827	48,319,680
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/13/2024	5/6/2027	4.75	12,727,000	12,740,236	12,731,124	12,823,471
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	4,650,000	4,646,792	4,649,316	4,661,067
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,996,550	4,999,265	5,011,900
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,987,001	20,997,229	21,049,980
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,750	24,996,323	25,059,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	31,000,000	30,905,760	30,973,323	31,037,510
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	58,850,000	58,662,269	58,796,857	58,921,209
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	10,000,000	9,986,700	9,993,212	9,990,400
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	13,000,000	12,982,710	12,991,175	12,987,520
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	16,500,000	16,478,055	16,488,799	16,484,160
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	20,000,000	19,973,400	19,986,423	19,980,800
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	36,000,000	35,952,120	35,975,562	35,965,440
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	10,000,000	10,141,500	10,029,677	9,959,800

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	12,375,000	12,552,829	12,412,296	12,325,253
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/20/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	21,725,000	22,016,550	21,786,181	21,637,666
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/13/2024	6/11/2027	4.50	11,000,000	10,937,190	10,979,045	11,061,490
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2024	6/11/2027	4.63	20,700,000	20,795,634	20,733,642	20,841,671
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2027	4.13	28,940,000	28,911,928	28,932,718	28,994,986
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2022	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	27,915,497	27,653,783
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2024	6/28/2027	4.50	30,000,000	29,985,840	29,994,931	30,188,100
Federal Agencies	3133ERV9R	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/30/2024	7/1/2027	3.50	55,000,000	54,925,200	54,970,572	54,765,150
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,033,250	25,012,218	25,109,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/10/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,025,500	25,009,379	25,109,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	10,000,000	9,996,500	9,998,667	10,034,800
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	15,000,000	14,994,750	14,998,001	15,052,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,950	4,993,998	4,981,950
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,750	4,993,878	4,981,950
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	7,000,000	6,985,930	6,991,597	6,974,730
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,992,906	10,023,500
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	20,000,000	19,959,400	19,972,560	19,881,000
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	25,000,000	24,949,250	24,965,700	24,851,250
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	41,000,000	40,916,770	40,943,748	40,756,050
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	50,000,000	49,898,500	49,931,400	49,702,500
Federal Agencies	3133ET6R3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/8/2026	10/8/2027	3.38	15,000,000	14,977,650	14,982,695	14,867,400
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	5,000,000	4,997,250	4,998,742	4,993,250
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	8,000,000	7,996,160	7,998,243	7,989,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/27/2025	10/27/2027	3.38	9,320,000	9,298,844	9,305,133	9,240,594
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/27/2025	10/27/2027	3.38	60,000,000	59,863,800	59,904,287	59,488,800
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	5,000,000	4,999,350	4,999,663	5,017,950
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	41,880,000	41,877,738	41,878,826	42,030,349
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	27,950,000	27,834,008	27,907,763	28,164,656
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	33,300,000	33,161,472	33,249,557	33,555,744
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,936,790	20,967,640	21,031,080
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	25,505,000	25,428,485	25,465,828	25,542,747
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	33,000,000	32,893,080	32,945,262	33,048,840
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	38,343,000	38,227,588	38,283,915	38,399,748
Federal Agencies	3133EN5N6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2025	1/6/2028	4.00	50,000,000	50,486,000	50,378,432	49,996,400
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	23,480,000	23,403,690	23,418,255	23,226,651
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/7/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	30,000,000	29,941,500	29,953,120	29,676,300
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/7/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	46,000,000	45,910,300	45,928,117	45,503,660
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2025	1/14/2028	4.25	29,750,000	29,575,963	29,655,908	29,813,070
Federal Agencies	3133ET2W6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/8/2025	1/20/2028	3.50	5,000,000	4,991,800	4,993,656	4,955,350
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/21/2026	1/21/2028	3.50	35,000,000	34,926,150	34,939,403	34,709,150
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/21/2026	1/21/2028	3.50	35,000,000	34,926,150	34,939,403	34,709,150
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	47,000,000	46,976,030	46,986,698	47,135,830
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	50,000,000	49,974,500	49,985,849	50,144,500
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	13,000,000	12,988,820	12,990,170	12,900,420
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	15,000,000	14,987,100	14,988,657	14,885,100
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	25,000,000	24,978,500	24,981,095	24,808,500
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	30,000,000	29,974,200	29,977,314	29,770,200

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	50,000,000	49,957,000	49,962,191	49,617,000
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2024	3/20/2028	4.25	4,971,000	4,916,667	4,946,190	4,988,100
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	2,000,000	1,998,040	1,998,217	1,994,100
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,978,500	24,980,441	24,926,250
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,976,500	24,978,622	24,926,250
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,975,500	24,977,712	24,926,250
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/11/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	7,370,000	7,342,584	7,351,513	7,322,390
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,957,250	24,971,331	24,838,500
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	14,934,000	14,962,076	14,948,349	15,051,829
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/7/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,994,600	14,997,276	15,118,350
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	20,000,000	20,037,600	20,019,217	20,157,800
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/14/2025	6/9/2028	4.00	10,000,000	9,996,600	9,997,761	9,990,730
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	22,500,000	22,424,175	22,447,020	22,375,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	25,000,000	24,904,000	24,932,862	24,862,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	50,000,000	49,829,500	49,880,869	49,724,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/7/2023	8/7/2028	4.25	19,500,000	19,412,250	19,461,672	19,573,125
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	10,000,000	9,979,100	9,990,631	10,075,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,962,800	14,983,324	15,113,400
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	25,000,000	24,943,500	24,974,672	25,189,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	33,000,000	32,904,960	32,957,396	33,249,480
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	9/22/2028	3.50	10,000,000	9,997,600	9,997,984	9,871,000
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	9/22/2028	3.50	20,000,000	19,995,200	19,995,969	19,742,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	5,000,000	4,972,100	4,984,631	5,011,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	38,000,000	37,785,300	37,881,732	38,083,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	5,000,000	4,977,650	4,981,582	4,921,350
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	25,000,000	24,890,000	24,909,351	24,606,750
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	30,000,000	29,865,900	29,889,490	29,528,100
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/5/2026	11/3/2028	3.88	5,000,000	4,983,750	4,984,231	4,978,500
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/5/2026	11/3/2028	3.88	11,500,000	11,465,385	11,466,409	11,450,550
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	12,000,000	11,984,040	11,992,173	12,129,360
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	20,000,000	19,971,600	19,986,072	20,215,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	55,000,000	54,922,285	54,961,887	55,592,900
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/28/2024	11/27/2028	4.00	47,025,000	46,940,355	46,973,339	46,848,656
Federal Agencies	3133ET2S5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/9/2025	11/28/2028	3.38	35,000,000	34,735,750	34,778,127	34,401,325
Federal Agencies	3133EJ5J4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/8/2026	1/16/2029	3.19	10,000,000	9,891,400	9,905,565	9,774,000
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/9/2024	3/9/2029	4.50	25,000,000	25,018,750	25,010,571	25,218,000
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2024	3/20/2029	4.13	51,660,000	51,008,309	51,291,057	51,659,483
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	21,700,000	21,649,005	21,652,076	21,602,784
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	25,000,000	24,947,250	24,950,427	24,888,000
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	50,000,000	49,882,500	49,889,576	49,776,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	27,892,000	28,191,755	28,067,434	28,396,845
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	30,000,000	30,317,400	30,185,761	30,543,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	63,085,000	63,763,795	63,482,270	64,226,839
Federal Agencies	3133EWNE6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/1/2026	5/1/2029	3.75	25,000,000	24,934,000	24,935,867	24,751,500
Federal Agencies	3133EWNE6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/5/2026	5/1/2029	3.75	33,950,000	33,710,992	33,716,902	33,612,537
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/31/2025	6/8/2029	4.63	9,705,000	9,943,355	9,891,723	9,834,465
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,980,213	10,038,740

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,980,213	10,038,740
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,980,213	10,038,740
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,935,200	19,960,426	20,077,480
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	29,000,000	28,923,730	28,953,421	29,112,346
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,823,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,823,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,823,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,823,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,647,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,875,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,875,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,875,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,875,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,750,000
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,725,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,725,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	64,285,650
Federal Agencies	3133ERXK8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/12/2024	7/12/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,989,200	19,993,275	20,084,000
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/27/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,392,700	15,260,139	14,995,875
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,048,300	15,032,571	14,995,875
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,043,200	15,029,131	14,995,875
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/11/2025	9/14/2029	4.13	17,000,000	17,204,170	17,164,019	16,995,325
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	25,590,000	25,663,699	25,639,698	25,582,963
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,595,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	10,000,000	9,987,500	9,990,319	9,949,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,981,250	14,985,479	14,923,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,750,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,750,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,750,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,750,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,501,000
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,926	24,848,000
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,926	24,848,000
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,926	24,848,000
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,926	24,848,000
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	50,000,000	49,997,852	49,997,852	49,696,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,945,400	14,957,581	14,904,750
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	23,000,000	22,922,030	22,939,425	22,853,950
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,797,750
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,595,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,750
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,750
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,750
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,750
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,445,500
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	12,815,000	13,022,219	12,971,238	12,929,182
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	18,000,000	18,289,620	18,218,367	18,160,380
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	5,000,000	4,989,550	4,991,690	4,976,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	14,450,000	14,418,788	14,425,179	14,381,218
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,946,000	24,957,058	24,881,000
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	3/18/2030	4.00	8,695,000	8,671,610	8,677,020	8,622,223
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,993,700	14,995,149	14,954,550
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	32,260,000	32,243,870	32,247,579	32,162,252
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	43,020,000	42,904,276	42,930,835	42,889,649
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	46,750,000	46,732,703	46,736,680	46,608,348
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/15/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,527,500	49,634,934	49,848,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	9,750,000	9,746,100	9,746,810	9,695,108
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,979,069	9,943,700
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,998,650	14,998,896	14,915,550
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	20,000,000	19,945,000	19,955,723	19,887,400
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,965,000	24,971,622	24,859,250
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/9/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	12,515,000	12,579,452	12,567,750	12,493,274
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/23/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	16,000,000	16,063,200	16,051,270	15,972,224
Federal Agencies	3130AWMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/20/2025	6/14/2030	4.38	31,000,000	31,899,000	31,794,917	31,231,694
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	10,070,000	10,077,855	10,076,427	10,005,995
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	15,000,000	15,012,900	15,010,556	14,904,660
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	16,944,000	16,937,222	16,938,451	16,836,304
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	41,000,000	41,035,260	41,028,853	40,739,404
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,702,750
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,702,750
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,702,750
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,702,750
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,405,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,811,250
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,811,250
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,811,250
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,622,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,738,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,738,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,738,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,738,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,476,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/14/2025	7/8/2030	3.75	20,000,000	19,776,200	19,815,795	19,742,200
Federal Agencies	3133EWGC8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/6/2026	9/6/2030	3.50	36,750,000	36,529,500	36,541,162	35,824,635
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,760,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,760,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,760,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,760,250
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,520,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	22,753,440
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,732,000
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,732,000
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,732,000
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,464,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,755,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,755,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,755,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,755,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,510,000
Subtotals					3.54	8,602,384,000	8,583,612,685	8,595,365,358	8,567,890,140
Negotiable CDs	06367DRZ0	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/5/2025	6/1/2026	4.17	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,004,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSQ9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/9/2025	6/9/2026	4.00	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,005,060
Negotiable CDs	06367DS97	Bank of Montreal/CHI	8/18/2025	6/15/2026	4.20	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,019,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSR7	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/9/2025	6/15/2026	4.00	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,008,100
Negotiable CDs	89115DNV4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	1/5/2026	6/15/2026	3.78	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,001,000
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	Westpac Banking Corp/NY	6/20/2025	6/15/2026	4.32	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,023,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSV8	Bank of Montreal/CHI	9/24/2025	6/17/2026	3.98	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,005,500
Negotiable CDs	89115DK96	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	12/11/2025	6/23/2026	3.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,003,500
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	7/24/2025	7/1/2026	4.27	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,043,000
Negotiable CDs	78015JL88	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	8/14/2025	7/1/2026	4.06	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,022,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DKD7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	12/11/2025	7/1/2026	3.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,004,500
Negotiable CDs	89115MA63	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	9/23/2026	4.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,012,500
Negotiable CDs	89115MAA4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	9/24/2026	4.05	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,025,000
Negotiable CDs	89115MAE6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	10/5/2026	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,013,250
Negotiable CDs	13606DUD2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/25/2026	10/23/2026	4.05	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,059,000
Negotiable CDs	78015J4M6	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	3/25/2026	10/23/2026	4.00	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,047,000
Negotiable CDs	89115MAJ5	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/26/2026	10/23/2026	4.07	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,055,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DUX1	Bank of Montreal/CHI	4/1/2026	11/2/2026	4.00	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,035,000
Negotiable CDs	89115M4K9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	4/2/2026	11/3/2026	4.01	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,014,500
Negotiable CDs	06367DUZ6	Bank of Montreal/CHI	4/2/2026	11/4/2026	4.01	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,023,400
Negotiable CDs	13606DUU4	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/9/2026	12/3/2026	4.00	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,012,600
Negotiable CDs	13606DUV2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/9/2026	12/14/2026	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,004,250
Negotiable CDs	78015J6H5	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	4/15/2026	12/15/2026	3.95	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,001,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NQH8	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	4/23/2026	12/16/2026	3.91	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	69,975,500
Negotiable CDs	06418NQJ4	Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU	4/23/2026	12/28/2026	3.91	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	29,986,800
Negotiable CDs	78015J6R3	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	4/23/2026	12/28/2026	3.92	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,982,000
Negotiable CDs	78015J6V4	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	4/23/2026	12/30/2026	3.91	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	69,982,500
Negotiable CDs	13606DUN0	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/6/2026	1/11/2027	4.04	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,018,900
Negotiable CDs	13606DUP5	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/6/2026	1/13/2027	4.04	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,014,300
Negotiable CDs	89115M5L6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	5/5/2026	2/5/2027	3.98	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,976,500
Negotiable CDs	13606DVN9	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	5/5/2026	2/8/2027	3.98	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,034,000
Subtotals					4.03	2,195,000,000	2,195,000,000	2,195,000,000	2,195,411,660
Commercial Paper	62479MF16	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/1/2026	0.00	30,000,000	29,451,033	30,000,000	29,987,820
Commercial Paper	89233HF33	Toyota Motor Credit	9/9/2025	6/3/2026	0.00	60,000,000	58,264,500	59,987,000	59,963,340
Commercial Paper	62479MFF5	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	1/6/2026	6/15/2026	0.00	65,000,000	63,922,444	64,905,714	64,881,440

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Original Cost	Amortized Book	Market Value
Commercial Paper	62479MFJ7	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/18/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,699,175	14,972,942	14,968,095
Commercial Paper	02314QFN4	Amazon	5/21/2026	6/22/2026	0.00	34,730,000	34,617,938	34,656,459	34,642,029
Commercial Paper	62479MFP3	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/23/2026	0.00	50,000,000	48,970,722	49,883,278	49,868,500
Commercial Paper	62479MFV0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	12/11/2025	6/29/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,469,444	24,925,722	24,918,900
Commercial Paper	89233HG16	Toyota Motor Credit	10/27/2025	7/1/2026	0.00	70,000,000	68,184,550	69,779,500	69,752,340
Commercial Paper	89233HGE8	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/14/2026	0.00	75,000,000	73,359,375	74,664,063	74,631,000
Commercial Paper	89233HGQ1	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/24/2026	0.00	75,000,000	73,285,833	74,587,042	74,550,525
Commercial Paper	89233HGV0	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/29/2026	0.00	50,000,000	48,834,375	49,699,528	49,673,350
Commercial Paper	62479MJP9	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/25/2026	9/23/2026	0.00	100,000,000	97,987,889	98,739,667	98,754,400
Commercial Paper	62479MK77	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	6/30/2026	10/7/2026	0.00	51,000,000	49,931,196	50,283,733	50,284,419
Commercial Paper	62479MKF9	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/30/2026	10/15/2026	0.00	11,000,000	10,759,818	10,835,856	10,835,550
Commercial Paper	62479ML27	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/2/2026	11/2/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,417,444	24,580,778	24,575,325
Commercial Paper	62479ML68	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/2/2026	11/6/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,643,933	14,741,933	14,738,610
Commercial Paper	62479MLP6	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/7/2026	11/23/2026	0.00	90,000,000	87,746,000	88,285,000	88,262,910
Commercial Paper	62479MNR0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	5/26/2026	1/25/2027	0.00	15,000,000	14,602,483	14,612,258	14,603,310
Commercial Paper	89233HNT7	Toyota Motor Credit	5/22/2026	1/27/2027	0.00	100,000,000	97,250,000	97,360,000	97,320,100
Commercial Paper	62479MNU3	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	5/26/2026	1/28/2027	0.00	25,000,000	24,327,611	24,343,944	24,330,250
Subtotals					0.00	981,730,000	959,725,766	971,844,416	971,542,213
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	6,452,000	6,270,957	6,427,952	6,439,161
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	13,009,000	12,645,919	12,960,771	12,983,112
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	Caterpillar	9/18/2024	10/16/2026	4.45	18,385,000	18,600,288	18,423,911	18,428,940
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	Toyota Motors	1/9/2025	1/8/2027	4.60	40,000,000	39,978,000	39,993,331	40,158,400
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	Apple	9/18/2024	2/9/2027	3.35	50,000,000	49,586,000	49,880,158	49,800,000
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	John Deere	9/6/2024	7/15/2027	4.20	10,000,000	9,999,450	10,012,300	10,012,300
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	John Deere	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	4.25	25,000,000	24,977,750	24,985,079	25,021,000
Subtotals					3.98	162,846,000	162,057,514	162,670,651	162,842,913
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	5/31/2026	6/1/2026	3.52	14,825,100	14,825,100	14,825,100	14,825,100
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	5/31/2026	6/1/2026	3.56	639,607,353	639,607,353	639,607,353	639,607,353
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	5/31/2026	6/1/2026	3.55	431,717,528	431,717,528	431,717,528	431,717,528
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	5/31/2026	6/1/2026	3.52	15,423,639	15,423,639	15,423,639	15,423,639
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	5/31/2026	6/1/2026	3.54	31,250,201	31,250,201	31,250,201	31,250,201
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	5/31/2026	6/1/2026	3.55	293,511,465	293,511,465	293,511,465	293,511,465
Subtotals					3.55	1,426,335,286	1,426,335,286	1,426,335,286	1,426,335,286
Supranational	459058KC6	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	9/12/2025	11/16/2026	2.25	55,000,000	54,035,300	54,623,094	54,509,400
Supranational	459058KJ1	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	7/17/2024	6/15/2027	3.13	12,323,000	11,934,333	12,184,425	12,215,297
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	4/9/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	24,630,000	24,793,401	25,019,750
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	7/17/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,827,000	49,897,688	50,039,500
Subtotals					3.32	142,323,000	140,426,633	141,498,608	141,783,947
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	5/31/2026	6/1/2026	3.60	167,163,449	167,163,449	167,163,449	167,163,449
Subtotals					3.60	167,163,449	167,163,449	167,163,449	167,163,449
Grand Totals					3.36	19,111,781,735	19,053,921,503	19,092,161,285	19,040,803,004

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	1,162	-	38,627
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-1,203	-	36,263
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-5,941	-	31,525
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-5,639	-	31,827
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	-	31,423	-17,555	-	13,868
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-7,040	-	30,426
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	-4,172	-	33,293
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	-	31,423	-15,371	-	16,052
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	1,114	-	38,579
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	50,000,000	31,590	9,496	-	41,086
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	5,295	-	42,351
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	5,595	-	42,651
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	7,322	-	44,787
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	37,056	11,694	-	48,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	53,219	-1,229	-	51,990
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	53,219	-1,997	-	51,221
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	50,000,000	37,465	18,408	-	55,873
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	50,000,000	53,522	51,594	-	105,116
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	53,219	53,063	-	106,281
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	25,000,000	52,937	4,125	-	57,062
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	184,273	-2,072	-	182,201
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	481	-	171,751
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	1,379	-	172,649
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	1,826	-	173,096
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	6,221	-	177,491
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	13,714	-	184,984
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	46,575	-	185,732
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	49,441	-	188,598
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	50,000,000	179,008	3,930	-	182,938
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	T 2.875 05/15/2028	65,000,000	158,600	81,130	-	239,730
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	T 2.625 02/15/2029	50,000,000	112,396	75,077	-	187,473
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	171,271	21,787	-	193,058
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-5,697	-	191,246
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-8,480	-	188,464
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	9,740	-	148,898
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	50,000,000	131,624	16,562	-	148,185
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	171,271	-18,397	-	152,873
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	T 3.375 09/15/2027	50,000,000	142,154	6,173	-	148,326
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	65,000,000	171,111	23,091	-	194,202

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	65,000,000	222,652	-9,940	-	212,712
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	65,000,000	222,652	-5,244	-	217,408
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-28,667	-	168,277
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	T 4.500 05/31/2029	50,000,000	191,587	-19,162	-	172,425
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	171,271	1,982	-	173,253
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	50,000,000	194,803	-22,030	-	172,773
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	50,000,000	173,743	6,690	-	180,433
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	170,330	7,970	-	178,299
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	170,330	8,136	-	178,465
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	51,000,000	198,699	-8,728	-	189,971
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	61,000,000	213,553	9,472	-	223,025
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	50,000,000	168,478	1,255	-	169,733
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	60,000,000	205,525	1,657	-	207,182
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	75,000,000	268,512	-12,703	-	255,809
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	184,273	-14,169	-	170,104
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	T 3.750 05/15/2028	70,000,000	222,783	14,540	-	237,323
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-24,585	-	172,359
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	50,000,000	163,213	9,129	-	172,342
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	T 4.000 10/31/2029	60,000,000	202,174	225	-	202,399
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-29,289	-	167,655
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-28,730	-	168,214
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	196,944	-28,431	-	168,513
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	26,452	-	165,609
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHB0	T 3.625 05/15/2026	-	35,048	1,102	-	36,150
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	153,518	-2,752	-	150,766
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	153,518	-1,680	-	151,838
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	153,518	-941	-	152,577
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	70,000,000	245,061	-31,223	-	213,838
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	139,157	14,145	-	153,302
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	T 4.250 02/15/2028	50,000,000	181,975	-26,926	-	155,049
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	T 3.875 10/15/2027	75,000,000	246,158	-16,181	-	229,977
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPE5	T 3.500 10/31/2027	75,000,000	221,128	7,143	-	228,271
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	T 3.875 10/15/2027	50,000,000	164,105	-12,214	-	151,891
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	50,000,000	152,683	-1,679	-	151,004
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	T 4.250 02/15/2028	90,000,000	327,555	-50,157	-	277,398
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	75,000,000	229,025	-2,803	-	226,222
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	50,000,000	165,007	-13,376	-	151,631
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPD7	T 3.625 10/31/2030	60,000,000	183,220	3,820	-	187,040
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHF1	T 3.750 05/31/2030	65,000,000	207,553	-3,659	-	203,894

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	60,000,000	195,856	-9,241	-	186,615
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	170,330	-17,909	-	152,420
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-4,894	-	161,025
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-4,715	-	161,203
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-4,611	-	161,308
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	75,000,000	252,717	-15,795	-	236,923
U.S. Treasuries	912797SW8	B 0.000 05/28/2026	-	-	80,651	-	80,651
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKY6	T 4.625 06/30/2026	100,000,000	396,064	-86,496	-	309,568
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-6,743	-	159,175
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	165,919	-6,313	-	159,606
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNY3	T 3.375 09/15/2028	55,000,000	156,369	5,655	-	162,024
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	60,000,000	186,257	4,474	-	190,731
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	50,000,000	165,007	-13,165	-	151,842
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	50,000,000	155,214	5,085	-	160,299
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	50,000,000	155,214	7,510	-	162,724
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	55,000,000	188,398	-14,773	-	173,624
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPK1	T 3.500 11/15/2028	62,000,000	184,167	7,486	-	191,653
U.S. Treasuries	912797TX5	B 0.000 08/20/2026	100,000,000	-	301,389	-	301,389
U.S. Treasuries	912797TY3	B 0.000 08/27/2026	25,000,000	-	75,928	-	75,928
U.S. Treasuries	912797QN0	B 0.000 05/14/2026	-	-	32,425	-	32,425
U.S. Treasuries	912797UA3	B 0.000 06/16/2026	25,000,000	-	77,134	-	77,134
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	40,000,000	130,571	-801	-	129,770
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	50,000,000	163,213	-917	-	162,296
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQG9	T 3.875 03/31/2031	100,000,000	328,210	9,658	-	337,869
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQK0	T 3.875 04/30/2031	55,000,000	156,369	7,645	-	164,014
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	50,000,000	56,046	1,040	-	57,086
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJF9	T 4.875 10/31/2028	50,000,000	66,236	-9,317	-	56,919
Subtotals			5,434,000,000	15,260,843	570,038	-	15,830,880
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026	25,000,000	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026	25,000,000	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026	25,000,000	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	25,000,000	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	25,000,000	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026	25,000,000	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027	25,000,000	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027	48,573,000	68,002	19,434	-	87,436
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	24,500,000	53,083	2,089	-	55,172
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	22,500,000	48,750	1,829	-	50,579
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	25,000,000	54,167	3,329	-	57,496
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	27,865,000	75,236	-3,993	-	71,242
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	12,375,000	36,094	-3,083	-	33,011
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	10,000,000	29,167	-2,453	-	26,713
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	21,725,000	63,365	-5,058	-	58,307
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	21,000,000	72,188	245	-	72,433
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	5,000,000	17,188	65	-	17,253
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	4,650,000	15,984	61	-	16,045
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	25,000,000	85,938	326	-	86,263
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	10,000,000	34,375	491	-	34,866
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	17,045,000	53,266	1,470	-	54,735
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	20,000,000	62,500	1,680	-	64,180
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	15,000,000	50,000	2,819	-	52,819
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	10,000,000	33,333	1,840	-	35,173

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	30,000,000	106,250	1,375	-	107,625
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	20,000,000	70,833	871	-	71,705
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	28,940,000	99,481	596	-	100,077
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	24,700,000	87,479	1,691	-	89,170
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	50,000,000	182,292	750	-	183,041
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375	-	91,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	25,000,000	91,146	375	-	91,521
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	50,000,000	197,917	4,180	-	202,096
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	19,500,000	69,063	1,489	-	70,551
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	50,000,000	187,500	3,253	-	190,753
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	10,000,000	37,500	355	-	37,855
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	25,000,000	93,750	959	-	94,709
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	15,000,000	56,250	631	-	56,881
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	33,000,000	123,750	1,613	-	125,363
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	19,000,000	75,208	456	-	75,664
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	10,000,000	39,583	249	-	39,832
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	21,000,000	83,125	516	-	83,641
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026	11,895,000	48,323	2,138	-	50,461
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	30,000,000	121,875	4,692	-	126,567
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	14,000,000	56,875	2,689	-	59,564
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	25,000,000	104,167	1,953	-	106,120
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	3,000,000	12,500	249	-	12,749
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	9,615,000	40,063	799	-	40,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	16,000,000	66,667	1,329	-	67,996
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	27,950,000	107,724	2,461	-	110,185
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	33,300,000	128,344	2,939	-	131,283
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	12,000,000	46,250	271	-	46,521
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	20,000,000	77,083	482	-	77,565
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	55,000,000	211,979	1,319	-	213,298
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	FHLB 4.625 11/17/2026	50,000,000	192,708	2,503	-	195,212
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026	28,975,000	19,317	86,563	-	105,879
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	31,000,000	103,333	2,343	-	105,676
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	58,850,000	196,167	4,667	-	200,834
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	35,000,000	120,313	1,247	-	121,560
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	50,000,000	171,875	1,895	-	173,770
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	25,000,000	85,938	891	-	86,828
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	10,000,000	34,375	379	-	34,754
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	5,000,000	17,188	202	-	17,390
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	12,000,000	41,250	774	-	42,024

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	25,000,000	85,938	1,612	-	87,549
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	29,350,000	100,891	1,892	-	102,783
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	50,000,000	171,875	3,223	-	175,098
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027	50,000,000	187,500	2,564	-	190,064
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029	51,660,000	177,581	11,180	-	188,761
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028	4,971,000	17,606	1,169	-	18,774
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029	25,000,000	93,750	-324	-	93,426
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	20,000,000	79,167	1,498	-	80,664
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	17,000,000	67,292	1,273	-	68,565
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	48,000,000	190,000	3,594	-	193,594
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	40,000,000	158,333	2,995	-	161,328
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	63,085,000	249,711	-11,575	-	238,137
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	27,892,000	110,406	-5,111	-	105,294
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	30,000,000	118,750	-5,412	-	113,338
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	FFCB 4.750 05/06/2027	12,727,000	50,378	-377	-	50,001
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	FHLB 4.500 06/11/2027	11,000,000	41,250	1,732	-	42,982
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	15,000,000	56,250	115	-	56,365
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026	13,485,000	54,783	-860	-	53,922
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	32,000,000	130,000	-2,192	-	127,808
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	20,000,000	81,250	-1,302	-	79,948
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	38,000,000	134,583	4,204	-	138,788
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	5,000,000	17,708	546	-	18,255
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555	-	35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555	-	35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	20,000,000	70,833	1,109	-	71,943
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	555	-	35,971
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	29,000,000	102,708	1,306	-	104,014
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	20,000,000	75,000	-808	-	74,192
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	14,934,000	56,003	-604	-	55,399
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	FFCB 4.500 06/28/2027	30,000,000	112,500	401	-	112,901
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	-942	-	92,808
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	FHLB 4.625 06/11/2027	20,700,000	79,781	-2,781	-	77,000
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	-723	-	93,027
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	FFCB 4.250 07/12/2029	20,000,000	70,833	183	-	71,017
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	10,000,000	35,417	99	-	35,516
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	15,000,000	53,125	149	-	53,274
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,000,000	75,521	1,430	-	76,950
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	50,000,000	151,042	2,859	-	153,901
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	19,000,000	57,396	1,087	-	58,482

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,900,000	78,240	1,481	-	79,721
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-6,715	-	44,848
Federal Agencies	3133ERVR9	FFCB 3.500 07/01/2027	55,000,000	160,417	2,310	-	162,726
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	65,000,000	217,208	-	-	217,208
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	25,000,000	83,542	-	-	83,542
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029	25,000,000	83,542	-	-	83,542
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	FFCB 3.500 01/07/2027	12,500,000	36,458	4,767	-	41,225
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	8,000,000	25,833	109	-	25,942
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	5,000,000	16,146	78	-	16,224
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	15,000,000	50,000	134	-	50,134
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	224	-	83,557
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	224	-	83,557
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	50,000,000	166,667	447	-	167,114
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	FHLB 4.000 11/27/2028	47,025,000	156,750	1,760	-	158,510
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-841	-	50,722
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-752	-	50,811
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	25,590,000	87,966	-1,283	-	86,683
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	622	-	106,872
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	38,343,000	131,804	3,288	-	135,092
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	25,505,000	87,673	2,180	-	89,854
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	21,000,000	72,188	1,801	-	73,989
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	33,000,000	113,438	3,046	-	116,484
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	FFCB 4.250 01/14/2028	29,750,000	105,365	4,927	-	110,292
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	50,000,000	177,083	724	-	177,807
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	47,000,000	166,458	680	-	167,139
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ23	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	41,880,000	148,325	70	-	148,395
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ23	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	5,000,000	17,708	20	-	17,728
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	1,376	-	107,626
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	25,000,000	88,542	1,093	-	89,635
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	2,000,000	7,083	91	-	7,174
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	12,815,000	48,056	-3,650	-	44,406
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	18,000,000	67,500	-5,101	-	62,399
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	32,260,000	107,533	275	-	107,808
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	46,750,000	155,833	295	-	156,128
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	15,000,000	50,000	107	-	50,107
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	43,020,000	143,400	1,974	-	145,374
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030	8,695,000	28,983	402	-	29,385
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	50,000,000	166,667	8,084	-	174,750
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	FHLB 4.000 06/09/2028	10,000,000	33,333	94	-	33,427

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	45,000,000	150,000	1,349	-	151,349
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	10,000,000	33,333	300	-	33,633
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	15,000,000	50,000	1,029	-	51,029
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	FFCB 4.000 11/10/2026	12,600,000	42,000	1,091	-	43,091
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	23,000,000	76,667	1,469	-	78,136
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	25,000,000	80,729	1,209	-	81,938
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	20,000,000	66,667	934	-	67,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	10,000,000	33,333	441	-	33,775
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	15,000,000	50,000	367	-	50,367
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	10,000,000	33,333	245	-	33,578
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	7,370,000	23,799	780	-	24,579
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	16,500,000	53,281	944	-	54,225
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	10,000,000	32,292	572	-	32,864
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	20,000,000	64,583	1,144	-	65,727
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	13,000,000	41,979	743	-	42,723
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	36,000,000	116,250	2,059	-	118,309
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	25,000,000	83,333	999	-	84,333
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	14,450,000	48,167	578	-	48,744
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	5,000,000	16,667	193	-	16,860
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	16,000,000	55,000	-1,078	-	53,922
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	25,000,000	83,333	598	-	83,932
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	50,000,000	156,250	4,840	-	161,090
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	22,500,000	70,313	2,153	-	72,465
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	41,000,000	136,667	-606	-	136,061
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	15,000,000	50,000	-222	-	49,778
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	10,070,000	33,567	-135	-	33,432
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	25,000,000	78,125	2,728	-	80,853
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	15,000,000	50,000	23	-	50,023
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	9,750,000	32,500	67	-	32,567
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	16,944,000	56,480	116	-	56,596
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	12,515,000	43,020	-1,109	-	41,911
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	FFCB 3.750 07/08/2030	20,000,000	62,500	3,812	-	66,312
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029	9,705,000	37,405	-5,248	-	32,157
Federal Agencies	3133ETX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	7,000,000	21,146	597	-	21,743
Federal Agencies	3133ETX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	427	-	15,531
Federal Agencies	3133ETX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	435	-	15,539
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	17,000,000	58,438	-4,234	-	54,204
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	40,000,000	125,000	3,004	-	128,004
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	25,000,000	78,125	1,835	-	79,960

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	15,000,000	46,875	1,127	-	48,002
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	35,000,000	109,375	2,787	-	112,162
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	25,000,000	83,958	-	-	83,958
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030	50,000,000	167,917	-	-	167,917
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	50,000,000	170,000	-	-	170,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	25,000,000	85,000	-	-	85,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	25,000,000	85,000	-	-	85,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029	25,000,000	85,000	-	-	85,000
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	50,000,000	166,667	-	-	166,667
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	41,000,000	119,583	3,559	-	123,142
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	50,000,000	145,833	4,340	-	150,173
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	25,000,000	72,917	2,170	-	75,087
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	20,000,000	58,333	1,736	-	60,069
Federal Agencies	313385WN2	FHDN 0.000 05/08/2026	-	-	17,500	-	17,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027	9,320,000	26,213	898	-	27,111
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027	60,000,000	168,750	5,784	-	174,534
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	50,000,000	168,750	53	-	168,803
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	27	-	84,402
Federal Agencies	3130AWMP2	FHLB 4.375 06/14/2030	31,000,000	113,021	-16,718	-	96,303
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	5,000,000	14,063	652	-	14,714
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	25,000,000	70,313	3,208	-	73,520
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	30,000,000	84,375	3,911	-	88,286
Federal Agencies	3133ET2W6	FFCB 3.500 01/20/2028	5,000,000	14,583	329	-	14,912
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	20,000,000	68,750	-7,850	-	60,900
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	50,000,000	173,958	-	-	173,958
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	25,000,000	86,979	-	-	86,979
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	25,000,000	86,979	-	-	86,979
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	25,000,000	86,979	-	-	86,979

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ET2S5	FFCB 3.375 11/28/2028	35,000,000	98,438	7,550	-	105,988
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	23,000,000	80,021	-	-	80,021
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	45,000,000	131,250	1,567	-	132,817
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	37,000,000	107,917	1,288	-	109,205
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	15,000,000	43,750	522	-	44,272
Federal Agencies	3133EN5N6	FFCB 4.000 01/06/2028	50,000,000	166,667	-20,088	-	146,579
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	50,000,000	168,125	-	-	168,125
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	25,000,000	84,063	-	-	84,063
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028	10,000,000	29,167	74	-	29,241
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028	20,000,000	58,333	148	-	58,481
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	46,000,000	129,375	3,809	-	133,184
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	30,000,000	84,375	2,484	-	86,859
Federal Agencies	3133ET6R3	FFCB 3.375 10/08/2027	15,000,000	42,188	1,086	-	43,273
Federal Agencies	313385ZG4	FHDN 0.000 07/13/2026	15,000,000	-	44,627	-	44,627
Federal Agencies	313385ZS8	FHDN 0.000 07/23/2026	15,000,000	-	44,563	-	44,563
Federal Agencies	313385ZT6	FHDN 0.000 07/24/2026	50,000,000	-	148,972	-	148,972
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	50,000,000	171,250	-	-	171,250
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030	25,000,000	85,625	-	-	85,625
Federal Agencies	3133EJ5J4	FFCB 3.190 01/16/2029	10,000,000	26,583	3,049	-	29,633
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	50,000,000	169,167	-	-	169,167
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Federal Agencies	313385B47	FHDN 0.000 08/10/2026	25,000,000	-	74,809	-	74,809
Federal Agencies	313385B62	FHDN 0.000 08/12/2026	51,000,000	-	152,610	-	152,610
Federal Agencies	313385A97	FHDN 0.000 08/07/2026	10,000,000	-	29,967	-	29,967
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	23,480,000	66,038	3,272	-	69,309
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028	35,000,000	102,083	3,136	-	105,219
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028	35,000,000	102,083	3,136	-	105,219
Federal Agencies	313385B88	FHDN 0.000 08/14/2026	22,900,000	-	69,511	-	69,511
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	25,000,000	-	76,101	-	76,101
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	25,000,000	-	76,101	-	76,101

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	15,000,000	-	45,660	-	45,660
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	75,455	-	75,455
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	75,455	-	75,455
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	75,455	-	75,455
Federal Agencies	313385D45	FHDN 0.000 08/26/2026	51,000,000	-	155,465	-	155,465
Federal Agencies	3133EWGC8	FFCB 3.500 09/06/2030	36,750,000	107,188	4,155	-	111,343
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	15,000,000	43,750	549	-	44,299
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	50,000,000	145,833	1,829	-	147,662
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	30,000,000	87,500	1,097	-	88,597
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	25,000,000	72,917	914	-	73,831
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	13,000,000	37,917	475	-	38,392
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	50,000,000	-	153,063	-	153,063
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	25,000,000	-	76,531	-	76,531
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	15,585,000	-	47,911	-	47,911
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	40,000,000	-	122,450	-	122,450
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	80,729	912	-	81,641
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	80,729	997	-	81,726
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	80,729	1,039	-	81,768
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	2,000,000	6,458	83	-	6,541
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	25,000,000	80,729	1,492	-	82,221
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	21,700,000	70,073	1,442	-	71,515
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	50,000,000	161,458	3,323	-	164,782
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	FNMA 4.200 03/17/2031	25,000,000	87,500	-	-	87,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	FNMA 4.200 03/17/2031	25,000,000	87,500	-	-	87,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	FNMA 4.200 03/17/2031	25,000,000	87,500	-	-	87,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	FNMA 4.200 03/17/2031	25,000,000	87,500	-	-	87,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	FNMA 4.200 03/17/2031	50,000,000	175,000	-	-	175,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	FNMA 4.180 01/07/2030	50,000,000	174,167	-	-	174,167
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	FNMA 4.180 01/07/2030	25,000,000	87,083	-	-	87,083
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	FNMA 4.180 01/07/2030	25,000,000	87,083	-	-	87,083
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	FNMA 4.180 01/07/2030	25,000,000	87,083	-	-	87,083
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	FNMA 4.180 01/07/2030	25,000,000	87,083	-	-	87,083
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	50,000,000	177,083	-	-	177,083
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	25,000,000	88,542	-	-	88,542
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	25,000,000	88,542	-	-	88,542
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	25,000,000	88,542	-	-	88,542
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	25,000,000	88,542	-	-	88,542
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	FNMA 4.183 07/01/2030	50,000,000	174,292	-	-	174,292
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	FNMA 4.183 07/01/2030	25,000,000	87,146	-	-	87,146

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	FNMA 4.183 07/01/2030	25,000,000	87,146	-	-	87,146
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	FNMA 4.183 07/01/2030	25,000,000	87,146	-	-	87,146
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	FNMA 4.183 07/01/2030	25,000,000	87,146	-	-	87,146
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	-	-	85,938
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	-	-	85,938
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	-	-	85,938
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	-	-	85,938
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	50,000,000	171,875	-	-	171,875
Federal Agencies	3133EWNE6	FFCB 3.750 05/01/2029	25,000,000	78,125	1,867	-	79,992
Federal Agencies	313385WK8	FHDN 0.000 05/05/2026	-	-	9,972	-	9,972
Federal Agencies	3133EWNE6	FFCB 3.750 05/01/2029	33,950,000	91,948	5,910	-	97,857
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	FFCB 3.875 11/03/2028	11,500,000	32,184	1,024	-	33,208
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	FFCB 3.875 11/03/2028	5,000,000	13,993	481	-	14,474
Federal Agencies	313385WS1	FHDN 0.000 05/12/2026	-	-	9,889	-	9,889
Federal Agencies	313385WT9	FHDN 0.000 05/13/2026	-	-	9,889	-	9,889
Federal Agencies	313385ZL3	FHDN 0.000 07/17/2026	35,000,000	-	21,058	-	21,058
Subtotals			8,602,384,000	25,317,077	1,884,996	-	27,202,074
Negotiable CDs	96130AZZ4	WSTNY 4.350 05/04/2026	-	45,312	-	-	45,312
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026	100,000,000	372,000	-	-	372,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	BNSHOU 4.270 07/01/2026	100,000,000	367,694	-	-	367,694
Negotiable CDs	06367DRZ0	BMOCHG 4.170 06/01/2026	100,000,000	359,083	-	-	359,083
Negotiable CDs	78015JL88	RY 4.060 07/01/2026	100,000,000	349,611	-	-	349,611
Negotiable CDs	06367DS97	BMOCHG 4.200 06/15/2026	100,000,000	361,667	-	-	361,667
Negotiable CDs	06367DSQ9	BMOCHG 4.000 06/09/2026	46,000,000	158,444	-	-	158,444
Negotiable CDs	06367DSR7	BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026	54,000,000	186,000	-	-	186,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSV8	BMOCHG 3.980 06/17/2026	55,000,000	188,497	-	-	188,497
Negotiable CDs	89115DK96	TDNY 3.850 06/23/2026	50,000,000	165,764	-	-	165,764
Negotiable CDs	89115DKD7	TDNY 3.850 07/01/2026	50,000,000	165,764	-	-	165,764
Negotiable CDs	89115DNLV4	TDNY 3.780 06/15/2026	100,000,000	325,500	-	-	325,500
Negotiable CDs	78015J4M6	RY 4.000 10/23/2026	100,000,000	344,444	-	-	344,444
Negotiable CDs	13606DUD2	CIBCNY 4.050 10/23/2026	100,000,000	348,750	-	-	348,750
Negotiable CDs	89115MA63	TDNY 4.050 09/23/2026	25,000,000	87,188	-	-	87,188
Negotiable CDs	89115MAA4	TDNY 4.050 09/24/2026	50,000,000	174,375	-	-	174,375
Negotiable CDs	89115MAE6	TDNY 4.060 10/05/2026	25,000,000	87,403	-	-	87,403
Negotiable CDs	89115MAJ5	TDNY 4.070 10/23/2026	100,000,000	350,472	-	-	350,472
Negotiable CDs	06367DUX1	BMOCHG 4.000 11/02/2026	100,000,000	344,444	-	-	344,444
Negotiable CDs	06367DUZ6	BMOCHG 4.010 11/04/2026	60,000,000	207,183	-	-	207,183
Negotiable CDs	89115M4K9	TDNY 4.010 11/03/2026	50,000,000	172,653	-	-	172,653

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Negotiable CDs	13606DUN0	CIBCNY 4.040 01/11/2027	70,000,000	243,522	-	-	243,522
Negotiable CDs	13606DUP5	CIBCNY 4.040 01/13/2027	55,000,000	191,339	-	-	191,339
Negotiable CDs	13606DUU4	CIBCNY 4.000 12/03/2026	60,000,000	206,667	-	-	206,667
Negotiable CDs	13606DUV2	CIBCNY 4.000 12/14/2026	25,000,000	86,111	-	-	86,111
Negotiable CDs	78015J6H5	RY 3.950 12/15/2026	100,000,000	340,139	-	-	340,139
Negotiable CDs	78015J6R3	RY 3.920 12/28/2026	100,000,000	337,556	-	-	337,556
Negotiable CDs	06418NQH8	BNSHOU 3.910 12/16/2026	70,000,000	235,686	-	-	235,686
Negotiable CDs	78015J6V4	RY 3.910 12/30/2026	70,000,000	235,686	-	-	235,686
Negotiable CDs	06418NQJ4	BNSHOU 3.910 12/28/2026	30,000,000	101,008	-	-	101,008
Negotiable CDs	13606DVN9	CIBCNY 3.980 02/08/2027	100,000,000	298,500	-	-	298,500
Negotiable CDs	89115M5L6	TDNY 3.980 02/05/2027	50,000,000	149,250	-	-	149,250
Subtotals			2,195,000,000	7,587,714	-	-	7,587,714
Commercial Paper	89233HEN0	TOYCC 0.000 05/22/2026	-	-	237,417	-	237,417
Commercial Paper	89233HEL4	TOYCC 0.000 05/20/2026	-	-	113,499	-	113,499
Commercial Paper	89233HF33	TOYCC 0.000 06/03/2026	60,000,000	-	201,500	-	201,500
Commercial Paper	89233HG16	TOYCC 0.000 07/01/2026	70,000,000	-	227,850	-	227,850
Commercial Paper	62479MFP3	MUFGBK 0.000 06/23/2026	50,000,000	-	164,472	-	164,472
Commercial Paper	62479MFV0	MUFGBK 0.000 06/29/2026	25,000,000	-	82,236	-	82,236
Commercial Paper	62479MF16	MUFGBK 0.000 06/01/2026	30,000,000	-	98,942	-	98,942
Commercial Paper	62479MFJ7	MUFGBK 0.000 06/18/2026	15,000,000	-	49,342	-	49,342
Commercial Paper	89233HGE8	TOYCC 0.000 07/14/2026	75,000,000	-	242,188	-	242,188
Commercial Paper	89233HGQ1	TOYCC 0.000 07/24/2026	75,000,000	-	241,542	-	241,542
Commercial Paper	89233HGV0	TOYCC 0.000 07/29/2026	50,000,000	-	160,597	-	160,597
Commercial Paper	62479MFF5	MUFGBK 0.000 06/15/2026	65,000,000	-	208,776	-	208,776
Commercial Paper	62479MJP9	MUFGBK 0.000 09/23/2026	100,000,000	-	342,722	-	342,722
Commercial Paper	62479MK77	MUFGBK 0.000 10/07/2026	51,000,000	-	173,471	-	173,471
Commercial Paper	62479MKF9	MUFGBK 0.000 10/15/2026	11,000,000	-	37,415	-	37,415
Commercial Paper	62479ML27	MUFGBK 0.000 11/02/2026	25,000,000	-	84,389	-	84,389
Commercial Paper	62479ML68	MUFGBK 0.000 11/06/2026	15,000,000	-	50,633	-	50,633
Commercial Paper	62479MLP6	MUFGBK 0.000 11/23/2026	90,000,000	-	303,800	-	303,800
Commercial Paper	14912EE78	CATFIN 0.000 05/07/2026	-	-	17,725	-	17,725
Commercial Paper	14912EEK9	CATFIN 0.000 05/19/2026	-	-	168,356	-	168,356
Commercial Paper	14912EEL7	CATFIN 0.000 05/20/2026	-	-	75,030	-	75,030
Commercial Paper	14912EES2	CATFIN 0.000 05/26/2026	-	-	119,651	-	119,651
Commercial Paper	14912EEV5	CATFIN 0.000 05/29/2026	-	-	214,667	-	214,667
Commercial Paper	14912EEV5	CATFIN 0.000 05/29/2026	-	-	105,187	-	105,187
Commercial Paper	02314QFN4	AMZN 0.000 06/22/2026	34,730,000	-	38,521	-	38,521
Commercial Paper	89233HNT7	TOYCC 0.000 01/27/2027	100,000,000	-	110,000	-	110,000

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Commercial Paper	62479MNR0	MUFGBK 0.000 01/25/2027	15,000,000	-	9,775	-	9,775
Commercial Paper	62479MNU3	MUFGBK 0.000 01/28/2027	25,000,000	-	16,333	-	16,333
Subtotals			981,730,000	-	3,896,036	-	3,896,036
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	6,452,000	18,281	7,033	-	25,314
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	13,009,000	36,859	14,105	-	50,963
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	DE 4.200 07/15/2027	10,000,000	35,000	42	-	35,042
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	CAT 4.450 10/16/2026	18,385,000	68,178	-8,805	-	59,373
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	AAPL 3.350 02/09/2027	50,000,000	139,583	14,684	-	154,268
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	TOYOTA 4.600 01/08/2027	40,000,000	153,333	936	-	154,269
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	DE 4.250 06/05/2028	25,000,000	88,542	629	-	89,171
Subtotals			162,846,000	539,776	28,624	-	568,399
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	14,825,100	43,959	-	-	43,959
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	639,607,353	1,914,322	-	-	1,914,322
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	431,717,528	987,198	-	-	987,198
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	15,423,639	45,735	-	-	45,735
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	31,250,201	93,148	-	-	93,148
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	293,511,465	231,949	-	-	231,949
Subtotals			1,426,335,286	3,316,311	-	-	3,316,311
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	6,469	-	92,407
Supranationals	459058KJ1	IBRD 3.125 06/15/2027	12,323,000	32,091	11,335	-	43,426
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	50,000,000	171,875	3,204	-	175,079
Supranationals	459058KC6	IBRD 0.700 11/16/2026	55,000,000	103,125	69,548	-	172,673
Subtotals			142,323,000	393,029	90,556	-	483,584
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	167,163,449	509,550	-	-	509,550
Subtotals			167,163,449	509,550	-	-	509,550
Grand Totals			19,111,781,735	52,924,299	6,470,250	-	59,394,549

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
59121	Buy	3133EWNE6	FFCB 3.750 05/01/2029	99.73600	05/01/2026	05/01/2026	25,000,000	24,934,000	-	24,934,000
59122	Buy	14912EEK9	CATFIN 0.000 05/19/2026	99.84625	05/04/2026	05/04/2026	109,500,000	109,331,644	-	109,331,644
59123	Buy	313385WK8	FHDN 0.000 05/05/2026	99.99003	05/04/2026	05/04/2026	100,000,000	99,990,028	-	99,990,028
59124	Buy	91282CQK0	T 3.875 04/30/2031	99.06250	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	55,000,000	54,484,375	28,957	54,513,332
59125	Buy	3133EWNE6	FFCB 3.750 05/01/2029	99.29600	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	33,950,000	33,710,992	14,146	33,725,138
59126	Buy	3133EWNL0	FFCB 3.875 11/03/2028	99.69900	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	11,500,000	11,465,385	1,238	11,466,623
59127	Buy	3133EWNL0	FFCB 3.875 11/03/2028	99.67500	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	5,000,000	4,983,750	538	4,984,288
59128	Buy	14912EEL7	CATFIN 0.000 05/20/2026	99.84625	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	48,800,000	48,724,970	-	48,724,970
59129	Buy	13606DVN9	CIBCNY 3.980 02/08/2027	100.00000	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59130	Buy	89115M5L6	TDNY 3.980 02/05/2027	100.00000	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
59131	Buy	14912EES2	CATFIN 0.000 05/26/2026	99.79556	05/06/2026	05/06/2026	58,525,000	58,405,349	-	58,405,349
59132	Buy	14912EEV5	CATFIN 0.000 05/29/2026	99.78533	05/08/2026	05/08/2026	100,000,000	99,785,333	-	99,785,333
59133	Buy	14912EEV5	CATFIN 0.000 05/29/2026	99.78533	05/08/2026	05/08/2026	49,000,000	48,894,813	-	48,894,813
59134	Buy	313385WS1	FHDN 0.000 05/12/2026	99.99011	05/11/2026	05/11/2026	100,000,000	99,990,111	-	99,990,111
59135	Buy	313385WT9	FHDN 0.000 05/13/2026	99.99011	05/12/2026	05/12/2026	100,000,000	99,990,111	-	99,990,111
59136	Buy	02314QFN4	AMZN 0.000 06/22/2026	99.67733	05/21/2026	05/21/2026	34,730,000	34,617,938	-	34,617,938
59137	Buy	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	99.73828	05/22/2026	05/22/2026	50,000,000	49,869,141	123,302	49,992,442
59138	Buy	91282CJF9	T 4.875 10/31/2028	101.66406	05/22/2026	05/22/2026	50,000,000	50,832,031	145,720	50,977,751
59139	Buy	89233HNT7	TOYCC 0.000 01/27/2027	97.25000	05/22/2026	05/22/2026	100,000,000	97,250,000	-	97,250,000
59140	Buy	62479MNR0	MUFGBK 0.000 01/25/2027	97.34989	05/26/2026	05/26/2026	15,000,000	14,602,483	-	14,602,483
59141	Buy	62479MNU3	MUFGBK 0.000 01/28/2027	97.31044	05/26/2026	05/26/2026	25,000,000	24,327,611	-	24,327,611
59142	Buy	313385ZL3	FHDN 0.000 07/17/2026	99.47856	05/26/2026	05/26/2026	35,000,000	34,817,494	-	34,817,494
Activity Total							1,256,005,000	1,251,007,560	313,901	1,251,321,461

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58677	Maturity	96130AZZ4	WSTNY 4.350 05/04/2026	100.00000	05/04/2026	05/04/2026	125,000,000	125,000,000	-	125,000,000
59123	Maturity	313385WK8	FHDN 0.000 05/05/2026	100.00000	05/05/2026	05/05/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59113	Maturity	14912EE78	CATFIN 0.000 05/07/2026	100.00000	05/07/2026	05/07/2026	28,900,000	28,900,000	-	28,900,000
58857	Maturity	313385WN2	FHDN 0.000 05/08/2026	100.00000	05/08/2026	05/08/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
59134	Maturity	313385WS1	FHDN 0.000 05/12/2026	100.00000	05/12/2026	05/12/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59135	Maturity	313385WT9	FHDN 0.000 05/13/2026	100.00000	05/13/2026	05/13/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
58994	Maturity	912797QN0	B 0.000 05/14/2026	100.00000	05/14/2026	05/14/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
47103	Maturity	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	100.00000	05/15/2026	05/15/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47147	Maturity	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	100.00000	05/15/2026	05/15/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58858	Maturity	91282CHB0	T 3.625 05/15/2026	100.00000	05/15/2026	05/15/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
59122	Maturity	14912EEK9	CATFIN 0.000 05/19/2026	100.00000	05/19/2026	05/19/2026	109,500,000	109,500,000	-	109,500,000
59128	Maturity	14912EEL7	CATFIN 0.000 05/20/2026	100.00000	05/20/2026	05/20/2026	48,800,000	48,800,000	-	48,800,000
58810	Maturity	89233HEL4	TOYCC 0.000 05/20/2026	100.00000	05/20/2026	05/20/2026	55,000,000	55,000,000	-	55,000,000
58795	Maturity	89233HENO	TOYCC 0.000 05/22/2026	100.00000	05/22/2026	05/22/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59131	Maturity	14912EES2	CATFIN 0.000 05/26/2026	100.00000	05/26/2026	05/26/2026	58,525,000	58,525,000	-	58,525,000
58915	Maturity	912797SW8	B 0.000 05/28/2026	100.00000	05/28/2026	05/28/2026	30,000,000	30,000,000	-	30,000,000
59132	Maturity	14912EEV5	CATFIN 0.000 05/29/2026	100.00000	05/29/2026	05/29/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59133	Maturity	14912EEV5	CATFIN 0.000 05/29/2026	100.00000	05/29/2026	05/29/2026	49,000,000	49,000,000	-	49,000,000
Activity Total							1,179,725,000	1,179,725,000	-	1,179,725,000

Interest Received Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
58524	Interest Income	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	05/04/2026	889,950.00	0.00	889,950.00
58525	Interest Income	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	05/04/2026	106,250.00	0.00	106,250.00
58677	Interest Income	96130AZZ4	WSTNY 4.350 05/04/2026	05/04/2026	5,346,875.00	0.00	5,346,875.00
57936	Interest Income	3133ERDS7	FFCB 4.750 05/06/2027	05/06/2026	302,266.25	0.00	302,266.25
58880	Interest Income	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	05/07/2026	506,250.00	0.00	506,250.00
58881	Interest Income	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	05/07/2026	506,250.00	0.00	506,250.00
58882	Interest Income	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	05/07/2026	1,012,500.00	0.00	1,012,500.00
58883	Interest Income	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	05/07/2026	506,250.00	0.00	506,250.00
58884	Interest Income	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	05/07/2026	506,250.00	0.00	506,250.00
58691	Interest Income	3133ETJS7	FFCB 4.000 11/10/2026	05/11/2026	252,000.00	0.00	252,000.00
57800	Interest Income	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	05/13/2026	277,500.00	0.00	277,500.00
57801	Interest Income	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	05/13/2026	462,500.00	0.00	462,500.00
57802	Interest Income	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	05/13/2026	1,271,875.00	0.00	1,271,875.00
58858	Interest Income	91282CHB0	T 3.625 05/15/2026	05/15/2026	453,125.00	0.00	453,125.00
47147	Interest Income	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	05/15/2026	406,250.00	0.00	406,250.00
58885	Interest Income	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	05/15/2026	1,443,750.00	0.00	1,443,750.00
58981	Interest Income	91282CPK1	T 3.500 11/15/2028	05/15/2026	1,085,000.00	437,596.69	647,403.31
57798	Interest Income	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	05/15/2026	646,343.75	0.00	646,343.75
57799	Interest Income	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	05/15/2026	770,062.50	0.00	770,062.50
57904	Interest Income	9128284N7	T 2.875 05/15/2028	05/15/2026	934,375.00	0.00	934,375.00
58547	Interest Income	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	05/15/2026	1,258,125.00	0.00	1,258,125.00
58675	Interest Income	91282CND9	T 3.750 05/15/2028	05/15/2026	1,312,500.00	0.00	1,312,500.00
47103	Interest Income	912828R36	T 1.625 05/15/2026	05/15/2026	406,250.00	0.00	406,250.00
58817	Interest Income	459058KC6	IBRD 0.700 11/16/2026	05/18/2026	618,750.00	0.00	618,750.00
47210	Interest Income	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	05/18/2026	178,750.00	0.00	178,750.00
47211	Interest Income	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	05/18/2026	178,750.00	0.00	178,750.00
47212	Interest Income	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	05/18/2026	178,750.00	0.00	178,750.00
47213	Interest Income	3130APPR0	FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026	05/18/2026	178,750.00	0.00	178,750.00
47222	Interest Income	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	05/18/2026	200,625.00	0.00	200,625.00
47223	Interest Income	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	05/18/2026	200,625.00	0.00	200,625.00
47224	Interest Income	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	05/18/2026	200,625.00	0.00	200,625.00
47225	Interest Income	3130AQ7L1	FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026	05/18/2026	200,625.00	0.00	200,625.00
57509	Interest Income	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	05/18/2026	433,125.00	0.00	433,125.00
57510	Interest Income	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	05/18/2026	103,125.00	0.00	103,125.00
57511	Interest Income	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	05/18/2026	95,906.25	0.00	95,906.25
57512	Interest Income	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	05/18/2026	515,625.00	0.00	515,625.00
57803	Interest Income	3130AXU63	FHLB 4.625 11/17/2026	05/18/2026	1,156,250.00	0.00	1,156,250.00
57820	Interest Income	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	05/20/2026	620,000.00	0.00	620,000.00
57821	Interest Income	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	05/20/2026	1,177,000.00	0.00	1,177,000.00
58433	Interest Income	3130B3GD9	FHLB 4.000 11/27/2028	05/27/2026	940,500.00	0.00	940,500.00
58913	Interest Income	3133ET2S5	FFCB 3.375 11/28/2028	05/28/2026	590,625.00	36,093.75	554,531.25
Activity Total					28,430,904	473,690	27,957,213

Cash Activity Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Description	Activity Date	Transaction	Amount
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/01/2026	Withdrawal	-60,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/04/2026	Withdrawal	-145,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/05/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/05/2026	Withdrawal	-75,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/06/2026	Withdrawal	-115,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/07/2026	Deposit	30,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/08/2026	Withdrawal	-65,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/08/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/11/2026	Withdrawal	-115,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/12/2026	Deposit	30,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/13/2026	Deposit	80,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/14/2026	Deposit	40,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/15/2026	Deposit	70,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/15/2026	Deposit	100,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/18/2026	Withdrawal	-125,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	05/19/2026	Deposit	145,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	05/20/2026	Deposit	35,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	05/21/2026	Withdrawal	-40,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	05/22/2026	Withdrawal	-115,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/26/2026	Deposit	60,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/27/2026	Deposit	25,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/28/2026	Deposit	30,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	05/28/2026	Deposit	90,000,000
09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	05/29/2026	Interest Received	43,959
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	05/29/2026	Interest Received	1,914,322
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/29/2026	Deposit	70,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	05/29/2026	Interest Received	987,198
262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	05/29/2026	Interest Received	45,735
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	05/29/2026	Interest Received	93,148
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	05/29/2026	Deposit	150,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	05/29/2026	Interest Received	231,949
0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	05/29/2026	Interest Received	509,550
Activity Total				-96,174,139

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: SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 3:28:00 PM
Attachments: [SFPD_2026_Q1_CoverLetter_sign.pdf](#)
[OADR Q1 2026.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached report from the Police Department.

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: Lam, Terry (POL) <terry.lam@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 11:11 AM
To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Fountain, Chris (POL) <Christine.Fountain@sfgov.org>; Nicita, Carl (POL) <carl.nicita@sfgov.org>; Cunningham, Jason (POL) <jason.cunningham@sfgov.org>; Gorman, Patrick (POL) <patrick.gorman@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting

Good afternoon Madam Clerk,

On behalf of Chief Derrick Lew, the attached reports for Quarter 1 2026 are being submitted pursuant to Admin Code Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting. Your assistance is appreciated in the distribution to the members of the Board.

Thank you for your assistance.

Very Respectfully,

Terry Lam

Sr Analyst (Acting Supervisor)

Business Analysis Team (BAT), Crime Strategies Division

San Francisco Police Department

Email or MS Teams: terry.lam@sfgov.org (Preferred contact method)

Office: 415-837-7013



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

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



DERRICK J. LEW
CHIEF OF POLICE

June 9, 2026

The Honorable Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable C. Don Clay
President, Police Commission
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

Director Mawuli Tugbenyoh
Executive Director, Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisor Mandelman, Commissioner Clay, and Director Tugbenyoh:

Subject: First Quarter 2026 Report per Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements – Stop Data, Use of Force, Crime Victim, and Domestic Violence

As required by Administrative Code Chapter 96A, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is submitting the attached Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR).

SFPD is transitioning its Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR) into a series of online dashboards. As these dashboards rolled out in phases—covering Stops, Arrests, Victim Demographics, and Use of Force—they replaced a large section of the 'paper' QADR with explorable data. These dashboards are updated quarterly, in tandem with data prepared for submission to the California Department of Justice.

The Stop and Arrest Dashboards are located here: ([SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department](#)), while the Victim & Suspect Dashboards are here: ([SFPD 96A.5 Victim and Suspect Demographic Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department](#)), and the Use of Force Dashboards are here: ([SFPD Use of Force Dashboard | San Francisco Police Department](#)).

Beginning with the Q1 2025 report, the Department incorporated three additional benchmark measures alongside the Census Population benchmark: the Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) index, the Suspect Adjusted Disparity (SAD) Index, and the Not-at-Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout (TAL) Index. Each utilizes a distinct methodology to provide enhanced context and more comprehensive benchmarking of departmental interactions.

We appreciate the partnership of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors in promoting the transparency of the SFPD to the communities we have sworn to protect.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff, Government Affairs Manager Carl Nicita at carl.nicita@sfgov.org. These documents are also available online at www.sanfranciscopolice.org.

Sincerely,

DERRICK J. LEW
Chief of Police

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Quarterly Activity and Data Report Quarter I 2026



Safety with Respect

**Derrick J. Lew,
Chief of Police
San Francisco Police
Department**



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Benchmarking Stop Data.....	2
Census Population Benchmarking	3
Census Population Benchmark Advantages	3
Census Population Benchmark Disadvantages.....	3
Including Three Additional Benchmarks	4
Risk Adjusted Disparity Index.....	6
Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index.....	11
Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout	14
CRSTAL Conclusions	16
CRSTAL Methodologies	18
Risk Adjusted Disparity Index.....	18
Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index	20
Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout.....	20
Stops Data Collection Transition & Associated Errors	23
Quarterly Activity and Data Report	24
2026 Q1 Overview.....	25
Suspects Observed or Reported.....	26
Stops and Searches	27
Use of Force.....	28
Arrest Demographic Data.....	29
96A.5 Victim and Suspect Demographic Data	30
Bias-Related Complaints	31
Domestic Violence Reporting - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b.....	33
Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b Reporting Components	34
Calls for Service, Q1 2026.....	35
Glossary	37

Introduction

SFPD is transitioning its Quarterly Activity and Data Report to a series of online dashboards. These dashboards will be rolled out in phases, by data set, starting with Stops data, commencing with the Q1 2025 QADR. As each type of police action is added to the online dashboard site, SFPD will remove the descriptive statistical elements of that police action data set and announce the move on the SFPD QADR landing site. Where it does not already provide them, SFPD will also be adding these data sets to DataSF.

SFPD will continue to provide benchmarking and other special analyses in the QADR. However, SFPD is sunsetting the series of metrics that use a “Per Capita” benchmarking approach. SFPD is adding three other types of metrics to the population comparison metric. These additional metrics are expected to factor in more of the context of what problems officers are trying to solve and what direction they’ve been provided to solve them.


Benchmarking Stop Data

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), in line with its dedication to transparency, provides descriptive statistics about enforcement and search patterns and trends. To provide a simple contextual setting for the reader, previous Quarterly Activity and Data Reports (QADRs) have compared the demographics of the general residential population with individuals subject to a police stop or other action. However, the many dissimilarities between the group of people who may experience police action and the group who comprise the San Francisco residential population means that this comparison provides only partial information at best.

To provide more insight, the Department is broadening the types of benchmarks it employs for stop and search data analysis. The QADR will now include a total of four (4) types of benchmark analyses to enhance public understanding of police contact with the public. It's important to note that there is no universally agreed upon optimal benchmark, as each benchmark comes with its own set of advantages and disadvantages. Smith, Tillyer, Lloyd and Petrocelli describe benchmarking as an "imperfect science" (2021).

Neil and Winship assert that “benchmarking oversimplifies stop and search data to the point where it should not be used as a metric¹” (2019). Despite this assertion, the Department has a responsibility to provide these data, as well as their context, in a manner that allows the public to better understand the actions of the Department. More

¹ [Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing | Annual Reviews](#)



recent scholarship on benchmarking was published in 2025 by Ratcliffe and Hyland that also discusses in depth the challenges of benchmarking².

Each of the new benchmarking types are described below, including the advantages and disadvantages of each. The descriptions also provide the underlying assumptions, any accompanying methodological adjustments, and the results of the analysis required to calculate the benchmark.

Census Population Benchmarking

The SFPD has consolidated and moved its census benchmarking analysis to a web-based dashboard, located on the SFPD website: [SFPD Stop Data Dashboards](https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sfpd-stop-data-dashboards)³.

By moving the analysis to a live dashboard and publishing online, the department hopes to increase access to this high-level contextual information.

Census Population Benchmark Advantages

A key benefit in using a population data benchmark is the intuitive ease of understanding as compared to other benchmarks. Other benchmarking techniques can utilize univariate or multivariate statistical analysis that can be hard to explain succinctly and can quickly become overwhelming. This benchmark can provide an easy to comprehend, high level datapoint when considering disparities in police contacts.

Census Population Benchmark Disadvantages


Although population data is easy to obtain and use, and the resulting benchmarked metrics are clear and easily understood, as noted by Smith et al., in “nearly every other regard... [it] fails as a benchmark” (2021). The California Department of Justice, in their Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) 2021 report, stated that “An assumption of this type of comparison is that the distribution of who is stopped would be similar to who resides within a comparable geographic region.”⁴ However, officers do not encounter individuals at the same rates as found in the census and to conduct a stop, the circumstances and/or behavior must warrant it.

Additionally, other differences in the data sets further complicate any comparability between them. For instance, the requirements and/or method for recording characteristics vary between data sets. The method for collecting demographic characteristics in the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS) is self-

² [Police stops and naïve denominators](#)

³ <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sfpd-stop-data-dashboards>

⁴ [2021 RIPA Board Report - Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory \(RIPA\) Board \(ca.gov\)](#)Pp46



reported, where the California Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) stops data is *officer perceived*. The choices within a characteristic also vary between data sets. For instance, for individuals of Polynesian descent, census data offers Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, whereas RIPA stops data offers Pacific Islander or Asian and SFPD data systems only offer Asian as a collected datapoint.

Further, “Population counts generally overestimate bias in stop decisions, as differences in poverty, education, and labor market opportunities vary across identity groups in the U.S. Because education and employment affect criminal behavior, disparities along these dimensions will lead to disparities in who commits crime. In this way, pre-existing social disparities will tend to make the fraction of Black or Latinx people in the population smaller than the fraction of Black or Latinx people who are potentially subject to being stopped, overestimating any bias in a stop decision⁵” (Owens & Rosenquist). These limitations should be kept in mind when interpreting results of any population benchmark.

For further reading, a deeper analysis of the challenges around per capita population benchmarking is discussed in the 2019 paper “Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing⁶” by Roland Neil and Christopher Winship.

Including Three Additional Benchmarks

Given the challenges that Census benchmarking presents, and that there are no perfect metrics or comparison populations to use, SFPD is adding three benchmarks to its regular reporting. The additional benchmarks are the Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) index, Suspect Adjusted Disparity (SAD) index and Not-at-fault crash Traffic Analytic Layout (TAL) index. They each utilize different measures to provide additional context and an additional benchmark with which to understand with whom the department interacts.

Each benchmark uses data from the last six quarters (18 months). This will provide a near-term historical analysis, and the results show trends over time, per demographic group. For an in-depth explanation of methodologies, see the methodology section below.

Each benchmarking methodology comes with specific strengths and weaknesses, some of which are noted below in **Table 1**:

⁵<https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/RIPA-in-the-LAPD-Summary-Report.pdf> pp12-13⁶
[Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing | Annual Reviews](#)

⁶ [Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing | Annual Reviews](#)

Table 1: Advantages and Disadvantages of Different Benchmarking Strategies


	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><u>Population Benchmark</u></p> <p>Uses the demographic makeup of the population in Census data to compare whether there is a similar makeup in population of individuals stopped by Police</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple to conduct • Easy to explain for all residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to accurately estimate due to unequal racial resident population • Does not include relevant control variables to explain differences⁷ • Stop location can differ from residence location • Relies on census information which may be outdated/underrepresented
<p><u>RAD Index</u></p> <p>Uses the demographic makeup of violent crime victims. Compares this to the demographic makeup of the population of individuals stopped by Police</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates an easy ratio to compare across racial categories • Relies on victim demographics which are consistently captured • Reflects motivators of officer behavior – addressing crime generally, and addressing crime for those most at risk of being victimized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes victim/perpetrator are the same race • Assumes equivalency in incident reporting across racial groups • Assumes all stops are in furtherance of addressing violent crime

⁷ For instance, a population benchmark used in stop data assumes the full residential population including infants or immobile community members would be open to police interaction, when that is not the case.

<p><u>SAD Index</u></p> <p>Uses the demographic makeup of violent crime suspects. Compares this to the demographic makeup of the population of individuals stopped by Police</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relies on suspect information which narrows population of those contacted by police • More directly approaches RAD index intent while avoiding homogeneity challenges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerator includes all stops regardless if the stop was the 'right' individual • May not account for repeat offenders • Inconsistent racial identifiers for suspects • Assumes all stops are made in response to the suspect descriptions of violent crime • May insert a level of human bias by the reporting and/or investigating parties
<p><u>TAL Index</u></p> <p>Uses the demographic makeup of drivers in serious collisions who are deemed not at fault. Compares this to the same demographic population of individuals stopped by Police</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a metric closer to the true driving population than census data • Relies on data from officer interaction during a traffic crash with crash injuries, a random occurrence • Simple interpretation of results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific locations may be more prone to traffic crashes • Small data set because traffic crashes reported are only those resulting in injury or complaint of pain • Only measures stops of vehicles, and excludes pedestrian stops

Risk Adjusted Disparity Index

The Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) Index was introduced by Lawrence Sherman and Sumit Kumar in 2021 as a methodology to address the flaws in traditional police interaction disparity measures (e.g. population benchmarking). Instead of considering the whole population in the analysis, the RAD focuses on victims of violent crime. Isolating the scope of police interaction to victims of violent crime allows comparisons to be contextualized



within a group of the population that has documented contact with the police. This victim focused approach is consistent with SFPD values of protection of life being the highest priority and vigorous pursuit of those who commit serious crimes.

Utilizing the RAD index provides a new viewpoint from which to observe, measure, and report on potential disparities. It also provides additional context and the opportunity to monitor more than a single benchmark over time to observe trends. However, it is possible the count of victims of crime may be skewed due to historical understanding of different reasons people may avoid contact with the police after being victimized by a crime. We are aware that this measure is imperfect, but it can be used as an additional viewpoint.

The RAD index, a ratio of ratios, is a way to compare the treatment of different demographic groups across a population using victims as the denominator. Here, the RAD index compares the number of victims of violent crime against the number of stops per racial demographic group and compares that ratio for a racial group of interest against the ratio for the racial group baseline (e.g. White). In this analysis, Black/African American and Hispanic/Latine victims of violent crime are the groups of interest and those are compared to White victims of violent crime. Any violent crime with more than 20 people listed within an incident has been excluded as significantly different (e.g. mass arrest).

Equation 1: Example RAD Index Calculation

$$RAD\ Index_{Black} = \frac{Stops_{Black}/Victims_{Black}}{Stops_{White}/Victims_{White}}$$

A key assumption in the RAD index is that victims and suspects of violent crime share the same racial demographic group, as has been observed by the National Research Council⁸. The ratios that make up the RAD index, therefore, compare the rate of enforcement activity, based on the risk of a particular demographic group being victims (and also suspects) of violent crime. If officers are taking enforcement activity based on suspect descriptions, there should be similar levels of enforcement-to-victimization rates.

In practice, the assumption that victims and suspects share demographic groups varies from city to city and between demographic groups within those cities. As part of this analysis, violent crime homogeneity was analyzed to understand how victim and suspect align across demographic groups within the City of San Francisco. The results of this

⁸ National Research Council. 1993. Understanding and Preventing Violence: Volume 1. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

<https://doi.org/10.17226/1861>

analysis are shown in **Figure 1** below and indicate that the victim/suspect homogeneity differs significantly across racial/ethnic groups.




Figure 1: San Francisco, CA Victim/Suspect Homogeneity Analysis (Last 6 Quarters as of Q1 2026)

Figure 2 shows the RAD index for Black/African American individuals in San Francisco over the last six quarters. The overall RAD index value for Black/African American individuals over that period is 0.72. That is, the ratio of stops per victims of violent crimes for Black/African American individuals is 28% lower than that same ratio for White individuals. In this case, the RAD index suggests a similar frequency of stops of Black/African American compared to White individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for victims of violent crimes.




Figure 2: RAD Index for Black/African American, 2024-2026 by Quarter

Figure 3 shows the RAD index for Hispanic/Latine individuals in San Francisco over the last six quarters. The overall RAD index value for Hispanic/Latine individuals over that period is 0.50. That is, the ratio of stops per victims of violent crimes for Hispanic/Latine individuals is 50% lower than that of White individuals. In this case, the RAD index does not show a disparity in stops of Hispanic/Latine compared to White individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for victims of violent crime.




Figure 3: RAD Index for Hispanic/Latine(x) American from 2024 - 2026 by Quarter

Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index

As noted above, San Francisco suspects and victims may not share racial demographic characteristics. To improve simplicity, using suspect demographics in an analysis might better reflect enforcement activity, as in the next benchmark - Suspect Adjusted Disparity (SAD) index. Highlighting suspect information in a benchmark allows for a count of police contact based on law enforcement data that may be more readily available. Suspect information is usually captured during a law enforcement encounter, however the information provided does not always match the information later gathered during an arrest. The SAD index relies on reported information from the public or developed by officers during an investigation, which may include societal bias and individual perceptions. As noted with the RAD index, adding another benchmark analysis provides a new viewpoint from which to observe, measure and report on potential disparities. It also provides the opportunity to monitor more than a single benchmark over time to observe trends.

The SAD index also uses a ratio of ratios, where levels of each suspect demographic group are the denominators. The SAD index compares the number of suspects of violent crime against the number of stops per demographic group and compares that ratio for a group of interest against the ratio for the baseline group (e.g. White). In this analysis, two groups of interest are analyzed – Black/African American and Hispanic/Latine suspects of violent crime. This ratio is compared to White suspects of violent crime. Any violent crime with more than 20 people associated with the crime has been excluded as an outlier (e.g. mass arrest).

Equation 2: Example SAD Index Calculation

$$SAD\ Index_{Black} = \frac{Stops_{Black}/Suspects_{Black}}{Stops_{White}/Suspects_{White}}$$

This methodology avoids the assumption that victims and suspects share demographic groups, as assumed in the RAD index. The SAD index does, however, capture potential individual and societal biases by including suspects reported to police. The SAD index only considers suspects of violent crimes.

Figure 4 shows the SAD index for Black/African American individuals over the last six quarters in San Francisco. The overall SAD index for Black/African American individuals over the last six quarters is 0.24. In other words, the ratio of suspects to stops for Black/African American individuals is 76% less than the same ratio for White individuals. The SAD index suggests no disparity in stops for Black/African American individuals compared to White individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for suspects in violent crimes.




Figure 4: SAD Index for Black/African American from 2024 -2026 by Quarter

Figure 5 shows the SAD index for Hispanic/Latine individuals over the last six quarters. The overall SAD index for Hispanic/Latine individuals over the last six quarters is 0.45. In other words, the ratio of suspects to stops for Hispanic/Latine individuals is 55% less than the same ratio for White individuals. The SAD index does not suggest a disparity in stops for Hispanic/Latine compared to White individuals over the last six quarters after adjusting for suspects in violent crimes.




Figure 5: SAD Index for Hispanic/Latine from 2024 - 2026 by Quarter

Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout

The not at fault crash traffic analytic layout (TAL) compares the demographic data of individuals stopped in vehicles by officers with the demographic data of drivers in San Francisco. This benchmark was originally presented by Alpert, Et. Al in 2004⁹, and further utilized by the State of California in the 2020 RIPA Technical report¹⁰. Instead of using victims or suspects of crime as the comparator population, this benchmark uses individual vehicle drivers who are ‘selected’ at random. To obtain this sample, data are compiled from the individuals involved in a serious vehicle crash in San Francisco and who were found not at fault. These data serve as a proxy for the overall driving population.¹¹ This removes some of the dissimilarities in the population that exist when using census data, such as residency in San Francisco and age.

Using crash data for comparison with stops data, the proportion of stops involving a specific demographic group of interest is compared to the proportion of crashes involving the same specific demographic. This calculation is repeated for each demographic group of interest. A result of 1.0 denotes similarity between the potential of being stopped and the sample of drivers in each demographic group on the road. A ratio above 1.0 indicates more stops than expected for that demographic group, while a ratio below 1.0 indicates less than expected stops for that demographic group. The calculation is summarized below:

Equation 3: Example of TAL Calculation

$$TAL_{white} = \frac{\frac{Stops_{white}}{Stops_{total}}}{\frac{Collision_{white}}{Collision_{total}}}$$

Figure 6 shows the TAL for each demographic group for San Francisco over the last six quarters. The graph shows:

- The proportion of Asian/Pacific Islander individuals in the stops data is about 23% higher than their proportion in the crash data.

⁹ Alpert, G. P., Smith, M.R., Dunham, R.G. (2004). Toward a better benchmark: Assessing the utility of not at-fault traffic crash data in racial profiling research. *Justice Research and Policy*, 6, 43 – 69.

¹⁰ <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-tech-report-2020.pdf>

¹¹ Withrow, B.L. & Williams, H. (2015). Proposing a benchmark based on vehicle collision data in racial profiling research. *Criminal Justice Review*, 40, 449 – 469.

- The proportion of Black/African American individuals in the stops data is about 21% higher than their proportion in the crash data.
- The proportion of White individuals in the stops data is about 33% higher than their proportion in the crash data.
- The proportion of Hispanic/Latine individuals in the stops data is about 26% lower than their proportion in the crash data.





Figure 6: Ratio of Stops to Crashes by Demographic Group, 2024-2025

To quantify the significance of these differences in proportion by demographic group between the stops and crash datasets, the Department utilized a two-proportion z-test at a p-value of 0.1. At this p-value, the differences between stops and crash proportions were statistically significant for all groups except Black/African American.



A two-proportion z-test compares the proportions of two independent groups to determine if the difference between them is statistically significant. Used here, the test determines if the differences between the racial categories are statistically significant, meaning more reliable than chance. A p-value is a statistical value that indicates the probability of observing results as extreme as or more extreme than what was observed – assuming the null hypothesis is true. A 0.1 p-value indicates a significance threshold of 10% and any p-value under that suggests rejecting the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis.


CRSTAL Conclusions

In an effort to improve the Department’s understanding of disparities in police action which may or may not exist, the Department is introducing the CRSTAL set of benchmarks. As top researchers have shown time and again, benchmarking police contact, and outcomes is a challenging issue without a clear solution. While the benchmarks introduced in the CRSTAL analysis provide a more holistic view of potential disparities, each benchmark comes with its own strengths and challenges which cannot be ignored. Each additional benchmark highlights a different subgroup of the population: crime victims, crime suspects, and the driving population and their interaction with law enforcement to illustrate a measurement of law enforcement contact by race. Each one provides unique insight and should be considered both individually and collectively, however, they do not lend themselves to ideal comparison given their unique subgroup metrics.

Each benchmark displays data of law enforcement contact without contextual explanation limiting the ability to draw conclusions. More research is needed to explain the causality of the data displayed in the additional benchmarks. Criminological research acknowledges a variety of predispositions, environmental factors, historical divestment, targeted discrimination and many more factors that could influence disparities. The research of causality is beyond the scope of the present report.

Over time, as trends develop in these benchmarks, further review of the underlying data may provide additional insight. Such changes might include changes to the makeup of comparison populations, changes to enforcement action, or catalyzing events in the community. As underlying data is influenced by various factors, some benchmarks may be more appropriate than others.

Taken together, these benchmarks present a more complete picture of, as compared to previous analysis, SFPD enforcement contacts. The policing and public safety needs and



demands of the community are wide and varied. By providing these four benchmarks, SFPD is differentiating among some of the types of work that officers perform. Further, it is improving the communication of the complexities of 21st Century work of law enforcement by sharing this analysis, the underlying data, the positive and negative aspects to each methodology, and the code that was developed and used to produce the analyses. These efforts demonstrate SFPD's commitment to transparency and accountability, and through this and the resulting actions, seeks to build trust in all communities, provide Safety with Respect for All.

CRSTAL Methodologies

This section provides a more in-depth description of the methodologies used in the above benchmarks, including any assumptions made or peculiarities in the data.

Risk Adjusted Disparity Index

The Risk Adjusted Disparity (RAD) index is a method of statistical measurement that adjusts for a specific community's potential risk of victimization. It can be used to compare any type of demographic category. Here, the Department has employed it for the race/ethnicity category. This methodology allows for comparison of racial groups across a population. The RAD was developed by Sherman and Kumar¹² (2021) and has been used in the United Kingdom. The RAD index has yet to be a mainstream measurement in The United States. In their own words, Sherman & Kumar note

"... measuring the racial balance of preventive policing can be calculated from a Risk-Adjusted Disparity (RAD) Index. In that index, the denominator would always be a measure of crime or harm per capita in each group; the numerator would be a measure of police action. Disparities in proactive police activities, such as stop and search or patrol time, could therefore be adjusted by the racial disparities in criminal victimization that preventive policing aims to equalize. What might look like disparities in policing against certain groups would then be understood as an equalizing intervention to reduce disparities in victimization across groups" (2021).

The present RAD index for San Francisco utilizes victims of Part 1 violent crime as the denominator to measure victims per racial group of interest against stops of that same demographic group. It then compares a similar set of metrics (victims and stops) for White individuals. The comparison leads to an index ratio where 1 indicates an exact ratio between White individuals and the racial group of interest. An index number above 1 indicates more stops per victim in the racial group of interest as compared to White stops per victim, whereas a number below 1 indicates less stops per victim in the racial group of interest compared to White stops per victim.

¹² Sherman, L.W., Kumar, S. Equal Protection by Race with Stop and Frisk: a Risk-Adjusted Disparity (RAD) Index for Balanced Policing. *Camb J Evid Based Polic* 5, 1–19 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41887-021-00065-4>

Methodology

- 1) Gather the statistical rate for stops for the racial population of interest per 1000 residents within the geographical boundaries in question.
- 2) Gather the statistical rate for victimization for the racial population of interest per 1000 residents within the same geographical boundary as step 1.
- 3) Divide the number in step 1 by the number in step 2.

$$a) = \frac{\text{Stops (group of interest)}}{\text{Victims (group of interest)}}$$

- b) This is the ratio for racial population of interest within the geographical boundary selected.
- 4) Repeat steps 1-3 for the baseline racial population, the number produced is the ratio for the baseline racial population within the geographical boundary selected.

$$a) = \frac{\text{Stops (baseline group)}}{\text{Victims (baseline group)}}$$

- 5) Divide the ratio for racial population of interest (3b) by the ratio for the baseline racial population (4a).

$$a) \text{ RAD} = \frac{\text{Stops (group of interest)} / \text{Victims (group of interest)}}{\text{Stops (baseline group)} / \text{Victims (baseline group)}}$$

- 6) The final number is the RAD index. It is a ratio of ratios comparing the racial population of interest to the baseline racial population.

Assumptions & Caveats

To generate the RAD index, its authors make a key assumption that victims of violent crime will by and large be of the same demographics as the suspect committing the crime. The assumption that a suspect and a victim share similar demographics (or are homogeneous) only holds for some demographics within the data but not for others (see Figure 1).

Victims associated with incidents with arrests for Part 1 crimes including more than 20 arrestees are excluded from the Part 1 Violent Crime count to prevent individuals arrested during a mass arrest (usually tied to protests) from being included in the data.

Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index

The Suspect Adjusted Disparity Index (SAD) similarly to the RAD is a statistical measurement of disparity using suspects of police recorded violent crime as the denominator. SAD has been pioneered in the United Kingdom by the Home Office (analogous to the U.S. Department of Justice). Instead of using the popular resident population benchmark, the Home Office-produced disparity ratios alongside the population data to compare differences.

Methodology

- 1) Gather the stop and search rate for suspects of violent crime for the racial group of interest.
- 2) Gather the total number of stops of the racial group of interest.
- 3) Divide the stop and search rate by the number of suspect stops for the racial group of interest.

$$a) = \frac{\text{Stops (group of interest)}}{\text{Suspects (group of interest)}}$$

- 4) Repeat steps 1-3 for the baseline racial group.

$$a) = \frac{\text{Stops (baseline group)}}{\text{Suspects (baseline group)}}$$

- 5) Divide the number from step 3 by the number from step 4.

$$a) \text{ SAD} = \frac{\frac{\text{Stops (group of interest)}}{\text{Suspects (group of interest)}}}{\frac{\text{Stops (baseline group)}}{\text{Suspects (baseline group)}}}$$

- 6) The final number is the SAD index. It is a ratio of ratios comparing the racial population of interest to the baseline racial population.

Not at Fault Crash Traffic Analytic Layout

The TAL utilizes a z-test for proportions and may seem statistically complicated. In this context, the statistical method tests for a null hypothesis that the two proportions of crash to stops for a racial group of interest are equal. Several scholars have identified the demographics of not-at-fault drivers involved in traffic crashes as a best-practice for

benchmarking police stops as it is the most accurate population demographics.¹³¹⁴ The data serves as a largely neutral benchmark because police are required to respond to traffic crashes when injuries are involved, making it independent of any discretionary behavior that could intentionally, or unintentionally, alter the subject demographics.

The benefits of this approach to benchmarking police stops are:

- 1) This subset of the driving population more closely matches drivers who may be stopped by police, especially as compared to a census population benchmark.
- 2) Random occurrence data source as officers are required to respond to traffic crashes resulting in injuries.
- 3) Relatively simple to collect and interpret results without the need for complex modeling or methodologies.

The drawbacks of this approach to benchmarking police stops are:

- 1) Some locations may be more prone to traffic crashes, introducing over saturation into the data based on which drivers need to pass through certain locations.
- 2) Relatively sparse data source because there are a relatively low number of crashes resulting in injuries especially in certain areas of the City.
- 3) Is not comparable to non-vehicular stops which makes up approximately 45% of the stops by the Department.

Methodology

1. Calculate standard error (SE) of crash to stops for each group of interest to determine expected variance between proportions based on each unique sample size.

a. $SE = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$

- i. p = total stops for group of interest
 n = total crashes for group of interest

¹³ Alpert, G. P., Smith, M.R., Dunham, R.G. (2004). Toward a better benchmark: Assessing the utility of not-at-fault-traffic crash data in racial profiling research. *Justice Research and Policy*, 6, 43 – 69.

¹⁴ Withrow, B.L. & Williams, H. (2015). Proposing a benchmark based on vehicle collision data in racial profiling research. *Criminal Justice Review*, 40, 449 – 469.

2. Calculate Z-score which tells us the range of normality between proportions based on standard error.

a. $Z = \frac{\hat{p} - p_0}{SE}$

- i. \hat{p} = the same proportion p_0 = is the null hypothesis proportion SE = from step 1

3. Calculate p-value, based on the z-score, to test the likelihood of the results being realized at random. (at significance level 0.10).

Data Availability

Data tables utilized for this analysis, along with raw code utilized are available at https://github.com/sfpd-public/crstal_analysis

Raw stops data utilized for this analysis are located on DataSF, available at: https://data.sfgov.org/Public-Safety/Police-Department-Stop-Data/ubqf-aqzw/about_data


Stops Data Collection Transition & Associated Errors

SFPD’s ongoing efforts to transform its administration and operations into a 21st Century Policing agency have included several themes. The outstanding work underway in the United States Department of Justice Collaborative Reform Initiative (USDOJ CRI) Use of Force and Bias recommendations is also representative of those themes. Specifically, to meet the recommendations of CRI and to advance the management approaches of the Department, it has been necessary to make significant improvements to data collection, validation, and analysis. Further explanation of the changes in 2023 and 2024, and Stops data collection challenges can be found in [Quarterly Activity and Data Report of Quarter 1 through 3, 2024](#).

Improvement of the Stops Data Collection over time

California Department of Justice Submission Errors Over Time

Please see the chart below illustrating the breakdown of records with errors submitted to CA DOJ versus those with no errors over time.



Note: Please note that these are the official error statistics for 2023, 2024, 2025, and 2026 Stops Data, as submitted to the California Department of Justice. SFPD is actively improving the data collection system to address current issues and prevent future errors, ensuring better data quality moving forward.

Quarterly Activity and Data Report

Quarter I, 2026




SFPD stands for safety with respect for all.

We will:

- Engage in just, transparent, unbiased, and responsive policing.
- Do so in the spirit of dignity and in collaboration with the community.
- Maintain and build trust and respect as the guardian of constitutional and human rights.

2026 Q1 Overview



Data collected during the pandemic and recovery period reflect the unique circumstances of the time. Users should take care when comparing data trends across pandemic and non-pandemic response timeframes.

Suspects Observed or Reported

Suspect information obtained by the San Francisco Police Department from 2013 through 2025 are available through the SFPD Reported Victim and Suspect Demographics [online dataset](#), hosted on the city's Open Data Portal, [DataSF](#).

The [SFPD 96A.5 Victim and Suspect Demographic Dashboard](#) provide the public ability to explore through interactive dashboards to show the numbers of suspects for specific crimes by demographic groups and police districts. It further provides reported Hate Crimes by Bias type, bias, demographic groups and police districts.

Suspect information/description is either provided by a member of the public, reported directly to the police or through dispatch. Suspect data may also be obtained from a police-initiated stop, in which there is reasonable suspicion or probable cause for an officer to conduct the stop. The suspect Information is documented in a police incident report.

Stops and Searches

Stops and Search data and analysis from 2018 through present are now available through an interactive dashboard hosted on the San Francisco Police Department Website. [[SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department](#)] Additionally, data sources for the dashboard is also available on DataSF [[SFPD Stops Data | DataSF Open Data Portal](#)] for further self-service analysis. Stop data collection errors are annotated in the Stops data error update section within the QADR Q4 2024 report. The readers should approach the dashboard with careful understanding and consideration of the errors which may have impacted the overall count of Stops and Searches.

Please note: Beginning in Q1 2025 QADR report, Population per capita analysis will be merged into the CRSTAL Benchmark analysis to better contextualize the information and enhance public understanding of police enforcement activities. Additionally, the SFPD has integrated the census benchmarking analysis to a web-based dashboard along with the Stops and Search dashboard, located here: [SFPD Stop Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department](#). By moving the analysis to an online published dashboard, the Department hopes to increase access to and understanding of the census benchmark.

Stops Resulting in contact with the Department of Homeland Security or it's subordinate organization:

- There were no stops result involving the Department of Homeland Security or its subordinate's organizations for Quarter 1 of 2026

Use of Force

Use of Force data and analysis from 2016 through present are now available through an interactive dashboard hosted on the San Francisco Police Department Website. [[SFPD Use of Force Data Dashboards | San Francisco Police Department](#)] This information was previously presented under the [Quarterly Activity and Data Report](#) (QADR), published on the SFPD website.

The SFPD Use of Force Dashboard allows users to explore use-of-force data beyond what is presented in printed reports through interactive visualizations. The readers should approach the dashboard with careful understanding and consideration of the four reporting standards from 2016-present, each reflecting different definitions and thresholds for use of force.

Additionally, SFPD is in the process of publishing Use of Force (Standards 2-4) datasets on DataSF for further self-service analysis, in support of the Department's transparency goal.

USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

There were no Use of Force incidents that resulted in death during Q1 of 2026.

Arrest Demographic Data

Arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department from 2012 through present are available through the [San Francisco Sheriff Jail Bookings](#) online dataset, hosted on the city's Open Data Portal, [DataSF](#).

Booking data is collected by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. A Booking is defined as "the recordation of an arrest in official police records, and the taking by police of fingerprints and photographs of the person arrested." [California Penal Code §7](#).

[San Francisco's Intake and Release Center](#) is where the San Francisco Sheriff's Office books people after they are arrested and taken into custody. San Francisco Sheriff's Office's Jail Bookings are also available by [Ethnicity](#), [Gender](#), and [Age](#), and can be found on the San Francisco Open Data Portal.

The SFPD [Stops Dashboards](#), include Booking data, provide users to explore through interactive dashboards to show the numbers of bookings for by demographic groups.

Arrests made by the San Francisco Police Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

96A.5 Victim and Suspect Demographic Data

On April 12, 2020, Ordinance 40-20 went into effect, amending San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96 to include section 96A.5, “Quarterly Crime Victim Data Reporting.” The ordinance mandated that the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provide quarterly reports regarding victim demographics across a host of data points, further specifying that the quarterly reports would be due on the first Tuesday in February, May, August and November.

This information was previously presented under the [Quarterly Activity and Data Report \(QADR\)](#), as the Victim Data Demographic Report, published on the SFPD website.

Data for Crime Victims and Suspects for specified crimes as noted in Ordinance 40-20, are now available through interactive dashboards, [SFPD 96A.5 Victim and Suspect Demographic Dashboards](#), hosted on the San Francisco Police Department Website.

For this report, the adopted methodology counts any victim or suspect associated with a reportable incident under each applicable mandated crime category, rather than only under the highest-ranking charge. This approach ensures that all relevant offenses and victimizations are represented, even when multiple crimes occur within a single incident.

For example:

An incident involving burglary, hate crime, and domestic violence charges would result in the individual being counted in all 3 mandated reporting categories - not just the highest-ranking offense.

By transitioning the presentation of these data from a static quarterly paper report to a quarterly interactive set of dashboards, we continue to strive to increase transparency, context and understanding of these data. The data that informs these dashboards can be found at [DataSF](#), our data transparency partner.

Bias-Related Complaints

Department of Police Accountability

The Department is required to obtain information from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) regarding the total number of complaints received during the reporting period that it characterizes as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity. The Department also is required to include in its report the total number of complaints DPA closed during the reporting period that were characterized as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity, as well as the total number of each type of disposition for such complaints.

Cases Received in Q1-2026

Type of Case Received	# of Cases
Racial Bias	3
Gender Bias	0
Transphobic Bias	0
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
TOTAL	3

DPA received 269 total cases for the quarter.

5 officer(s) was named for allegations of racial or gender bias.

Total Case(s) Received in 2026 involving Racial or Gender Bias: 3

During Quarter 1 of 2026, DPA completed 3 complaint investigations in which there was an allegation of racial or gender bias.

Q1-2026 Case Closures & Dispositions

Type of Case	Sustained	Withdrawn	Unfounded	No Finding	Insufficient Evidence	Proper Conduct	Referral	TOTAL
Racial Bias	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Homophobic Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transphobic Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racial, Homophobic, Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4

*Source: Department of Police Accountability

DPA closed a total of 266 cases for the quarter, including above.

DPA closed a total of 266 cases for the year, including above

Bias-Related Complaints

BIAS-RELATED COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SFPD, AND INVESTIGATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

As part of the Department’s commitment to transparency, the Department also reports on all bias-related complaints received internally from members of the Department and forwarded to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for investigation. Closed cases may include complaints received in previous quarters. Bias-related complaints are referred to as Employment Equal Opportunity (EEO) cases by DHR.

Q1-2026 Bias Cases Received

EEO Cases Received	Q1-2026
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	
Disability Discrimination	1
Gender/Gender Identity Discrimination	
Harassment/Non-EEO	1
Hostile Work Environment	1
Medical Discrimination	
Parental Status	
Race Discrimination	
Retaliation	2
Sexual Harassment	2
Sexual Orientation	1
TOTAL	8

Complainants: 6 Department Member(s); Outside Civilian(s); 1 Whistleblower

Respondents (Named): 3 SFPD; 2 Sworn Officer(s); 3 Civilian(s); 0 Unknown

Total Respondents: 3 SFPD Named; 2 Sworn Officer(s); 3 Civilian(s); 2 Unknown

Type of Case	Administrative Closures			Sustained	TOTAL
	Rej/Ref/WD Non-EEO	Insufficient Evidence	Misc/RTS*		
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	1				1
Disability/Medical Condition					0
Gender Discrimination					0
Gender Identity					0
Harassment/ Non-EEO					0
Hostile Work Environment	2				2
Marital/Parental Discrimination					0
Medical Discrimination					0
Parental Status					0
Political Affiliation					0
Race Discrimination		1			1
Sex Discrimination					0
Religion					0
Retaliation					0
Sex					0
Sexual Harassment	1				1
Sexual Orientation					0
Slurs/Inappropriate Comment					0
Weight Discrimination					0
TOTAL	4	1	0	0	5

Source: SFPD Risk Management EEO Quarterly Report

*RTS=Right to Sue

Domestic Violence Reporting

- Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

Domestic Violence Reporting - Background

In November 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved, and Mayor Breed signed, legislation amending the San Francisco Administrative Code to require certain data involving Domestic Violence be reported on a quarterly basis starting in the first quarter of 2022. The report is to be submitted on a quarterly basis to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, Office of Racial Equity, the Human Rights Commission, the Department on the Status of Women, and the Police Commission.

Domestic Violence Calls for Service and Investigations

Domestic Violence, also known as Intimate Partner Violence, is abbreviated as DV for brevity in this report. For the purposes of this report, Admin Code 96D defines Domestic Violence as: *"Domestic Violence" means the crime defined in Section 273.5 and the crimes punishable under Section 243 (e){1}, of the California Penal Code.*

SFPD responds to calls for service (CFS) received by the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) whether as a 911 emergency or through the non-emergency line. After gathering information from the caller, DEM staff has the responsibility of determining the appropriate code for the call, based on the information provided, and to dispatch units to the location as either a Priority A (highest), Priority B, or Priority C.

Upon arrival, SFPD officers conducted a thorough investigation into the allegations of domestic violence. Per SFPD policy, calls for service are coded with a final disposition of domestic violence (DV) in cases in which DV is evident during an officer's investigation.

In some cases, a report may be taken without a call to 911 (self-reporting at a police station, forexample.) In these cases, a call for service number is generated during the report writing process.

This is a quarterly data report from 1 January 2026 through 31 March 2026.

Domestic Violence Reporting

- Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b Reporting Components

1(A) The number of calls for service for domestic violence that the Police Department received from the Department of Emergency Management for the period of January 1 to March 31, 2026.

Calls for Service, Final Call Code Includes "DV" January 1 - March 31, 2026				
	2026			
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total
DV Calls for Service	562	520	541	1623

1(B) The number of domestic violence cases that the Police Department presented to the District Attorney for investigation and/or prosecution in the prior quarter, and of those cases, the number in which a child or children were present and/or a firearm or firearms were present.

DV INCIDENTS SUBMITTED TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE			
	2026		
	Jan	Feb	Mar
Number of DV Cases Presented to the District Attorney's Office	93	92	80
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a child was present	5	10	11
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a firearm was present	0	0	1



Confiscation of Weapons: Pursuant to Penal Code § 18250 and Department policy, officers are mandated to confiscate any firearms or other deadly weapons discovered at the scene of a domestic violence incident. The weapon is booked into the Department's Property Room as evidence. As federal and state laws prohibit individuals convicted of a domestic violence charge from owning or acquiring a weapon, the Property Room follows California DOJ protocols, including criminal records' checks, to determine if the individual is eligible for release of the weapon.

Presence of Children: SFPD Department General Order 6.09 also outlines the procedures to follow if children are present during a domestic violence incident. DGO 7.04, Children of Arrested Parents, provides guidance to minimize the negative impact and harmful stressors on children when a parent/guardian is arrested whether in their presence or not. This policy is considered a national model, highlighting law enforcement's responsibility to ensure a safe environment for children following a traumatic experience such as the arrest of one's parent.

Calls for Service, Q1 2026

Calls for Service*

The Department responded to 109,285 total calls for service during Q1 2026.




Data Source: San Francisco Police Department Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). Calls for Service data represent calls to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) via the 911 system and assigned to SFPD.

***Please note:** Calls for Service data underwent a methodology update to more accurately capture SFPD call volume. This methodology change is reflected beginning with the 2025 Q1 Quarterly Activity and Data Report. Call volume for prior years on the above chart has also been adjusted to the new methodology.

Officers Assaulted, Q1 2026

Officers Assaulted - Trailing 6 Quarters

In Quarter 1 of 2026, there were a total of 56 officers assaulted.



Glossary

AB 953	Assembly Bill 953, also known as the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) of 2015; requires CA law enforcement agencies to collect and report demographic data to the California Department of Justice
ACS	American Community Survey
Benchmark	Benchmark Stop Data System, the tool used to collect stops and search data in compliance with AB953 beginning June 28, 2023, 1200hrs.
CDW	Crime Data Warehouse
City	City and County of San Francisco
Department	San Francisco Police Department
DGO	Department General Order
DHR	San Francisco Department of Human Resources
DHS	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
DOJ	U.S. Department of Justice
DPA	Department of Police Accountability
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
PRCS	Post Release Community Supervision; used to classify probation and parole searches.
RIPA Board	California’s Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board; produces an annual report on the past and status of racial identity profiling and provides recommendations to law enforcement agencies.
SDCS	Stop Data Collection System, the tool used to collect stops and search data in compliance with AB953 from 2018 through June 28, 2023, 1159hrs.
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
TSA	Transportation Security Administration
UoF	Use of Force



Safety with Respect

Prepared by San Francisco Police Department

Crime Strategies Division
June 2026

Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Early Intervention Systems Benchmark Data Analytics System; San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau, San Francisco Police Department Human Resources; San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs; San Francisco Department of Emergency Management; San Francisco Department of Police Accountability; California Department of Justice Stop Data Collection System

Q1 2026 Stops data was uploaded to DataSF on May 29, 2026

Q1 2026 Use of Force data was queried on May 5, 2026

Q1 2026 Victim Demographic data was queried on May 5, 2026

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Pretrial Data, Metrics, and Methods
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 8:34:39 AM
Attachments: [2026-048 Pretrial Data, Metrics, and Methods.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the Sheriff's Office regarding **File No. 260442**:

Resolution authorizing the Sheriff's Office to contract with the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial) for Pretrial Services for a three year period from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2029, for a contract total not to exceed amount of \$22,532,145, with two one-year options to extend.

Regards,

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

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

From: Miyamoto, Paul (SHF) <paul.miyamoto@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 4:47 PM
To: MYR - Brandon Riley <briley@sftc.org>; davidm <davidm@sfprenal.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong@sfgov.org>; Tullock, Cristel (ADP) <cristel.tullock@sfgov.org>; carlos@sqcommercial.com
Cc: Moriarty, Tara (SHF) <tara.moriarty@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Katherine (SHF) <katherine.johnson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Pretrial Data, Metrics, and Methods



**OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
ROOM 456, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102



**PAUL M. MIYAMOTO
SHERIFF**

June 11, 2026
Reference: 2026-048

Mayor Daniel Lurie
City and County of San Francisco

President Rafael Mandelman, Honorable Members of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Brandon E. Riley
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

David Mauroff
Executive Director, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project

Carlos Serrano-Quon
Board of Directors, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project

Dear Colleagues:

As discussions continue regarding the future of pretrial services in San Francisco, I write to encourage a collaborative path forward that prioritizes public safety, court compliance, accountability, and continuity of service for the more than 2,100 individuals currently supervised in our community.

Recent correspondence has highlighted significant disagreements regarding the interpretation of pretrial performance data, particularly as it relates to appearance rates, public safety outcomes, and program evaluation methodologies. While stakeholders may differ in their interpretation of those findings, I believe it is important that all parties work from a shared understanding of the measures being evaluated.

For example, nationally recognized pretrial standards developed by the **U.S. Department of Justice's National Institute of Corrections** and reaffirmed by the **Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab** in 2024 define a public safety rate based on whether an individual is charged with a new criminal offense while awaiting trial. The Court's recent analysis instead examined whether an individual was arrested while under supervision. These are

different measures that answer different questions and may produce different outcomes. An arrest does not necessarily result in a criminal charge, and substituting one measure for the other can lead to different and sometimes inaccurate conclusions regarding program performance.

Likewise, court appearance rates can vary depending on the population reviewed, the period examined, and the methodology used to calculate the rate. These differences underscore the importance of establishing common definitions and measurement standards before drawing conclusions that may inform major policy decisions.

It is also important to recognize that San Francisco's pretrial model was intentionally designed to operate independently from traditional law enforcement functions. In 2018, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 437-18, affirming that the City's pretrial services model should reflect principles of neutrality and structural independence in recognition of the fundamental principle that individuals awaiting trial are presumed innocent unless proven guilty. As policymakers consider future models for service delivery, those principles should remain part of the discussion.

The Sheriff's Office supports transparency and accountability and welcomes efforts to further strengthen performance measurement and reporting. Transparency, however, requires more than the publication of data. It requires a shared understanding of what is being measured, how it is being measured, and whether the metrics being compared are, in fact, measuring the same outcomes.

For more than 50 years, the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project has provided pretrial services on behalf of the Sheriff's Office. Today, those services extend beyond court appearance monitoring and include Public Safety Assessments, individualized case management, housing support, mental health and substance use treatment referrals, and other interventions designed to improve outcomes for participants while supporting public safety and court compliance.

The program currently supervises 2,167 individuals. Beyond supervision services, the community-based model allows pretrial providers to leverage partnerships and resources that may not be readily available within a traditional government structure. These include connections to housing resources, treatment providers, Medi-Cal enrollment assistance, peer support services, and other interventions that help stabilize individuals while their cases are pending. The flexibility to build and maintain these partnerships has been an important component of San Francisco's pretrial system for decades.

As the agency responsible for operating the County jail system, the Sheriff's Office must also consider the broader impact that changes to pretrial services could have on jail population management. San Francisco has long relied on effective pretrial release and supervision programs to reduce unnecessary detention, promote compliance with court orders, and avoid the operational and legal challenges associated with jail overcrowding. Any proposed changes should be evaluated not only for their administrative impacts, but also for their potential effects on jail operations, public safety outcomes, and continuity of service.

I recognize and respect the Court's responsibility to ensure that pretrial services meet its expectations for transparency, accountability, and performance measurement. Those interests deserve thoughtful consideration and meaningful solutions. However, addressing concerns regarding transparency and reporting does not necessarily require abandoning service models that have been built and refined over decades.

Rather than viewing this issue as a choice between maintaining the current structure or implementing a complete transfer of services, the City should consider whether a collaborative model could achieve the objectives of all parties.

One potential approach would be a partnership in which **Adult Probation** assumes responsibilities necessary to satisfy the Court's oversight, reporting, and accountability requirements, while the Sheriff's Office continues contracting with the **Pretrial Diversion Project** for Public Safety Assessments, case management, and other direct client services. Such an approach could preserve the Court's desired oversight functions while maintaining the service infrastructure, community partnerships, and specialized expertise that currently support individuals under pretrial supervision.

The Sheriff's Office also intends to maintain its robust electronic monitoring program as a critical component of San Francisco's pretrial release system. **Electronic Monitoring** has long served as an effective tool for managing risk, supporting court-ordered release, reducing unnecessary detention, and safely managing jail populations. Regardless of how future case management responsibilities are structured, the Sheriff's Office remains committed to continuing this function as part of a comprehensive pretrial supervision strategy.

Ultimately, our focus remains on ensuring that pretrial services promote public safety, support court compliance, and connect participants with resources that reduce future justice-system involvement. We remain committed to working with the Court, Adult Probation, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Pretrial Diversion Project to identify a path forward that minimizes disruption, preserves effective services, and maintains public confidence in our criminal justice system.

I respectfully encourage all parties to continue these discussions in good faith and pursue solutions that build upon our shared goals.

Sincerely,



PAUL MIYAMOTO, SHERIFF
City and County of San Francisco

Sarah Chan
Senior Manager Assistant to Sheriff Paul Miyamoto, and Undersheriff Katherine Johnson
San Francisco Sheriff's Office
City Hall, Room 456
1 DR. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4676

Telephone: (415) 554-7225

Cell: (415) 654-1128

Fax (415) 554-7050

Sarah.e.chan@sfgov.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: *This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this communication*



OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
ROOM 456, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102



PAUL M. MIYAMOTO
SHERIFF

June 11, 2026
Reference: 2026-048

Mayor Daniel Lurie
City and County of San Francisco

President Rafael Mandelman, Honorable Members of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Brandon E. Riley
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

David Mauroff
Executive Director, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project

Carlos Serrano-Quon
Board of Directors, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project

Dear Colleagues:

As discussions continue regarding the future of pretrial services in San Francisco, I write to encourage a collaborative path forward that prioritizes public safety, court compliance, accountability, and continuity of service for the more than 2,100 individuals currently supervised in our community.

Recent correspondence has highlighted significant disagreements regarding the interpretation of pretrial performance data, particularly as it relates to appearance rates, public safety outcomes, and program evaluation methodologies. While stakeholders may differ in their interpretation of those findings, I believe it is important that all parties work from a shared understanding of the measures being evaluated.

For example, nationally recognized pretrial standards developed by the **U.S. Department of Justice's National Institute of Corrections** and reaffirmed by the **Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab** in 2024 define a public safety rate based on whether an individual is charged with a new criminal offense while awaiting trial. The Court's recent analysis instead examined whether an individual was arrested while under supervision. These are

different measures that answer different questions and may produce different outcomes. An arrest does not necessarily result in a criminal charge, and substituting one measure for the other can lead to different and sometimes inaccurate conclusions regarding program performance.

Likewise, court appearance rates can vary depending on the population reviewed, the period examined, and the methodology used to calculate the rate. These differences underscore the importance of establishing common definitions and measurement standards before drawing conclusions that may inform major policy decisions.

It is also important to recognize that San Francisco's pretrial model was intentionally designed to operate independently from traditional law enforcement functions. In 2018, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 437-18, affirming that the City's pretrial services model should reflect principles of neutrality and structural independence in recognition of the fundamental principle that individuals awaiting trial are presumed innocent unless proven guilty. As policymakers consider future models for service delivery, those principles should remain part of the discussion.

The Sheriff's Office supports transparency and accountability and welcomes efforts to further strengthen performance measurement and reporting. Transparency, however, requires more than the publication of data. It requires a shared understanding of what is being measured, how it is being measured, and whether the metrics being compared are, in fact, measuring the same outcomes.

For more than 50 years, the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project has provided pretrial services on behalf of the Sheriff's Office. Today, those services extend beyond court appearance monitoring and include Public Safety Assessments, individualized case management, housing support, mental health and substance use treatment referrals, and other interventions designed to improve outcomes for participants while supporting public safety and court compliance.

The program currently supervises 2,167 individuals. Beyond supervision services, the community-based model allows pretrial providers to leverage partnerships and resources that may not be readily available within a traditional government structure. These include connections to housing resources, treatment providers, Medi-Cal enrollment assistance, peer support services, and other interventions that help stabilize individuals while their cases are pending. The flexibility to build and maintain these partnerships has been an important component of San Francisco's pretrial system for decades.

As the agency responsible for operating the County jail system, the Sheriff's Office must also consider the broader impact that changes to pretrial services could have on jail population management. San Francisco has long relied on effective pretrial release and supervision programs to reduce unnecessary detention, promote compliance with court orders, and avoid the operational and legal challenges associated with jail overcrowding. Any proposed changes should be evaluated not only for their administrative impacts, but also for their potential effects on jail operations, public safety outcomes, and continuity of service.

I recognize and respect the Court's responsibility to ensure that pretrial services meet its expectations for transparency, accountability, and performance measurement. Those interests deserve thoughtful consideration and meaningful solutions. However, addressing concerns regarding transparency and reporting does not necessarily require abandoning service models that have been built and refined over decades.

Rather than viewing this issue as a choice between maintaining the current structure or implementing a complete transfer of services, the City should consider whether a collaborative model could achieve the objectives of all parties.

One potential approach would be a partnership in which **Adult Probation** assumes responsibilities necessary to satisfy the Court's oversight, reporting, and accountability requirements, while the Sheriff's Office continues contracting with the **Pretrial Diversion Project** for Public Safety Assessments, case management, and other direct client services. Such an approach could preserve the Court's desired oversight functions while maintaining the service infrastructure, community partnerships, and specialized expertise that currently support individuals under pretrial supervision.

The Sheriff's Office also intends to maintain its robust electronic monitoring program as a critical component of San Francisco's pretrial release system. **Electronic Monitoring** has long served as an effective tool for managing risk, supporting court-ordered release, reducing unnecessary detention, and safely managing jail populations. Regardless of how future case management responsibilities are structured, the Sheriff's Office remains committed to continuing this function as part of a comprehensive pretrial supervision strategy.

Ultimately, our focus remains on ensuring that pretrial services promote public safety, support court compliance, and connect participants with resources that reduce future justice-system involvement. We remain committed to working with the Court, Adult Probation, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Pretrial Diversion Project to identify a path forward that minimizes disruption, preserves effective services, and maintains public confidence in our criminal justice system.

I respectfully encourage all parties to continue these discussions in good faith and pursue solutions that build upon our shared goals.

Sincerely,



PAUL MIYAMOTO, SHERIFF
City and County of San Francisco

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding District 9
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 11:58:39 AM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding District 9.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding District 9.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: clerk@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Mayor, MYR \(MYR\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Board Must Hold Supervisor Fielder Accountable
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 5:36:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge the Board to take immediate action regarding District 9 Supervisor Jackie Fielder.

While on extended leave through June 30, 2026, Supervisor Fielder retains powerful committee chairs and is conveniently absent during critical budget negotiations. This follows investigations into municipal espionage — leaking privileged City Attorney communications about the RESET Center — and an ethics complaint over promoting the \$KITKAT memecoin from her public office.

San Francisco cannot tolerate supervisors who sabotage public safety efforts, promote speculative crypto schemes, and hide from accountability.

I respectfully request that the Board publicly call for her resignation and ensure her committee assignments reflect her absence from governing duties.

Sincerely,

JD.

From: [Prodan Statev](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Board Must Hold Supervisor Fielder Accountable
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 12:24:22 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a Mission resident and voter, I urge the Board to take immediate action regarding District 9 Supervisor Jackie Fielder. While on extended leave through June 30, 2026, Supervisor Fielder retains powerful committee chairs and is conveniently absent during critical budget negotiations. This follows investigations into municipal espionage, leaking privileged City Attorney communications about the RESET Center, and an ethics complaint over promoting the \$KITKAT memecoin from her public office.

San Francisco cannot tolerate supervisors who sabotage public safety efforts, promote speculative crypto schemes, and hide from accountability.

I respectfully request that the Board publicly call for her resignation and ensure her committee assignments reflect her absence from governing duties.

Prodan
2525 Harrison St

Bos 11



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUN 15 AM08:41

June 3, 2026

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

board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: NEXT Village Funding

Dear Board Members:

We NEXT Village members received the disappointing news today that Mayor Lurie did not restore funding for NEXT Village's District 2 University (D2U) nor any of the other Senior programs that were eliminated. This is a hugely disappointing turn of events. The hope is when this funding comes up for the final vote in a couple of weeks, you will understand the huge impact this organization has on seniors .in our district.

The NEXT Village monthly calendar of events reflects only some of the many programs and services they provide including social, cultural, and foreign language courses. Public outings, walking tours, and music. Tech support for many seniors that find it continually challenging. They also provide well-being programs as yoga, meditation to help you release the daily challenges or just make you feel centered in a constantly challenging world.

For those seniors physically less agile or who experience mobility issues and on fixed income, getting around to taking care of the necessities of life like doctor's appointments, grocery store runs and laundry are impossible without a NEXT Village volunteer. It's not about summing autonomous driving vehicles or taxis, to have transportation because you no longer drive. It's about staying in your residence that worked for you in your 30's that now presents real everyday logistical challenges like needing someone to help you in and out of the vehicle, to carry groceries up Victorian stairs or up buildings with no elevators and help you put them away. The NEXT Village volunteers to help you with home projects that you can no longer do for yourself to straighten up, clean up and help you reorganize a life

to be less cluttered and easier to maneuver in..

I have always been independent, and on my own. I NEVER, EVER would have thought I would get to the point that I would need to say, I need help, I can't do this anymore. But I am.

The search for what I needed for my particular situation was challenging. You have to fit into a preset box or they can't help you. They tell you more what they can't do for you than what they can. There are waiting lists and, you get who is next available even if not a good match. Or, there isn't a comfort level about having the volunteer they send in your home. And, that doesn't even address the level of service you get.

NEXT Village offers social, cultural, and educational on line and in person programs , tech support, yoga and meditation language music, outdoor exercise for seniors as well as assisting us in transportation to doctor's appointments, grocery and laundry runs that provide normalcy and helps seniors stay connected and engaged in their neighborhood as well as challenged outside their comfort zone.

I phoned every similar organization and the Dept of Aging and was shocked I couldn't get help. A neighbor told me about NEXT Village, and I was shocked when my next-door neighbor came to my door and said, "I understand you have joined us." "Us?" That was a revelation. WOW!

Suddenly in a world that I didn't know, I knew someone and instantly comfortable. I'm matched with people that connect with me and my needs. It's like a family in a sense. It was refreshing and surprising after the hunt., I couldn't find any place close to NEXT Village.

This is not duplicated by any other organization I contacted. If you don't make your scheduled volunteer appointment they do wellness, checks too. For so many seniors that are living single, these programs, services and the screenings to make a match rather than getting the next volunteer and never seeing the same person again allows for quality interactions. I believe NEXT Village takes servicing senior non-medical needs to another level.

If the Board of Supervisors cuts funding for NEXT Village. We will still have the same needs but no one to respond to them; like yelling down a dark hole. They need more funding not LESS because the need is high for quality senior services is high.

Seniors are the passed-over population. It was tough for seniors

while confined during COVID and we were the most vulnerable.


I am writing today to say this is the Good Fight for an organization and their volunteers who do such important and great support work for seniors in D2.

With family and friends too far away to help, which is why we joined up in the first place any cost cutting of the services provide to us will impactful seniors.

No one thinks they'll get here. But they will.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Victoria Underwood

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Victoria Underwood". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the printed name.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 7 Letters Regarding the SF Budget
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:08:25 PM
Attachments: [7 Letters Regarding the SF Budget.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 7 letters regarding the San Francisco Budget.

Ref. File Nos.: 260616, 260596, and 260597

Regards,

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

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

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

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal*

identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: [Erica Wang](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fund the SF Public Defender's Office and Preserve SF Pretrial!!!
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 9:04:27 AM

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

Hi, my name is Erica Wang.

I'm a resident who lives and works in District 11. I'm calling on the Board of Supervisors to fully fund the San Francisco Public Defender's Office and preserve SF Pretrial. The right to counsel is a constitutional guarantee, not a luxury. Yet our Public Defender has been forced to declare "unavailable" in some misdemeanor and felony cases for over a year because of unsustainably high caseloads, leaving low-income San Franciscans ***without the representation they are entitled to!*** Underfunding this office does not save money; the Bar Association has estimated that these unavailability declarations ***will cost the City around \$1.4 million this fiscal year for felonies alone***, on top of the human cost of delayed justice.

I also urge you to reject any move to displace SF Pretrial's decades-long, community-based work. For nearly 50 years, SF Pretrial has reduced unnecessary incarceration, supported court appearances, and connected people to housing, treatment, and other stabilizing services, ***all at lower cost than incarceration or probation-heavy approaches***. Many staff are system-impacted and deeply trusted by the communities they serve—trust that cannot simply be replicated by a more punitive agency. I urge you to invest in what works: robust defense and community-rooted pretrial services that address root causes and keep our city safer.

Sincerely,



Erica Wang
She/Her/Hers

From: [Joseph J. Wang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please fund the SF Public Defender, and keep SF Pretrial in place
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 12:01:14 PM

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

To the SF Board of Supervisors:

I live and work in District 11 of San Francisco, and I urge you to fully fund the San Francisco Public Defender's Office and preserve SF Pretrial.

The right to counsel is guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, and it is not a luxury for only the rich among us. Contrary to this constitutional guarantee, our Public Defender has been forced to declare themselves "unavailable" in some misdemeanor some and even some felony cases for over a year now, because of unsustainably high caseloads. This short-staffing leave low-income San Franciscans without the legal representation to which they are constitutionally entitled. Underfunding the Public Defender's office does not save money, as the California State Bar Association estimated these unavailability declarations will cost the City around \$1.4 million this fiscal year for felonies alone, on top of the human cost of delayed justice.

I also urge you to reject any move to displace SF Pretrial's decades-long, community-based work. For nearly 50 years, SF Pretrial has reduced unnecessary incarceration, supported court appearances, and connected people to housing, treatment, and other stabilizing services, all at lower cost than incarceration or probation-heavy approaches. Many staff are system-impacted and deeply trusted by the communities they serve—trust that cannot simply be replicated by a more punitive agency. I urge you to invest in what works: robust defense and community-rooted pretrial services that address root causes and keep our city safer.

Sincerely,
Joseph J. Wang

--

Joseph J. Wang
joew10@yahoo.com

From: [Longtin, Jeannette \(HSS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Alicia Flores](#); [Collins, Marquitta \(HSA\)](#)
Subject: Clarification of SFHSS EAP Metrics Presentation from June 10, 2026
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 2:48:54 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to provide critical context and data clarification regarding the presentation delivered to the Board on June 10, 2026, by Health Service System (HSS) Director Rey Guillen concerning the proposed elimination of the SFHSS Internal Employee Assistance Program (EAP).

During public comment, I noted that the metrics presented to justify cutting this 40-year program do not accurately reflect operational realities. As an 11-year employee of the HSS Internal EAP and liaison for the First Responder EAP, I want to ensure the Board has the complete data necessary to make an informed decision.

Core Data & Operational Corrections

Director Guillen frequently cites an **80% ComPsych / 20% HSS EAP** split. This metric only tracks raw incoming phone calls and presents a misleading picture of actual casework for the following reasons:

- **First Responder Routing:** The 80% includes all First Responder EAP calls, which are intentionally routed directly to ComPsych to connect individuals with Specialty Providers.
- **After-Hours Coverage:** 25% of ComPsych's volume occurs during nights, weekends, and holidays when the internal EAP office is closed.
- **Case Redirection:** A significant portion of these initial calls are immediately referred back to internal HSS EAP staff for high-level handling, including Critical Incidents, Leadership Consultations, and complex work-related issues.

True Utilization Metrics

When looking at actual care delivery and services rendered, the internal team manages the vast majority of the workload:

- **66% vs. 34% (Counseling Delivery):** Internal HSS EAP Counselors handle **66%** of all ongoing counseling cases, while ComPsych external contracted therapists handle only 34%.
- **91% vs. 9% (System-Wide Services):** The internal team provides 91% of organizational and individual services. This deeply embedded team provides a multitude of city-wide supports including leadership consultations and coaching, specialized workshops, bridge to care and navigation services, health plan substance abuse and mental health navigation, and critical incident response.
- **35% Service Retention:** If the internal EAP is eliminated, **only 35% of current EAP services will be retained** via the external vendor. The remaining 65% of specialized organizational and individual support will be permanently lost.

Conclusion

The internal EAP team provides an interconnected network of institutional knowledge and specialized care that an external vendor cannot replicate. Relying strictly on call-volume metrics ignores where the actual clinical and organizational work is performed. Thank you for your time, your consideration, and your continued support of City employees. I welcome any questions you may have regarding these metrics.

Respectfully,

Jeannette Longtin

Jeannette Longtin, MS, MBA, CEAP LMFT #20579

Senior Employee Assistance Counselor

(415) 919-9718 Cell Phone

(628) 652-4643 Desk Phone

(628) 652-4600 EAP Main Number 24/7

sfhss.org/eap



Get Outdoors For Your Mental Health

If you or someone you know is in crisis, reach out for help – Call the National Suicide Prevention and Crisis Hotline: Dial or text 988 or call 800-273-8255.

**SAN FRANCISCO
HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM**

Affordable, Quality Benefits & Well-Being

Mailing Address:

1145 Market Street, Suite 210 (2nd Floor)
San Francisco, CA 94103



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication (including any attachments) may contain confidential, proprietary, privileged and/or otherwise protected information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this communication. Any unauthorized disclosure, copying, and/or distribution of this communication, or the taking of any action based thereon, without the express permission of the originator, is strictly prohibited.

From: [Anonymous Person](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Budget & Appropriations Committee Budget Hearing 6/12 - 1-3: DEM
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 3:45:25 PM

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

Hello Board of Supervisors. As being present today in the Budget hearing regarding Department of Emergency Management, I write to you with words that cannot describe how not all details have been presented for the Emergency Services Division. Below is what I highlight that have made the Department of Emergency Management - Emergency Services, needing a change. I am reaching out to provide more education, insight, and details of what is happening behind the scenes. I also hope this can be used as Public Comment. Thank you.

Urban Area Security Initiative(UASI) is an integral part to combining regional emergency management jurisdictions in networking, collaborating, training, and preparedness for disasters. Cutting them from roughly \$40 million couple years ago to now \$4 million, and having a staff from 10+ to now approximately 4 employees is an insult. Without them, we will be delayed in responses, preparedness, and improvement within the Emergency Management community.

Budget/Layoffs/Promotions: We need budget in order to retain critical emergency management professionals who specialize and are subject matter experts in various positions with external and internal agencies. We've lost several key critical positions and employees and that has created burn out within the division, low morale, and no competence in our Executive Director, as she has dodged all the questions and have not been transparent with us. We need a budget that we can help with improving Emergency Management because we are a critical component to keeping San Franciscans safe when an unplanned or planned event occurs that requires the collaboration of regional jurisdictions.

An example would be the upcoming 250 celebration of July 4th. We are coordination, collaborating, and preparing for a big emergency operations center activation while preparing with constant hours to ensure the safety of millions that may come to watch the fireworks. Having numerous layoffs impacts this response and delay.

One huge highlight I want to highlight is during the layoffs, there have been promotions to the Executive Director's chief of staff, and another position that was created and approved all while these major budget cuts have occurred. That is extremely insulting.

As I am close to concluding this email, **I want to highlight that as board of supervisors, you receive the necessary internal notifications via Everbridge system. We are a part of that issuing those notifications and with the layoffs, those notifications will be delayed. We also need the importance of siren systems because even though it is redundant, it is vital part to San Francisco, as Executive Director opposed it and does not think so.**

Lastly, we do not have an Emergency Operations Center tailored to respond to unplanned and planned events. We need the budget to appropriate and be able to have an EOC that other jurisdictions have in order to activate, respond, mitigate, prepare, and recover from emergencies and disasters.

I have a big ask along with the folks within the division that also ask this:

Retain employees. Make all General funds/Permanent Civil Service.

Give us a bigger budget.

Give us an Emergency Operations Center

Give us a new Executive Director that respects and value the employees, and allow promotional opportunities and help improve the mission core criticals of Emergency

Management - Emergency Services Division.

Thank you.

From: [Andrew Law](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Cal Academy Workers!
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 4:06:03 PM

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

Hello Friendly SF Board Members,

Please support the workers at the California Academy of Science.

The Board of Trustees and senior management there have botched the budget, with too much spent on compensation and bonuses for management, and too little for programs and the workers that greet us and make the museum wonderful for paying visitors.

Nonprofit administration is good work and should be compensated well. But not at the expense of the mission or those most responsive for delivering results. If someone wants or needs north of \$250,000 plus generous annual bonuses to show up to work, there are plenty of Tech companies in town...

Please use the Board of Supervisors' "power of the purse" to correct the Academy's financial mistakes. Help Academy management find the funds they need to stabilize their employees and programs. And induce their Trustees to cut executive compensation and bonuses in order to support the museum, its mission, and the front line workers we count on when we visit.

Thank you.

Andrew Law
2316 Alemany Blvd
S.F. CA
District 11

From: [Kyla Karch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Adult Probation request
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 7:52:40 PM

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

I live in District 5 and I oppose this!

Adult Probation's \$12.7M request, restore the health and education cuts

25M from community health orgs, including \$5.4M from HIV/AIDS services. That hits low-barrier HIV screening directly.

- Free City (free City College tuition) is on the chopping block.

- Immigrant legal services keep roughly half their funding. Senior and disability services take hits too.

Cutting HIV screening while entertaining a \$12.7M request to duplicate an \$8M program isn't budgeting. Our budget IS a moral document that reflects the community conscience.

Thank you, Kyla Karch

From: [Sheila Tully](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Create a Budget for SF Workers
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 2:53:06 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 a longtime resident of San Francisco and a retired educator. I am writing to urge you to reject a budget balanced on the backs of working people and create a budget that fully funds community needs and social services. In these times of increasingly dire economic, political, and social crises, you have a responsibility to fight for the values of our city.

This budget as proposed would shred every part of the social safety net. It would lay off hundreds of nonprofit and City workers, slash \$657 million from public health, including programs serving women, transgender, LGBTQ+, and HIV communities, weaken immigrant support services, reduce senior services that help older adults live independently, and strip services from over 10,000 low-income families who rely on support to stay employed, meet basic needs, and avoid homelessness.

Not only will these cuts devastate our communities, these cuts today will guarantee deeper and more expensive crises in the future. I know that when City Hall cuts the services that keep folks housed, healthy, working, safe, and connected, their needs do not disappear. Instead, people are pushed into more costly emergency rooms, shelters, hospitals, crisis response contacts, jails, and the court system.

You have a clear choice. As an elected official, you can double down on Trump's attacks or recognize a budget as a moral decision that reflects the city's values.

I urge you to create longterm solutions that benefit working people:

- Find the money and restore the cuts to essential community services
- Use reserves as a temporary lifeline to prevent mass layoffs and protect the safety net
- Raise revenue from wealthy corporations and support long-term progressive revenue solutions
- Reject tax breaks on luxury property sales
- Rein in runaway law enforcement overtime, mass arrests, jail expansion, and the RESET Center
- Protect the nonprofit and City workers who make San Francisco's recovery possible

I believe in a future where San Francisco invests in workers, immigrants, families, students, city employees, and small businesses. I implore you to build an economy that works for everyone. I stand with the People's Budget Coalition, city unions, and the community organizations fighting to protect San Francisco's safety net. If you choose to stand with the people of San Francisco instead of the billionaires, I will stand with you.

Please find the money: No cuts. No layoffs. Fund OUR San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Sheila R. Tully Ph.D.
Lecturer Emerita
San Francisco State University

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 8 Letters Regarding Crocker Amazon
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:09:05 PM
Attachments: [8 Letters Regarding Crocker Amazon.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 8 letters regarding the renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Vivian Perez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Crocker Amazon Park destruction from neighbors
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:53:47 PM

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

>

> Good morning, SF Board of Supervisors

>

> My family and I live 20 feet away from the entrance to Crocker Amazon Park. We use it several times a week. Our son played with the Junior Giants.

>

> We strongly oppose the plan to tear down old growth trees, replace the grass with turf and fence in currently open spaces. You see, these spaces have become community gathering spaces for the entire community. Come at any time and you will see people walking dogs, elderly Chinese doing tai chi and friends having picnics. These communities will be destroyed by this plan.

> The community will be displaced by kids been bussed in from the Peninsula a few times a week.

> Open spaces will now be surrounded by unwelcoming ugly fences.

> The Excelsior is already ignored plenty, and this plan will take away one of the best things of living in the neighborhood.

>

> There's the excuse that turf is safer for the kids to play, but research shows that the opposite is true. Injuries are actually higher with turf. I also don't want my child to breathe in plastic all day long. The environmental damage of replacing turf every few years is staggering.

>

> There has been zero community involvement in this project. We don't feel heard, and we are very hurt.

>

> Simply put, this plan goes against everything that San Francisco stands for. It's horrible for the environment; bad for our health, including that of the kids playing, and detrimental to the community.

>

> There are compromises that can be made.

> Please, please ensure that the community is heard. Please involve community leaders, and make sure that this is good for the neighborhood; not just for Peninsula kids at our own kids expense.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Vivian Perez

> Excelsior neighbor

> 415-539-8612

>

>

From: [Catherine Sullivan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Keep fields green and natural-Crocker Amazon
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 10:36:18 AM

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

Dear Supervisors

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed renovation plan for Crocker Amazon Park, particularly the expansion of artificial turf and the removal of mature trees.

My deepest concern is the health and safety of children who will be exposed to these synthetic surfaces. Artificial turf is not grass—it is plastic. Many artificial turf products contain PFAS, commonly known as “forever chemicals,” which persist in the environment and in human bodies for decades. These chemicals have been associated with serious health concerns including cancer, hormone disruption, reproductive harm, and immune system effects.

Children are especially vulnerable. They fall on these surfaces, breathe in dust and microplastic particles, touch the turf with bare skin, and often place their hands near their mouths. Even where long-term research remains incomplete, the uncertainty itself should be reason enough to proceed with extreme caution. We should not be turning public parks into experiments in chronic chemical exposure.

Crocker Amazon Park already contains approximately 12 acres of artificial turf on its soccer fields. That is already a massive amount of plastic in a public park. Why does this park need even more?

To put this in perspective, even Golden Gate Park—one of the most iconic and expansive urban parks in the country, spanning over 1,000 acres—contains relatively limited artificial turf compared to its vast natural landscapes. Golden Gate Park remains overwhelmingly defined by grass, trees, gardens, lakes, trails, and habitat. Its value comes from being a living ecosystem, not a plastic recreational surface. If San Francisco’s crown jewel park does not need to be covered in artificial turf to serve the public, why should Crocker Amazon?

Equally alarming is the proposed removal of mature trees.

Trees are not decorative extras. They are essential public infrastructure. They clean our air, cool surrounding temperatures, absorb carbon, reduce noise, support birds and wildlife, and provide shade that protects people from heat. Mature trees take decades to grow, yet can be removed in a single day. Once they are gone, their ecological and community value cannot simply be replaced by saplings or landscaping promises.

Removing healthy trees in order to install more plastic sends exactly the wrong message at a time when cities everywhere are trying to increase tree canopy to combat climate change and urban heat.

Artificial turf also creates dangerous heat conditions. Synthetic surfaces can become dramatically hotter than natural grass, increasing risks of burns, dehydration, and heat stress.

Replacing living green surfaces with heat-retaining plastic is not climate resilience—it is climate negligence.

Most importantly, this proposal reflects a troubling narrowing of what a park is supposed to be.

A park is not just athletic infrastructure.

A park is a public space for everyone.

It is a place where a child kicks a ball, yes—but also where someone lies in the grass and looks up at the sky. It is where neighbors walk their dogs, families share picnics, elders sit in the shade, and people reconnect with something increasingly rare in urban life: nature. It is where birdsong replaces traffic noise. It is where people walk beneath trees and experience calm, restoration, and joy. It is where someone can simply exist without needing to buy anything or compete for space.

Parks serve the entire public, not only organized sports programs.

Please do not allow Crocker Amazon Park to become further transformed from living green space into a plastic sports complex. San Francisco can invest in recreation without sacrificing trees, biodiversity, public health, and the essential character of our parks.

I urge you to reject the use of AstroTurf in the current plan and support alternatives that preserve natural grass, protect mature trees, and honor the true purpose of public parks.

A park belongs to everyone.

Sincerely,

Catherine Sullivan

From: vendor.carat.02@icloud.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Keep Amazon Real ~ NO TURF!!!
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 8:33:08 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Why is this project being approved? Why is so much asked of SF residents to recycle and fund ClimateSF and do away with plastic shopping bags only to turn around and replace natural habitat with plastic polluting grass? I know that you wouldn't want your children to play and inhale PFAS chemicals ~ what is it to stop it from landing your kid in the hospital with cancer? With cancer rates increasing among children and young adults at aprecedented rate, is this a chance you are willing to take?



Study shows higher risk of childhood leukemia tied to PFAS exposure from household dust
publichealth.berkeley.edu



'Forever chemicals' may be linked to childhood leukemia
news.uci.edu

And the research continues to support these findings. Children play on the field, PFAS dust

stays on their clothes and in their lungs and then carried home to other possible vulnerable family members.

Plus the leaching of PFAS into ground water adding another layer of contamination.

Please prove the communities wrong by NOT supporting the bond measure to replace clean air supporting natural grass with chemicals. Think of all the possible child deaths and lawsuits that will come from this egregious and ill conceived act for the short term “beneficial improvements” outlined in the proposal.

Please make the right decision for our community, our city and our world.

Thank you!

From: [Erin L Gardner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Crocker Amazon Park
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 8:45:37 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I feel compelled to write to the board urging a community-driven process to determine the future of Crocker Amazon park. As a parent of two elementary SFUSD children, I am concerned that the removal of mature trees and resurfacing with artificial turf is being pitched as being in their best interest. They do not agree, and neither do I.

Artificial turf means chemicals leaching into our water and environment, it means no worms or birds, it means removing towering mature trees that provide mental health respite, homes for animals, and free creative play for SF's children.

We love Rec & Parks; we even donate financially to support them, attend Camp Mather, and participate in their summer programs. However, Crocker Amazon needs community input and I believe Rec & Parks is making a huge mistake for our children and our city.

Thank you

Erin Gardner
39 Arbor Street, SF, 94131
650-283-6764

From: [Raymond Cachia](#)
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: Saturday, June 13, 2026 9:49:10 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,

R Cachia

From: [Raymond Cachia](#)
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: Saturday, June 13, 2026 10:00:39 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.

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,

R Cachia

From: [Kevin Koller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reject Crocker Amazon Artificial Turf Plan – Mandate Community-Led Natural Redesign
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 3:47:35 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a 10-year resident of Prague Street in the Excelsior, living directly adjacent to Crocker Amazon Park and raising a child

here, I write with urgency and deep concern about the proposed renovation of our neighborhood park. I strongly urge you to

reject the current plan and direct Recreation and Parks to launch a transparent, community-led redesign prioritizing natural grass, on-site tree preservation, genuine public input, and protection from toxic chemicals and light pollution.

Three Evidence-Based Concerns:

1. Toxic PFAS in All Artificial Turf: Rec & Park staff confirmed the proposed turf contains PFAS “forever chemicals.”

Mount Sinai’s Children’s Environmental Health Center warns against PFAS turf due to cancer, immune, thyroid, and developmental risks — especially for children. California bans PFAS in toys; why allow it on our parks where kids play for hours?

2. Environmental Harm & Heat Islands: The plan removes historic trees and replaces natural grass with plastic turf that runs 20–40°F hotter, worsens urban heat, releases microplastics, and harms biodiversity. This contradicts SF climate goals and the Urban Forestry Council’s canopy protections. City-wide replacements and on-site shrubs cannot substitute for mature park trees.

3. Misleading Costs & Public Funds: Promoted as a Giants “gift,” the ~\$50M project uses at least \$22M in public money (\$15M 2020 Bond + \$7M General Fund) plus naming rights that commercialize public space. Independent analyses show artificial turf has far higher lifetime costs (replacement every 8–12 years). Modern natural grass with organic management often provides more playable hours at lower long-term cost while cooling the environment.

A Proven Better Path:

Communities nationwide are choosing sustainable natural or hybrid fields + smart maintenance to increase access without toxins. The SF Youth Commission passed a resolution opposing the current plan and calling for redesign with natural grass, tree preservation, and community input. Requested upgrades (bathrooms, paths, clubhouse) can be funded with bond money alone.

I respectfully ask you to:

1. Withhold approval of the current plan and funding until a genuine community-led

redesign is completed.

2. Require on-site mature tree preservation, natural grass or low-impact surfacing, and lighting mitigation to protect homes on Prague, France, and Munich Streets.

3. Support the Health Commission in adopting a resolution recognizing artificial turf health risks and recommending natural grass for public parks and fields.

I am ready to meet, share peer-reviewed studies and successful case studies from other cities, and connect you with neighbors and experts. Crocker Amazon has been a vital natural community asset for generations. We can improve it without sacrificing our children's health or San Francisco's living environment.

Thank you for your leadership in protecting our children, neighborhoods, and future.

Sincerely,

Kevin Concerned Resident & Parent

374 Prague Street | Excelsior, San Francisco

Key references: Mount Sinai Children's Environmental Health Center Position Statement on Artificial Turf (2025); Rec & Park

written confirmation on PFAS; San Francisco Youth Commission resolution; independent cost-benefit analyses of natural vs.

synthetic fields. Full documentation and petition available at keepcrockerreal.com

From: [Wesley Saunders](#)
To: [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [John-Baptiste, Alicia \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: F*ck the Dodgers?xKeep Crocker Real
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 7:59:58 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The baseball season is long, and to do well, you need a short memory. You have to tip your cap sometimes and take the “L.” The Dodgers are objectively and quantifiably a vastly superior baseball team on the field. They have dominated our division for more than a decade, and they are likely to do so for the next decade while the Giants flounder along, directionless and inept. This season was over by the end of May.

The Dodgers are also winning off the field. They seem to know how to build ballparks for their community. Here, they are celebrating numbers 61–63 of the planned 75 baseball fields to be completed by 2033. Their LA Dodgers Foundation, along with actual community partners, built these three fields for \$1.7M. It’s all natural grass. As an added bonus, it bestows green space to a population lacking in it, rather than stripping it away.

<https://iecn.com/san-bernardino-celebrates-community-revival-with-three-dodgers-dreamfields-emphasizing-the-critical-importance-of-parks-for-youth/>

[El Chicano](#) [Newspapers](#) [San Bernardino](#) [Sports](#) [Youth Sports](#)

San Bernardino Celebrates Community Revival with Three Dodgers Dreamfields, Emphasizing the Critical Importance of Parks for Youth

3 min read

🕒 2 years ago ✍️ Manny Sandoval



In a significant stride towards community development and youth empowerment, the [Los Angeles Dodgers Foundation \(LADF\)](#), in collaboration

The Giants' recent Pride Night offered another low moment. I assume that when your majority ownership is made up of prominent MAGA supporters, those players and coaches who are uncomfortable with allowing other human beings to exist feel supported expressing their "views."

<https://apple.news/AKO5HrI2KToyi3O-4bz6s5A>

9:09 AM Sat Jun 13



73%



Jun 12, 2026; San Francisco, California, USA; San Francisco Giants starting pitcher Landen Roupp (65) throws against the Chicago Cubs during the first inning at Oracle Park. Mandatory Credit: John Hefti-Imagn Images

John Hefti-Imagn Images

Bad and bigoted

The Giants told fans exactly who they are on Friday.

By Brady Klopfer | June 13, 2026 2:02 am EDT

It took less than one pitch for the San Francisco Giants to ruin their Friday night game. The stands had yet to fill in. The clock had yet to strike 7:10. The umpire had yet to say “play ball.”

“It was equal parts bigoted and embarrassing, and blame deserves to shine throughout the

organization. I don't recall this ever happening with the Giants at prior Pride Nights, so it's a reasonable assumption to make that Tony Vitello was okay with this "expression" where other managers have shut it down. It speaks poorly to the leaders in the organization, like Logan Webb, Willy Adames, and Matt Chapman, who prioritized the desires of a few players over the comfort of their fans (and, you know ... humanity).

On a night meant to celebrate the LGBTQ+ community — which, it goes without saying, is a fairly significant demographic anywhere, but especially San Francisco — the Giants instead sent a message loudly and clearly: not all are welcome (though they're still more than welcome to spend a few hundred bucks on tickets and overpriced beer, of course)."

– Brady Klopfer, The McCovey Chronicles

Why do we feel the need to bend the knee to a corporate entity owned by people who are not part of our city and show open disdain for our community? Whose city is this? Does it belong to a multi-billion-dollar, multinational, right-leaning corporation or its longtime residents? This is a bad deal by the RPD that was poorly negotiated. The San Francisco Giants Baseball Corruption LLC has not pledged a single dime to this project, while we are giving away more than \$100M worth of developed land for a suspect purpose. We can do better.

Thank you for your time,
Keep Crocker Real



From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 10 Letters Regarding the SF Giants
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:09:52 PM
Attachments: [10 Letters Regarding the SF Giants.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 10 letters regarding the San Francisco Giants.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Daniel Haney](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Giants Pride Night
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 2:23:32 PM

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

Dear Representatives of San Francisco,

I would like to speak to you about our local baseball team. I and many believe Pride is a very important night, especially in San Francisco. I know the Giants take this seriously.

I am absolutely disgusted by the behavior of Landen Roupp, JT Brubaker, Ryan Walker, Matt Hentges (and possibly others?) undermining the message of pride and inclusivity by writing bible verses on their pride hats. I don't care how they or the organization wish to explain it, it is offensive and disgusting to San Francisco in its obvious context. These players do not represent me or this community. I am sorry, I cannot support these players or this team if you or Giants choose to not address this to the city and fanbase in any way. An apology should be the bare minimum.

I don't know who to contact on this matter, this seemed like my best bet, but I feel I need to reach out to the organization and elected officials in some way.

Thank you,

Daniel
Yerba Buena

From: [Garrett](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SF Giants Players" Anti-Pride Actions: Request for Response & Accountability
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 4:09:45 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Supervisors Dorsey & Mandelman, and the Board of Supervisors:

I am 15 year resident of D6, and a season ticket holder of the San Francisco Giants.

I am writing to express my deep dismay at the conduct of several San Francisco Giants players during last night's Pride Night at Oracle Park, and to request a response from your offices.

On the evening of Friday, June 13, 2026, the Giants' own Pride Night, starting pitcher **Landen Roupp** wrote a Bible verse across the rainbow SF logo of his Pride Night cap, using the Genesis rainbow covenant as a deliberate theological rebuke of Pride. Relief pitcher **J.T. Brubaker** followed with the same verse in even larger lettering. Relief pitcher **Sam Hentges** refused to wear the Pride Night cap entirely. **Manager Tony Vitello** (who wore the cap himself) declined to address or correct the conduct after the game, describing it as a matter of "individual freedom."

This was not a neutral expression of personal faith. *It was a coordinated, visible act of protest conducted on the field, in uniform, during an event the organization had explicitly dedicated to celebrating the LGBTQ+ community.* It sent an unmistakable message to LGBTQ+ fans, families, allies, athletes, and staff: you are not fully welcome here.

The San Francisco Giants are not a private enterprise operating in a vacuum. They play in our city, trade on its identity, and benefit from the civic infrastructure, public goodwill, and loyal fanbase of San Franciscans. The rainbow on those caps is not just a logo, **it is borrowed equity** from a community that has fought, bled, and died for its right to exist in this city. To write a Bible verse across it as an act of protest is a profound act of bad....faith and an incredibly thin interpretation of Scripture.

Players who publicly demonstrate contempt for the community that hosts them should not benefit from the goodwill and civic identity of this city. We call on Giants ownership to evaluate whether these players belong on a roster that represents San Francisco.

I am asking your offices to:

1. Issue a statement, public or private, condemning the players' actions and the organization's failure to respond with clarity or conviction.
2. Call on Giants ownership and MLB to take meaningful corrective action, up to and including disciplinary measures, to make clear that this conduct is incompatible with the values of this organization and this city.

3. Demand a direct apology, not a corporate statement, not a PR-managed deflection, but a personal acknowledgment of harm directed to the LGBTQ+ fans and community members who were in that ballpark last night.

4. Make clear to Giants ownership that the City of San Francisco's sustained civic support, public goodwill, and the use of this city's name and identity come with expectations, and that players who cannot meet those expectations have no business being on a San Francisco roster.

I'm under no illusion that much of this, if any, will actually happen. Nor am I under any illusion about the rampant homophobia in professional sports. But, as a concerned citizen, passionate fan, and someone who deeply believes in the values and history of this city, I would be remiss to not raise my concerns. \

It is worth noting that the players who chose to make theological statements on Pride Night are members of **a pitching staff that has been among the worst in baseball this season**, and is the primary reason the San Francisco Giants find themselves near the bottom of the MLB. Perhaps the energy spent on coordinated acts of protest against the LGBTQ+ community would be better directed toward the job these players are handsomely compensated to perform and are currently failing at.

As you well know, San Francisco is where Harvey Milk served. It is where the AIDS quilt was born. It is where LGBTQ+ people came for generations because they could be themselves. Last night, several Giants players chose to say otherwise.

Thank you for your service to this city.

Sincerely,

Garrett Shelton

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

From: [Jennifer Butler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SF Giants Players' Anti-Pride Actions
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 5:33:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As an SF resident and homeowner, I am writing to express my deep dismay at the conduct of several San Francisco Giants players during Friday night's Pride Night at Oracle Park, and to demand a public response from your office.

On the evening of Friday, June 13, 2026, the Giants' own Pride Night, starting pitcher Landen Roupp wrote a Bible verse across the rainbow SF logo of his Pride Night cap, using the Genesis rainbow covenant as a deliberate theological rebuke of Pride. Relief pitcher J.T. Brubaker followed with the same verse in even larger lettering. Relief pitcher Sam Hentges refused to wear the Pride Night cap entirely. Manager Tony Vitello who wore the cap himself, declined to address or correct the conduct after the game, describing it as a matter of "individual freedom."

San Francisco has a long, proud history of supporting the LGBTQ+ community. Their actions go against everything San Francisco stands for and show a lack of human decency and respect. Allowing players to use team-issued Pride gear to broadcast contrary personal messages alienates a large portion of your fanbase.

I am asking you to:

1. Issue a public statement condemning the players' actions and the organization's failure to respond with clarity or conviction.
2. Call on Giants ownership and MLB to take meaningful corrective action — up to and including disciplinary measures — to make clear that this conduct is incompatible with the values of this organization and this city
3. Demand a direct personal apology from each of the players involved, not a corporate statement, not a PR-managed deflection, but a personal acknowledgment of harm directed to the LGBTQ+ fans and community members who were in that ballpark last night.
4. Make clear to Giants ownership that the City of San Francisco's sustained civic support, public goodwill, and the use of this city's name and identity come with expectations and that players who cannot meet those expectations have no business being on a San Francisco roster.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Butler

San Francisco Potrero Hill homeowner

From: [Bonnie Wach](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SF Giants Players' Anti-Pride Actions - Demanding Public Statement & Accountability
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 7:04:47 PM

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

Dear Scott,

I am writing to express my deep dismay at the conduct of several San Francisco Giants players during last night's Pride Night at Oracle Park, and to demand a public response from your office.

On the evening of Friday, June 13, 2026, the Giants' own Pride Night, starting pitcher **Landen Roupp** wrote a Bible verse across the rainbow SF logo of his Pride Night cap, using the Genesis rainbow covenant as a deliberate theological rebuke of Pride. Relief pitcher **J.T. Brubaker** followed with the same verse in even larger lettering. Relief pitcher **Sam Hentges** refused to wear the Pride Night cap entirely. Manager **Tony Vitello** who wore the cap himself, declined to address or correct the conduct after the game, describing it as a matter of "individual freedom."

This was not a neutral expression of personal faith. It was a coordinated, visible act of protest conducted on the field, in uniform, during an event the organization had explicitly dedicated to celebrating the LGBTQ+ community. It sent an unmistakable message to LGBTQ+ fans, families, players, and staff: you are not fully welcome here.

The San Francisco Giants are not a private enterprise operating in a vacuum. They play in our city, trade on its identity, and benefit from the civic infrastructure, public goodwill, and loyal fanbase of San Franciscans. The rainbow on those caps is not just a logo, it is borrowed equity from a community that has fought, bled, and died for its right to exist in this city.

Players who publicly demonstrate contempt for the community that hosts them should not benefit from the goodwill and civic identity of this city.

I am asking your office to:

1. Issue a public statement condemning the players' actions and the organization's failure to respond with clarity or conviction.
2. Call on Giants ownership and MLB to take meaningful corrective action — up to and including disciplinary measures — to make clear that this conduct is incompatible with the values of this organization and this city.
3. Demand a direct personal apology from each of the players involved, not a corporate statement, not a PR-managed deflection, but a personal acknowledgment of harm directed to the LGBTQ+ fans and community members who were in that ballpark last night.
4. Make clear to Giants ownership that the City of San Francisco's sustained civic support, public goodwill, and the use of this city's name and identity come with expectations and that players who cannot meet those expectations have no business being on a San Francisco roster.

It is worth noting that the players who chose to make theological statements on Pride Night are members of **a pitching staff that has been among the worst in baseball this season**. Perhaps the energy spent on coordinated acts of protest against the LGBTQ+ community would be better directed toward the job these players are handsomely compensated to perform and are currently failing at.

San Francisco is where Harvey Milk served. It is where the AIDS quilt was born. It is where LGBTQ+ people came for generations because they could be themselves. The San Francisco Giants play here. They should act like it or they shouldn't be here.

Thank you for your service to this city.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Wach
Native San Franciscan and lifelong Giants fan

From: [Stan Sarkisov](#)
To: tony.vitello@gmail.com; customerservice@sfgiants.com; [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SF GIANTS: anti-gay Bible preachers who cant win a game
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 2:19:35 PM

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

Dear All of YOU,

Why did my friends and I spend \$40 a game to be preached HATE and EXCLUSION on PRIDE Night when the Giants continued their losing streak and brought in the Bible to preach exclusion on a night meant to be inclusive?

If you want to pretend to be ignorant (... "I have no idea what you're talking about and can't respond because I am fiending ignorance"), read this: <https://hangingsliders.beehiiv.com/p/the-giants-are-destroying-a-san-francisco-franchise>

I want my money back. I want an apology. Using MY lord and MY religion for your loser behavior is unbecoming of Christian.

Tony Vitello is ruining the Giants, and I will never go back to a game to see him ruin this team.

GOD LOVES EVERYONE,
Stan

From: [Garrett Lu](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Disappointed And Hurt - SF Giants Pride Night 6/13
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 9:00:06 PM

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

Dear Daniel Lurie and the SF Board Of Supervisors,

I am writing as a long-time Giants fan (since late 1990s) who attended Pride Night at Oracle Park on June 13, 2026 with my partner of 10 years (Section 210, Row D, Seats 13, 14). What should have been a joyful evening celebrating inclusion instead left us feeling deeply disappointed, hurt, and questioning whether we can continue supporting this organization.

I have followed the Giants for so many years, even during difficult seasons and disappointing stretches on the field, I have continued to attend games, buy tickets, spend money at the ballpark, and support the team because I believed the Giants represented something larger than wins and losses. I truly believed the organization embodied what makes San Francisco and the Bay Area so special: a welcoming community that embraces people from all backgrounds - especially LGBTQ+ individuals.

That is why the events surrounding Pride Night were so heartbreaking.

After attending the game, I learned that several players either altered their uniforms with Bible verses or refused to wear the Pride-themed cap altogether in apparent protest of the event. I then read the public comments that followed as well as the organization's response, which to me, was unacceptable and made the situation even worse.

I understand that professional athletes, like all people, have personal beliefs. This letter is not about demanding that every player think the same way. Rather, it is about the message sent to LGBTQ+ fans when a team hosts a Pride celebration while simultaneously allowing members of the organization to publicly reject the very community being honored.

To me, Pride Night is not just another promotional giveaway day at a Giants game. For many LGBTQ+ people, it is a rare opportunity to attend a sporting event and feel explicitly welcomed, visible, and valued. It is a night when LGBTQ+ fans bring their partners, spouses, children, parents, and friends to celebrate being part of the Giants family. That is exactly what I did.

I brought my partner with me to the game because I believed we would be spending the evening with an organization that wanted us there. Learning afterward that some players chose to use that occasion as an opportunity to distance themselves from or protest (and even "reclaim") the symbolism of Pride felt like a punch to the stomach. **What hurt even more was the apparent willingness of the organization to allow it to happen on a night specifically intended to celebrate inclusion.**

The message many LGBTQ+ fans received was clear: our support, ticket purchases, and

loyalty are welcome, but our identities remain optional and debatable. That, to me, is heartbreaking.

What has made this situation particularly difficult is that the Giants are not just any baseball team. They play in San Francisco. The organization has spent years promoting its commitment to diversity, inclusion, and community engagement. Those values should matter most when they are inconvenient, not only when they are easy.

As a fan, I am left wondering what Pride Night is supposed to mean if players can openly reject the event's symbolism without consequence and the organization simply asks everyone to move on. If the purpose of Pride Night is truly to welcome LGBTQ+ fans, then surely the organization must recognize why many of us feel alienated by what occurred.

I am not writing this because I want to attack the Giants. I am writing because I care about the team and because I am genuinely saddened by how this situation was handled. For the first time in many years, I do not feel excited to watch games. I do not feel motivated to buy tickets. I do not feel eager to support an organization that, from my perspective, failed to stand behind the very fans it invited to celebrate that evening.

I hope the Giants leadership takes seriously the concerns being expressed by LGBTQ+ fans and allies, and I hope the organization understands that this controversy is not simply about a uniform policy or a disagreement over beliefs. It is about whether LGBTQ+ fans can trust that they are genuinely valued members of the Giants community. Right now, that trust has been badly damaged.

I would appreciate hearing what steps the organization intends to take to ensure that future Pride events truly reflect the inclusion and respect they are advertised to represent.

Thank you for taking the time to read this message. I sincerely hope the Giants choose to respond not only with empty words, but with actions that demonstrate a meaningful commitment to the LGBTQ+ fans who have supported this team for decades. Otherwise, I don't plan on watching or attending any further games in the future.

With sincerity and great sadness,

Garrett Lu

From: [Garrett Lu](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Disappointed And Hurt - SF Giants Pride Night 6/13
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 9:05:46 PM

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

Apologies for the wrong date in my email - this was on Friday, 6/12 of course.

On Mon, Jun 15, 2026 at 8:59 PM Garrett Lu <garrettlu@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Daniel Lurie and the SF Board Of Supervisors,

I am writing as a long-time Giants fan (since late 1990s) who attended Pride Night at Oracle Park on June 13, 2026 with my partner of 10 years (Section 210, Row D, Seats 13, 14). What should have been a joyful evening celebrating inclusion instead left us feeling deeply disappointed, hurt, and questioning whether we can continue supporting this organization.

I have followed the Giants for so many years, even during difficult seasons and disappointing stretches on the field, I have continued to attend games, buy tickets, spend money at the ballpark, and support the team because I believed the Giants represented something larger than wins and losses. I truly believed the organization embodied what makes San Francisco and the Bay Area so special: a welcoming community that embraces people from all backgrounds - especially LGBTQ+ individuals.

That is why the events surrounding Pride Night were so heartbreaking.

After attending the game, I learned that several players either altered their uniforms with Bible verses or refused to wear the Pride-themed cap altogether in apparent protest of the event. I then read the public comments that followed as well as the organization's response, which to me, was unacceptable and made the situation even worse.

I understand that professional athletes, like all people, have personal beliefs. This letter is not about demanding that every player think the same way. Rather, it is about the message sent to LGBTQ+ fans when a team hosts a Pride celebration while simultaneously allowing members of the organization to publicly reject the very community being honored.

To me, Pride Night is not just another promotional giveaway day at a Giants game. For many LGBTQ+ people, it is a rare opportunity to attend a sporting event and feel explicitly welcomed, visible, and valued. It is a night when LGBTQ+ fans bring their partners, spouses, children, parents, and friends to celebrate being part of the Giants family. That is exactly what I did.

I brought my partner with me to the game because I believed we would be spending the evening with an organization that wanted us there. Learning afterward that some players chose to use that occasion as an opportunity to distance themselves from or protest (and even "reclaim") the symbolism of Pride felt like a punch to the stomach. **What hurt even**

more was the apparent willingness of the organization to allow it to happen on a night specifically intended to celebrate inclusion.

The message many LGBTQ+ fans received was clear: our support, ticket purchases, and loyalty are welcome, but our identities remain optional and debatable. That, to me, is heartbreaking.

What has made this situation particularly difficult is that the Giants are not just any baseball team. They play in San Francisco. The organization has spent years promoting its commitment to diversity, inclusion, and community engagement. Those values should matter most when they are inconvenient, not only when they are easy.

As a fan, I am left wondering what Pride Night is supposed to mean if players can openly reject the event's symbolism without consequence and the organization simply asks everyone to move on. If the purpose of Pride Night is truly to welcome LGBTQ+ fans, then surely the organization must recognize why many of us feel alienated by what occurred.

I am not writing this because I want to attack the Giants. I am writing because I care about the team and because I am genuinely saddened by how this situation was handled. For the first time in many years, I do not feel excited to watch games. I do not feel motivated to buy tickets. I do not feel eager to support an organization that, from my perspective, failed to stand behind the very fans it invited to celebrate that evening.

I hope the Giants leadership takes seriously the concerns being expressed by LGBTQ+ fans and allies, and I hope the organization understands that this controversy is not simply about a uniform policy or a disagreement over beliefs. It is about whether LGBTQ+ fans can trust that they are genuinely valued members of the Giants community. Right now, that trust has been badly damaged.

I would appreciate hearing what steps the organization intends to take to ensure that future Pride events truly reflect the inclusion and respect they are advertised to represent.

Thank you for taking the time to read this message. I sincerely hope the Giants choose to respond not only with empty words, but with actions that demonstrate a meaningful commitment to the LGBTQ+ fans who have supported this team for decades. Otherwise, I don't plan on watching or attending any further games in the future.

With sincerity and great sadness,

Garrett Lu

From: [Stephanie Koester](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Stephanie Koester](#)
Subject: SF Giants Players' Anti-Pride Actions - Demanding Public Statement & Accountability
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 9:41:26 AM

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

Dear Sirs/Madames,

I am writing to express my deep dismay at the conduct of several San Francisco Giants players during last night's Pride Night at Oracle Park, and to demand a public response from your office.

On the evening of Friday, June 13, 2026, the Giants' own Pride Night, starting pitcher ****Landen Roupp**** wrote a Bible verse across the rainbow SF logo of his Pride Night cap, using the Genesis rainbow covenant as a deliberate theological rebuke of Pride. Relief pitcher ****J.T. Brubaker**** followed with the same verse in even larger lettering. Relief pitcher ****Sam Hentges**** refused to wear the Pride Night cap entirely. Manager ****Tony Vitello**** who wore the cap himself, declined to address or correct the conduct after the game, describing it as a matter of "individual freedom."

This was not a neutral expression of personal faith. It was a coordinated, visible act of protest conducted on the field, in uniform, during an event the organization had explicitly dedicated to celebrating the LGBTQ+ community. It sent an unmistakable message to LGBTQ+ fans, families, players, and staff: you are not fully welcome here.

The San Francisco Giants are not a private enterprise operating in a vacuum. They play in our city, trade on its identity, and benefit from the civic infrastructure, public goodwill, and loyal fanbase of San Franciscans. The rainbow on those caps is not just a logo, it is borrowed equity from a community that has fought, bled, and died for its right to exist in this city.

Players who publicly demonstrate contempt for the community that hosts them should not benefit from the goodwill and civic identity of this city.

****I am asking your office to:****

1. Issue a public statement condemning the players' actions and the organization's failure to respond with clarity or conviction.
2. Call on Giants ownership and MLB to take meaningful corrective action — up to and including disciplinary measures — to make clear that this conduct is incompatible with the values of this organization and this city.
3. Demand a direct personal apology from each of the players involved, not a corporate statement, not a PR-managed deflection, but a personal acknowledgment of harm directed to the LGBTQ+ fans and community members who were in that ballpark last night.
4. Make clear to Giants ownership that the City of San Francisco's sustained civic support, public goodwill, and the use of this city's name and identity come with expectations and that players who cannot meet those expectations have no business being on a San Francisco roster.

It is worth noting that the players who chose to make theological statements on Pride Night are members of ****a pitching staff that has been**** ****among the worst in baseball this season****. Perhaps the energy spent on coordinated acts of protest against the LGBTQ+ community would be better directed toward the job these players are handsomely compensated to perform and are currently failing at.

San Francisco is where Harvey Milk served. It is where the AIDS quilt was born. It is where LGBTQ+ people came for generations because they could be themselves. The San Francisco Giants play here. They should act like it or they shouldn't be here.

Thank you for your service to this city.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Koester
Native San Franciscan and lifelong Giants fan

From: [Leor Friedman](#)
To: customerservice@sfgiants.com
Subject: Pride Night
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 11:21:52 AM

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

To the San Francisco Giants organization and other interested parties,

I write to express my deep anger and disappointment with the club's actions over the past week. I intentionally waited a few days to reflect on the situation resulting from the players' actions at the Pride event. Ultimately, I feel like I can no longer support this organization that I have rooted for for over 40 years. The issue extends far beyond the actions of a few individual players, and the repercussions of the event (or lack thereof) have made it clear that systemic failures exist in the Giants' leadership and that there are deep misunderstandings regarding the community that the Giants claim to support and represent.

To say that the actions of those individual players were divisive, hateful, bigoted, and mean-spirited is just scratching the surface. However, members of the organization could have addressed or at least ameliorated this issue at multiple levels. The lack of leadership shown by the veteran players and leaders on the team to have a conversation with those players about why their actions would be so damaging and hurtful shows just how little the players understand who they play for and represent by wearing the words San Francisco across their chest. The unwillingness on the part of the coaching and management staff to lay down the law, citing the MLB rules that are already in place, shows a lack of control over the clubhouse at best and sheer cowardice at worst. The community relations and ownership team's refusal to release any meaningful statement condemning the players' actions shows that their so-called "commitment" to the LGBTQIA+ community goes only as far as it helps them to sell tickets and merchandise, but they are unwilling to take any moral or ethical stance. It is truly and utterly embarrassing that the MLB, hardly a paragon of the moral high ground, was able to come out and warn the players that their actions violated the rules, and the Giants organization itself refused to do so.

The Giants organization's sheer audacity in asking, in their surveys, how people feel about whether the team represents the fans they play for and the city they represent is absolutely galling. The Giants do not play in a vacuum, the deep South, or the 1950s. They are inherently tied to San Francisco: its culture, values, history, and residents. They are dependent on the city's and its people's dedication, support, investments, infrastructure, and goodwill, much of which has been squandered this week. For an organization that started the Until There's a Cure night and the Pride night itself, I would have thought that the organization understood that. Clearly, I was wrong. How sad that I misunderstood this team's culture and intent for four decades.

Baseball iSFor everyone.

With sincere and deep disappointment,

Leor Friedman

From: [Anderson, Mace](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Disappointed in lack of response to the actions of the SF Giants Players
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 11:24:27 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

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

Dear elected representatives of San Francisco,

I, like many San Franciscans, have struggled to combine my love for the Giants with the actions of their players on Pride Night last Firday. San Francisco can be many things, but if it is anything it is a queer city. Any team that doesn't support that shouldn't play here. Any team that doesn't support that shouldn't wear our name on their jerseys.

While I am not surprised that an organization by Charles Johnson and the Kushner's only acknowledges that this caused "pain and anger" I can understand that of a sports team that is just a company with our city in its name. What I can't comprehend is the lack of acknowledgment, let alone outrage from any member of this Board. If doesn't matter if it's D8 or D2, each one of you represents a city that has been a dream and a reality for so many. Let us hope it continues to be.

Sincerely,

Mace Anderson



Mace Anderson (He/Him)
JD Candidate 2028
UC Law San Francisco | 200 McAllister St., San Francisco, CA 94102
Maceanderson1@uclawsf.edu | (415) 271-7808

From: [Bullock, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 17 Letters Regarding Retail Animal Sales
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:10:41 PM
Attachments: [17 Letters Regarding Retail Animal Sales.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 17 letters regarding banning of retail animal sales.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Kathleen Helmer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: BAN TRAFFICKED & Mill-bred animals
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 3:21:53 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am in strong support of the San Francisco Animal Commission's recommendation that San Francisco introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in San Francisco.

Thanks to Social Compassion in Legislation California successfully banned the sale of mill-bred dogs, cats, and rabbits back in 2017 through the Pet Rescue and Adoption Act (AB 485). Now, SF has the opportunity to extend this protection to other animals sold in pet stores and inspire other cities to do the same.

Retail animals are often trafficked from the wild and many die during importation, making this a crucial conservation issue. Retail animals who are not trafficked are bred in mills, where they are confined in deplorable conditions. Whether these animals are stolen from the wild or bred in mills, there is mass suffering that exists within the pet industry.

As a progressive and conservation-oriented city, San Francisco cannot continue to support the suffering of animals in breeding mills, in trafficking incidents, and in pet stores themselves.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to introduce a ban on the retail sale of animals in San Francisco. Thank you for your consideration.

From: [Josephine Bellacomo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
Subject: Please introduce ban on animal sales!
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 7:58:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a SF resident, volunteer at SF Animal Care & Control for 17 years, and a foster mom with Toni's Kitty Rescue, I'm glad to learn that the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban. Please introduce a ban on the retail sale of animals in San Francisco.

I'm sure you are aware that some of our SFACC wonderful dogs, cats and small animals may be on the adoption floor for many months, enduring stress despite all the love, kindness and enrichment we offer. It's tragic that many of them, including perfectly healthy animals, sometimes cannot endure the shelter stress to make it to loving forever homes because animals up for adoption compete with animals up for sale.

I hope the pet stores that currently sell animals will instead collaborate with shelters and rescues to feature adoptable animals and profit from SF adopters eager to spoil their new family members.

I have shed many tears, and I urge you to do all you can to save our animals: Please introduce a ban on the retail sale of animals in San Francisco. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Josephine Bellacomo
1649 Treat Av
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: [Linda Klann](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 9:13:56 AM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I have lived in SF for 26 years and am reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city!

Millions of animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to prompt adoption and end animal sales.

Sincerely
Linda

From: [imo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 12:46:58 PM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors, I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I'm reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city! Millions of animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to prompt adoption and end animal sales. *Sincerely, SF residents*

From: [Kayla Kaplan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 10:38:19 PM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I'm an SF resident in the Richmond reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city!

Millions of animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to prompt adoption and end animal sales.

All the best,
Kayla Kaplan

From: [hugo zuniga](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 11:09:32 AM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I'm reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city!

Millions of animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to prompt adoption and end animal sales.

Sincerely,

Hugo Zuniga
San Francisco resident

From: [hugo zuniga](#)
Subject: animal sales ban
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 11:21:07 AM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I'm reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city!

Millions of animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to prompt adoption and end animal sales.

Sincerely,

Hugo Zuniga
San Francisco resident

From: [Chelsea Davis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 11:28:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I was excited to learn that the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban. As someone appalled by millions of animals that die prematurely in breeding mills and en route to pet stores, I ask you to introduce a ban on this cruel practice in our city.

Animal shelters everywhere are overfull with wonderful animals in need of homes. Encouraging adoption and ending animal sales will save millions of animals from being tortured in the retail trade or euthanized in shelters.

Sincerely,
Chelsea Davis
San Francisco resident, 94131

From: [Beth Cataldo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 3:58:58 PM

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I was encouraged to hear that the San Francisco Commission of Animal Control and Welfare has recommended a retail animal sales ban. As a San Francisco resident for more than 30 years, I care deeply about the values and priorities of our community. I am writing to urge you to introduce and support legislation that would prohibit the retail sale of animals in our city.

The commercial sale of animals fuels breeding mills, wildlife trafficking, and the transportation of animals through stressful and often inhumane supply chains. At the same time, animal shelters and rescue organizations are overwhelmed with dogs, cats, rabbits, birds and other animals in need of loving homes.

A retail animal sales ban would help reduce demand for commercially bred animals while promoting adoption and supporting the lifesaving work of local shelters and rescues. It is a compassionate and practical step that reflects our community's commitment to animal welfare.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you will take action to end the retail sale of animals in our city.

Sincerely,

Beth Cataldo
692 8th Avenue,
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: shannon.pardini
To: shannon.pardini
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 8:53:38 AM

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

***Hi Board of Supervisors,
I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I'm reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city!***

Animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to promote adoption and end animal sales. I live in San Francisco California.

Much love and High Vibes,
Shannon Pardini

Quantum Energy Practitioner
Pioneer & Leader in DNA Intelligence
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___www.shannonpardini.com___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpjNDA5MTFlOTkzNDc1ZjcwZmIxN2ZiZmI1ZjMxODhkMjo3Ojk1ODU6ZjE5OTQyODgxMDExNjNjMjAxMjE4NmYyNWFKMjE2YmJlMTQ2OTgxMmU0MjNhMjE3YzZlNDQ0MGVhYWExMjIxMTp0O1Q6Tg

C: 415.336.1843
spardini@mac.com

From: [Stephanie Ciancio](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 11:46:36 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 encouraged by San Francisco's leadership of banning the retail sale of cats and dogs. I've been a volunteer with rescued cats and dogs for nearly 20 years, most of them in SF. I love it when shelter pets get adoption chances at shops.

I learned that we have an opportunity to reduce retail animal breeding and suffering, with a retail animal sales ban recommended by the Animal Commission.

I would be so thankful for your leadership to introduce a ban on retail sales of animals in our city. Have you seen/looked at dead and dying birds and other animals - they are dying in breeding mills, shipping, and pet stores.

Animal Care and Control has birds at least, and probably reptiles available for adoption, so let's eliminate a cruel and unnecessary practice that competes with adoption.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Ciancio
94110

From: [Prasanna Vasudevan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 3:16:59 PM

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco resident, and I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban. I'm reaching out to encourage you to **introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city.**

Animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. **We need to end animal sales and instead promote adoption.**

Sincerely,
Prasanna Vasudevan

From: [Rosie P](#)
To: [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce a Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 8:12:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I'm reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city!

Animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores. Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to promote adoption and end animal sales.

Sincerely, Rose Puntillo

"Every individual matters. Every individual has a role to play. Every individual makes a difference." Jane Goodall



norcalbats.org

From: [wendi raw](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Retail animal sales ban
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 9:09:18 AM

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

Thank you,
Wendi Raw

From: [wendi raw](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please introduce our band on retail sales of animals!
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 9:19:02 AM

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

Hi

I live in San Francisco and am a lifelong pet owner. I'm so happy to learn the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban! I'm reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city.

Animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores! Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to promote adoption and end animal sales.

There is no downside to this! Only benefit. How often can we say that? Let's do it!

Best,

WS Raw

From: [Tristan L'Heureux](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Retail Animal Sales Ban
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 10:30:47 AM

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

Hello Board of Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident and I had heard that the San Francisco Commission of Animal Control and Welfare has recommend a retail animal sales ban! I am reaching out in support of this ban and would ask that you all introduce it to end the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our great city.

Animals that many of us consider important and precious parts of lives are suffering and dying in breeding mills, shipping containers, and even in pet stores while adoption centers are overwhelmed by the number of animals in need homes. We need to promote adoption in lieu of animals sales. Please introduce and support this ban on animal sales!

Thank you for taking the time to read my email.

Sincerely,
Tristan L'Heureux

183 Paris St.
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: [Annalee Pineda](#)
To: [SauterStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Ban on the retail sale of animals in pet stores
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 10:51:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a constituent in District 3. I heard the Animal Commission has recommended a retail animal sales ban. I am reaching out to encourage you to introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city.

Animals are dying in breeding mills, in wildlife trafficking, in shipping, even in pet stores. Meanwhile rescues are chronically overwhelmed with animals in need of homes. We have got to promote adoption and end animal sales. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Annalee Pineda

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Barklee Sanders/HCSO
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 9:27:00 AM
Attachments: [Request for Board action keep reclaimed SF City Option SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care.msg](#)
[Follow-up full records packet attached keep SF City Option SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care.msg](#)
[Follow-up full records packet attached keep SF City Option SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care.msg](#)
[Follow-up full records packet attached keep SF City Option SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care.msg](#)

Hello,

Please see attached four emails are from Barklee Sanders regarding the Health Care Security Ordinance (HCSO).

Regards,

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

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

HCSO / SF City Option Worker Health Funds Outreach Packet

Prepared: June 12, 2026

This packet summarizes the requested SF City Option / HCSO policy change, the verified official sources, the public-records status, and the exact outreach text sent to public agencies and media.

Requested change in one sentence: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds dedicated to worker health care, and require stronger worker notice/employer onboarding so funds reach the employees they were created for.

Ground-truth note: stakes-bearing factual claims cite primary/current sources fetched on June 12, 2026 unless marked as media coverage.

Records status: no duplicate CPRA request needed now

Live NextRequest dedupe found existing requests already covering this issue:

- 26-4243 — DPH — balances, inactive age bands, Pool, worker notice text, projected General Fund transfer methodology. Closed; responsive record received.
- 26-4244 — Controller / City Services Auditor — audits, correspondence, budget treatment, legal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4922 — Controller — derivation of \$200–240M budget figure, revenue recognition, General Fund treatment, legal/fiscal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4923 — DPH — Health Commission policy, program data, outreach records, notice delivery metrics, complaints, correspondence. Open.
- 26-4924 — Treasurer & Tax Collector — escheatment notice, legal authority, account/fund transfer mechanics, post-escheat recovery process. Open.
- 26-5157 — DPH — OLSE referral follow-up, internal memos, transfer mechanism/destination. Open.
- 26-5219 — DPH / SF City Option Program — program records and communications on inactive-MRA transfer assumption and HCSO irrevocability. Open.

Official recipients

1. Board of Supervisors / public comment
 - To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

- Source: <https://sfbos.org/participate-and-submit-public-comments> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

2. San Francisco Health Commission

- To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org
- Optional CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/departments-san-francisco-health-commission> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org and Director of Health Commission Affairs mark.morewitz@sfdph.org.

3. OLSE / HCSO

- To: hcsosf@sfgov.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-contact-office-labor-standards-enforcement> and <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12; pages list HCSO email hcsosf@sfgov.org.

4. SF City Option program

- To: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists employer services and employee contacts.

Media contacts and coverage

1. Mission Local — David Mamaril Horowitz

- To: david@missionlocal.com
- Optional general: info@missionlocal.com
- Coverage: "SF to close workers' idle healthcare benefit accounts and pocket the funds"
- Article/source: <https://missionlocal.org/2023/01/sf-city-option-escheatment-sfmra-to-close-idle-medical-reimbursement-accounts-and-pocket-workers-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page metadata/mailto shows David Mamaril Horowitz and david@missionlocal.com.
- Contact page: <https://missionlocal.org/contact/> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@missionlocal.com.

2. Gazetteer SF — Olivia Peluso

- To: oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co
- Optional tips/general: info@gazetteer.co
- Coverage: "San Francisco could absorb \$240M of unused worker health reimbursement funds"

- Article/source: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/san-francisco-could-absorb-240m-of-unused-worker-health-reimbursement-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Olivia Peluso; page source exposed oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co.
- Tips page: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/tips> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@gazetteer.co and text tip line (415) 787-6570.

3. The Voice of San Francisco — Liz Le / general newsroom

- To: info@thevoicesf.org
- Coverage: “City Hall to tap \$200M unused health care mandate dollars to fill budget gap”
- Article/source: <https://thevoicesf.org/san-francisco-sweep-240m-unused-health-care-funds-general-fund-budget-gap> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Liz Le; page/contact lists info@thevoicesf.org.
- Contact page: <https://thevoicesf.org/contact-us/> — fetched 2026-06-12; contact form/general route.

4. NBC Bay Area — Christie Smith / newsroom tip route

- Contact route: NBC Bay Area “Email us” / Investigative Tips phone 888-996-8477; no direct email verified.
- Coverage: “Deadline approaching to claim funds under the SF City Option program”
- Article/source: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/deadline-approaching-claim-funds-sf-city-option/4084440> — fetched 2026-06-12; article says Christie Smith reports.
- Contact page: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists main phone 408-432-6221 and investigative tips 888-996-8477.

Core sources

- SF.gov HCSO page: covered employers must make required health care expenditures quarterly “on behalf of all covered employees.” <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov City Option guidance: employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA; employees can obtain reimbursements; contributions never return to employer. <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov worker deadline notice: inactive accounts close/transfer to General Fund; more than 160,000 people may have unclaimed/inactive funds; employees can keep funds indefinitely if active. <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF City Option employer page: employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees; inactive account funds revert to the City General Fund; employees notified at least three times before closure. <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> — fetched 2026-06-12.

- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053: legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV — fetched 2026-06-12.
- NextRequest 26-4243: DPH responsive production gave current figures: \$537.6M active SF MRA balances, \$184.3M inactive balances, \$294.3M Pool, and projected \$97.5M transfer to General Fund on/about May 21, 2026. Live API checked 2026-06-12 earlier in session; responsive record found.

1. Board of Supervisors / legislative ask

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org CC: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org; hcso@sfgov.org
Subject: Request for Board action: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care

Dear President and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am asking the Board to consider legislation or a budget policy requiring reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds to remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes instead of becoming unrestricted General Fund revenue.

Why the Board should make this change:

1. The money starts as a worker-health-care mandate. SF.gov states that covered employers must satisfy the Health Care Security Ordinance by making required health care expenditures “on behalf of all covered employees.”
2. SF City Option is supposed to create an irrevocable worker health benefit. SF.gov’s City Option guidance says the employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA and that employees can obtain reimbursement for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums.
3. The current transfer policy changes the practical character of the money. Records produced by DPH in NextRequest 26-4243 identify approximately \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.
4. State law appears to leave the policy choice with the City. California Government Code § 50053 says the legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. “May” is discretionary; it does not require San Francisco to treat reclaimed worker-health money as ordinary unrestricted revenue.

5. Stronger notice and employer onboarding requirements would make the program work better before money is forfeited. SF City Option's own employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. That should be a required compliance step, not just an optional best practice.

Requested action:

Please introduce or request legislation creating a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund, with language substantially like:

"Employer contributions made under the Health Care Security Ordinance and SF City Option shall remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes. Any funds that become City property under California Government Code §§ 50050 et seq. shall be deposited into a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund and may not be used for unrelated General Fund purposes. The Fund may be used only for worker health-care reimbursements, outreach, account reactivation, notice, claims assistance, and health-care services for affected covered-worker populations."

The legislation should also require:

- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer-forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access notice;
- employer onboarding notices explaining SF City Option, how to activate an SF MRA, and how to keep funds active;
- separation notices when workers leave employment;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding for workers with City Option contributions;
- a public dashboard showing employer contributions, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, notices sent/delivered/returned, and any transfers; and
- annual Controller/DPH reporting on whether reclaimed funds are being used for worker-health purposes.

This is not a request to weaken HCSO. It is a request to preserve the purpose of HCSO: worker health care.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12:

<https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12:

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV

- NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

2. Health Commission / DPH policy ask

To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org; employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: Public comment: strengthen SF City Option notice and keep reclaimed SF MRA funds restricted to worker health care

Dear San Francisco Health Commission,

Please accept this written public comment concerning the SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account program and the treatment of inactive or unclaimed SF MRA balances.

I am asking the Health Commission to revisit the program's closure/transfer policy and recommend that reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA money remain restricted to worker-health-care purposes.

Why the Health Commission should make this change:

1. SF City Option exists to deliver worker health-care benefits. SF.gov states that HCSO-covered employers must make health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees, and City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs.
2. The current closure/transfer process risks converting a worker-health benefit into General Fund revenue. DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer.
3. The City's own public notice says workers can keep their funds indefinitely as long as the account remains active, but accounts that remain inactive will be closed and transferred to the General Fund under state law. That makes notice and access the central fairness issue.
4. SF City Option's employer page already recognizes that employers can help by downloading enrollment reports and contacting employees. The Health Commission should recommend making this a required compliance practice for employers using City Option.

Requested policy changes:

- Require "super-notice" before closure/transfer: 180-day and 60-day notices through mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access materials.
- Require employers using City Option to provide onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices.
- Require employer proof that notices were actually provided to affected employees.

- Create a late-claim reserve for workers whose notice was defective, undelivered, or not language-accessible.
- Restrict reclaimed funds to worker reimbursements, outreach, claims help, reactivation, and health-care services for covered-worker populations.
- Publish dashboards showing contributions, notices, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

The Commission can preserve the program's purpose without rejecting state unclaimed-money law. Cal. Gov. Code § 50053 says the legislative body may transfer qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund; it does not require unrestricted use.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

3. OLSE / employer-notice implementation ask

To: hcsosf.gov CC: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: HCSO implementation improvement: require City Option activation notice at onboarding, quarterly contribution, and separation

Dear Office of Labor Standards Enforcement,

I am asking OLSE to strengthen HCSO employer notice requirements for employers who satisfy the Employer Spending Requirement through SF City Option.

Why OLSE should make this change:

1. The employer is usually the only actor with a direct relationship to the worker when the money is created.

2. SF.gov's HCSO page says covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employees are offered SF MRAs, and employer contributions are deposited in irrevocable reimbursement accounts.
3. The practical failure point is notice and activation. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. If this is optional, many workers may never understand that funds exist, how to activate them, or how to keep them active.
4. DPH records in NextRequest 26-4243 show significant active, inactive, and Pool balances, plus a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer. That makes worker notice a core compliance issue, not just a customer-service issue.

Requested HCSO notice requirements for City Option employers:

- Onboarding notice: explain that the employer may satisfy HCSO through SF City Option; funds may be available through an SF MRA; and the worker must activate/access the account.
- Quarterly contribution notice: state the dollar amount contributed on the worker's behalf and the exact activation/access steps.
- Annual notice: remind workers to search the SF MRA Funds Finder and keep the account active.
- Separation notice: when employment ends, explain that SF MRA funds may remain available and how to keep them active.
- Language-access notice: at least English, Spanish, Chinese, Filipino/Tagalog, Vietnamese, and any other languages already used by the program.
- Delivery proof: employers should retain records showing notices were provided, not merely posted.
- Anti-forfeiture disclosure: clear warning that inactive accounts may be closed and transferred unless the worker acts, with the exact steps to avoid that result.

If City Option remains an HCSO compliance path, worker access should be a legal requirement built into employer compliance, not a passive option workers may discover years later.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

4. Media pitch

To: david@missionlocal.com; oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co; info@thevoicesf.org CC: info@missionlocal.com; info@gazetteer.co Subject: Tip: new DPH records show \$97.5M SF City Option / SF MRA General Fund transfer; policy fix is discretionary

Hello,

I'm sharing a public-records update because you have covered SF City Option / SF MRA inactive funds and the pending transfer of worker health-care money to San Francisco's General Fund.

New DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify:

- \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances;
- \$184.3 million in inactive SF MRA balances;
- \$294.3 million in SF City Option Pool funds awaiting MRA assignment; and
- a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the City General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.

The policy issue is sharper than "state law requires this." California Government Code § 50053 says that when qualifying unclaimed money becomes local-agency property and is in a special fund, the legislative body may transfer it to the General Fund. "May" is discretionary. That means San Francisco can choose to keep reclaimed HCSO / SF City Option money restricted to worker health care rather than treating it as ordinary General Fund revenue.

The worker-access issue is also concrete. SF.gov says HCSO-covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs and workers can use them for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment.

A policy fix could require:

- a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund for reclaimed money;
- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- employer onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding;
- language-access and disability-accessible notice;
- a late-claim reserve for defective or undelivered notices; and
- public dashboards showing contributions, activation rates, notices, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

I can provide the DPH production, the Google Doc analysis, and the related open NextRequest IDs covering Controller, Treasurer, DPH, and OLSE/SF City Option follow-up records.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Thank you, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

Note: NBC Bay Area also covered this through Christie Smith, but I did not find a verified direct email. Verified route is NBC Bay Area contact/tip channel: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us>, investigative tips 888-996-8477.

From: [Barklee Sanders](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DPH Health Commission \(DPH\); HCSO \(ADM\)](#)
Subject: Follow-up: full records packet attached -- keep SF City Option / SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 4:21:48 PM
Attachments: [HCSO_SF_City_Option_Worker_Health_Funds_Outreach_Packet.pdf](#)
[NextRequest_26-4243_DPH_SFCCO_MRA_Production.zip](#)

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

Dear President and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am following up with a cleaner first-person packet and the full records production attached.

I am asking the Board to consider legislation or a budget policy requiring reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds to remain dedicated to worker-health-care purposes instead of becoming unrestricted General Fund revenue.

Why I am asking you to make this change:

- HCSO requires covered employers to make health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. Source: SF.gov HCSO page, fetched June 12, 2026: <https://url.lavanam.click/v2/01/...https://www.sf.gov/information--health-care-security-ordinance...YXAzOnNmZHqYOmE6bzpNjNiNjEwYmM0NmUzMZIN2M2YzgyMGMwMTE5MWRIMTo3OjEwNjI6N2QzOGQwMm13OGUwNGU0YnlyZTFMWM0GUxYjdjOGZlNjIhOTgzNTE5MzhiN2QxNDg1MjMzYzY5YWY2MjE4YjpwOIQ6Tg>
- SF.gov says SF City Option contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs and never return to the employer. Source: SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched June 12, 2026: <https://url.lavanam.click/v2/01/...https://www.sf.gov/information--section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance...YXAzOnNmZHqYOmE6bzpNjNiNjEwYmM0NmUzMZIN2M2YzgyMGMwMTE5MWRIMTo3OjEwNjI6N2QzOGQwMm13OGUwNGU0YnlyZTFMWM0GUxYjdjOGZlNjIhOTgzNTE5MzhiN2QxNDg1MjMzYzY5YWY2MjE4YjpwOIQ6Tg>
- DPH records produced in NextRequest 26-4243 identify active, inactive, and Pool balances and a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer. I am attaching the full production bundle.
- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053 says the legislative body "may" transfer qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. Source: California Legislative Information, fetched June 12, 2026: https://url.lavanam.click/v2/01/...https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053&lawCode=GOV...YXAzOnNmZHqYOmE6bzpNjNiNjEwYmM0NmUzMZIN2M2YzgyMGMwMTE5MWRIMTo3OjEwNjI6N2QzOGQwMm13OGUwNGU0YnlyZTFMWM0GUxYjdjOGZlNjIhOTgzNTE5MzhiN2QxNDg1MjMzYzY5YWY2MjE4YjpwOIQ6Tg

My requested fix is simple: create a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund, require stronger worker notice and employer onboarding, and keep reclaimed HCSO / SF City Option money tied to worker health care.

Attachments:
1. HCSO / SF City Option Worker Health Funds Outreach Packet.pdf
2. NextRequest 26-4243 DPH SFCCO MRA Production.zip

Respectfully,
Barklee Sanders
barkleesanders@gmail.com
San Francisco, CA

HCSO / SF City Option Worker Health Funds Outreach Packet

Prepared: June 12, 2026

This packet summarizes the requested SF City Option / HCSO policy change, the verified official sources, the public-records status, and the exact outreach text sent to public agencies and media.

Requested change in one sentence: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds dedicated to worker health care, and require stronger worker notice/employer onboarding so funds reach the employees they were created for.

Ground-truth note: stakes-bearing factual claims cite primary/current sources fetched on June 12, 2026 unless marked as media coverage.

Records status: no duplicate CPRA request needed now

Live NextRequest dedupe found existing requests already covering this issue:

- 26-4243 — DPH — balances, inactive age bands, Pool, worker notice text, projected General Fund transfer methodology. Closed; responsive record received.
- 26-4244 — Controller / City Services Auditor — audits, correspondence, budget treatment, legal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4922 — Controller — derivation of \$200–240M budget figure, revenue recognition, General Fund treatment, legal/fiscal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4923 — DPH — Health Commission policy, program data, outreach records, notice delivery metrics, complaints, correspondence. Open.
- 26-4924 — Treasurer & Tax Collector — escheatment notice, legal authority, account/fund transfer mechanics, post-escheat recovery process. Open.
- 26-5157 — DPH — OLSE referral follow-up, internal memos, transfer mechanism/destination. Open.
- 26-5219 — DPH / SF City Option Program — program records and communications on inactive-MRA transfer assumption and HCSO irrevocability. Open.

Official recipients

1. Board of Supervisors / public comment
 - To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

- Source: <https://sfbos.org/participate-and-submit-public-comments> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

2. San Francisco Health Commission

- To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org
- Optional CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/departments-san-francisco-health-commission> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org and Director of Health Commission Affairs mark.morewitz@sfdph.org.

3. OLSE / HCSO

- To: hcso@sfgov.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-contact-office-labor-standards-enforcement> and <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12; pages list HCSO email hcso@sfgov.org.

4. SF City Option program

- To: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists employer services and employee contacts.

Media contacts and coverage

1. Mission Local — David Mamaril Horowitz

- To: david@missionlocal.com
- Optional general: info@missionlocal.com
- Coverage: "SF to close workers' idle healthcare benefit accounts and pocket the funds"
- Article/source: <https://missionlocal.org/2023/01/sf-city-option-escheatment-sfmra-to-close-idle-medical-reimbursement-accounts-and-pocket-workers-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page metadata/mailto shows David Mamaril Horowitz and david@missionlocal.com.
- Contact page: <https://missionlocal.org/contact/> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@missionlocal.com.

2. Gazetteer SF — Olivia Peluso

- To: oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co
- Optional tips/general: info@gazetteer.co
- Coverage: "San Francisco could absorb \$240M of unused worker health reimbursement funds"

- Article/source: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/san-francisco-could-absorb-240m-of-unused-worker-health-reimbursement-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Olivia Peluso; page source exposed oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co.
- Tips page: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/tips> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@gazetteer.co and text tip line (415) 787-6570.

3. The Voice of San Francisco — Liz Le / general newsroom

- To: info@thevoicesf.org
- Coverage: “City Hall to tap \$200M unused health care mandate dollars to fill budget gap”
- Article/source: <https://thevoicesf.org/san-francisco-sweep-240m-unused-health-care-funds-general-fund-budget-gap> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Liz Le; page/contact lists info@thevoicesf.org.
- Contact page: <https://thevoicesf.org/contact-us/> — fetched 2026-06-12; contact form/general route.

4. NBC Bay Area — Christie Smith / newsroom tip route

- Contact route: NBC Bay Area “Email us” / Investigative Tips phone 888-996-8477; no direct email verified.
- Coverage: “Deadline approaching to claim funds under the SF City Option program”
- Article/source: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/deadline-approaching-claim-funds-sf-city-option/4084440> — fetched 2026-06-12; article says Christie Smith reports.
- Contact page: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists main phone 408-432-6221 and investigative tips 888-996-8477.

Core sources

- SF.gov HCSO page: covered employers must make required health care expenditures quarterly “on behalf of all covered employees.” <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov City Option guidance: employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA; employees can obtain reimbursements; contributions never return to employer. <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov worker deadline notice: inactive accounts close/transfer to General Fund; more than 160,000 people may have unclaimed/inactive funds; employees can keep funds indefinitely if active. <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF City Option employer page: employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees; inactive account funds revert to the City General Fund; employees notified at least three times before closure. <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> — fetched 2026-06-12.

- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053: legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV — fetched 2026-06-12.
- NextRequest 26-4243: DPH responsive production gave current figures: \$537.6M active SF MRA balances, \$184.3M inactive balances, \$294.3M Pool, and projected \$97.5M transfer to General Fund on/about May 21, 2026. Live API checked 2026-06-12 earlier in session; responsive record found.

1. Board of Supervisors / legislative ask

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org CC: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org; hcso@sfgov.org
Subject: Request for Board action: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care

Dear President and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am asking the Board to consider legislation or a budget policy requiring reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds to remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes instead of becoming unrestricted General Fund revenue.

Why the Board should make this change:

1. The money starts as a worker-health-care mandate. SF.gov states that covered employers must satisfy the Health Care Security Ordinance by making required health care expenditures “on behalf of all covered employees.”
2. SF City Option is supposed to create an irrevocable worker health benefit. SF.gov’s City Option guidance says the employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA and that employees can obtain reimbursement for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums.
3. The current transfer policy changes the practical character of the money. Records produced by DPH in NextRequest 26-4243 identify approximately \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.
4. State law appears to leave the policy choice with the City. California Government Code § 50053 says the legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. “May” is discretionary; it does not require San Francisco to treat reclaimed worker-health money as ordinary unrestricted revenue.

5. Stronger notice and employer onboarding requirements would make the program work better before money is forfeited. SF City Option's own employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. That should be a required compliance step, not just an optional best practice.

Requested action:

Please introduce or request legislation creating a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund, with language substantially like:

"Employer contributions made under the Health Care Security Ordinance and SF City Option shall remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes. Any funds that become City property under California Government Code §§ 50050 et seq. shall be deposited into a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund and may not be used for unrelated General Fund purposes. The Fund may be used only for worker health-care reimbursements, outreach, account reactivation, notice, claims assistance, and health-care services for affected covered-worker populations."

The legislation should also require:

- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer-forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access notice;
- employer onboarding notices explaining SF City Option, how to activate an SF MRA, and how to keep funds active;
- separation notices when workers leave employment;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding for workers with City Option contributions;
- a public dashboard showing employer contributions, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, notices sent/delivered/returned, and any transfers; and
- annual Controller/DPH reporting on whether reclaimed funds are being used for worker-health purposes.

This is not a request to weaken HCSO. It is a request to preserve the purpose of HCSO: worker health care.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12:

<https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12:

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

2. Health Commission / DPH policy ask

To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org; employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: Public comment: strengthen SF City Option notice and keep reclaimed SF MRA funds restricted to worker health care

Dear San Francisco Health Commission,

Please accept this written public comment concerning the SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account program and the treatment of inactive or unclaimed SF MRA balances.

I am asking the Health Commission to revisit the program's closure/transfer policy and recommend that reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA money remain restricted to worker-health-care purposes.

Why the Health Commission should make this change:

1. SF City Option exists to deliver worker health-care benefits. SF.gov states that HCSO-covered employers must make health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees, and City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs.
2. The current closure/transfer process risks converting a worker-health benefit into General Fund revenue. DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer.
3. The City's own public notice says workers can keep their funds indefinitely as long as the account remains active, but accounts that remain inactive will be closed and transferred to the General Fund under state law. That makes notice and access the central fairness issue.
4. SF City Option's employer page already recognizes that employers can help by downloading enrollment reports and contacting employees. The Health Commission should recommend making this a required compliance practice for employers using City Option.

Requested policy changes:

- Require "super-notice" before closure/transfer: 180-day and 60-day notices through mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access materials.
- Require employers using City Option to provide onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices.
- Require employer proof that notices were actually provided to affected employees.

- Create a late-claim reserve for workers whose notice was defective, undelivered, or not language-accessible.
- Restrict reclaimed funds to worker reimbursements, outreach, claims help, reactivation, and health-care services for covered-worker populations.
- Publish dashboards showing contributions, notices, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

The Commission can preserve the program's purpose without rejecting state unclaimed-money law. Cal. Gov. Code § 50053 says the legislative body may transfer qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund; it does not require unrestricted use.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

3. OLSE / employer-notice implementation ask

To: hcsosf.gov CC: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: HCSO implementation improvement: require City Option activation notice at onboarding, quarterly contribution, and separation

Dear Office of Labor Standards Enforcement,

I am asking OLSE to strengthen HCSO employer notice requirements for employers who satisfy the Employer Spending Requirement through SF City Option.

Why OLSE should make this change:

1. The employer is usually the only actor with a direct relationship to the worker when the money is created.

2. SF.gov's HCSO page says covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employees are offered SF MRAs, and employer contributions are deposited in irrevocable reimbursement accounts.
3. The practical failure point is notice and activation. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. If this is optional, many workers may never understand that funds exist, how to activate them, or how to keep them active.
4. DPH records in NextRequest 26-4243 show significant active, inactive, and Pool balances, plus a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer. That makes worker notice a core compliance issue, not just a customer-service issue.

Requested HCSO notice requirements for City Option employers:

- Onboarding notice: explain that the employer may satisfy HCSO through SF City Option; funds may be available through an SF MRA; and the worker must activate/access the account.
- Quarterly contribution notice: state the dollar amount contributed on the worker's behalf and the exact activation/access steps.
- Annual notice: remind workers to search the SF MRA Funds Finder and keep the account active.
- Separation notice: when employment ends, explain that SF MRA funds may remain available and how to keep them active.
- Language-access notice: at least English, Spanish, Chinese, Filipino/Tagalog, Vietnamese, and any other languages already used by the program.
- Delivery proof: employers should retain records showing notices were provided, not merely posted.
- Anti-forfeiture disclosure: clear warning that inactive accounts may be closed and transferred unless the worker acts, with the exact steps to avoid that result.

If City Option remains an HCSO compliance path, worker access should be a legal requirement built into employer compliance, not a passive option workers may discover years later.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

4. Media pitch

To: david@missionlocal.com; oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co; info@thevoicesf.org CC: info@missionlocal.com; info@gazetteer.co Subject: Tip: new DPH records show \$97.5M SF City Option / SF MRA General Fund transfer; policy fix is discretionary

Hello,

I'm sharing a public-records update because you have covered SF City Option / SF MRA inactive funds and the pending transfer of worker health-care money to San Francisco's General Fund.

New DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify:

- \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances;
- \$184.3 million in inactive SF MRA balances;
- \$294.3 million in SF City Option Pool funds awaiting MRA assignment; and
- a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the City General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.

The policy issue is sharper than "state law requires this." California Government Code § 50053 says that when qualifying unclaimed money becomes local-agency property and is in a special fund, the legislative body may transfer it to the General Fund. "May" is discretionary. That means San Francisco can choose to keep reclaimed HCSO / SF City Option money restricted to worker health care rather than treating it as ordinary General Fund revenue.

The worker-access issue is also concrete. SF.gov says HCSO-covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs and workers can use them for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment.

A policy fix could require:

- a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund for reclaimed money;
- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- employer onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding;
- language-access and disability-accessible notice;
- a late-claim reserve for defective or undelivered notices; and
- public dashboards showing contributions, activation rates, notices, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

I can provide the DPH production, the Google Doc analysis, and the related open NextRequest IDs covering Controller, Treasurer, DPH, and OLSE/SF City Option follow-up records.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Thank you, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

Note: NBC Bay Area also covered this through Christie Smith, but I did not find a verified direct email. Verified route is NBC Bay Area contact/tip channel: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us>, investigative tips 888-996-8477.



SF City Option

THE EMPLOYER'S HEALTH CARE CHOICE

GREAT NEWS! You Have Funds Waiting for You

<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Dear <<First Name>> <<Last Name>>,

Welcome to SF City Option (SFCO)!

In San Francisco, certain employers must give health benefits to SF workers who qualify. To follow the law, your past or current employer put funds into the SFCO health benefit program for you.

Your health benefit through SFCO is called a San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA).

Using Your Funds

Funds in your SF MRA can be used to pay back you, your partner, and your dependents for a many health costs, like:

- Health insurance premiums and co-pays
- The cost of doctor, dental, or vision health visits
- Prescription and over-the-counter medications
- Health services and products like chiropractic care, Oura rings, and more

To use your funds, you need to enroll in the SF MRA benefit. Get help enrolling in SF MRA at sfmra.org/enroll



Enroll Now!

Start using your existing funds!
sfmra.org/enroll

For questions about SF City Option

Call Customer Service Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 5:00pm Pacific Time

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

Answers to Your Questions



What are my next steps?

Please finish enrolling in your SF MRA to help keep your account active.

You must enroll in SF MRA before you can use your funds. The City and County of San Francisco will close accounts that have no activity after three years.

Can I use my SF MRA funds if I stop working for my employer?

Yes. Funds in your SF MRA belong to you. You can use your funds to get paid back for covered health care costs even if you leave your job, the state, or the country. You can use your SF MRA funds to get money back for many health costs and services.



After you submit your enrollment form, you'll get an update about your enrollment status in 1–3 weeks.

You'll also get information on:

- How to use your funds
- How to check your balance
- How to get money back for covered health care costs

Need more help?

- If you have questions, visit sfmra.org/faqs to learn more
- You can email us at info@sfcityoption.org



Obtenga esta carta en español

sfmra.org/es/welcome



取得這封信的中文版本

sfmra.org/zh/welcome



Kunin ang liham na ito sa Tagalog

sfmra.org/tl/welcome



Nhận bức thư này bằng tiếng Việt

sfmra.org/vi/welcome





SF CityOption

THE EMPLOYER'S HEALTH CARE CHOICE

¡BUENAS NOTICIAS! Tiene fondos de salud esperándolo

¡Bienvenido a SF City Option (SFCO)!

En San Francisco, ciertos empleadores deben otorgar beneficios de salud a los trabajadores de SF que califiquen. Para cumplir con la ley, su empleador actual o anterior destinó fondos al programa de beneficios de salud de SFCO en su nombre.

Este beneficio de salud a través de SFCO se llama Cuenta de reembolso médico de San Francisco (SF MRA).

Cómo usar sus fondos

Los fondos de su SF MRA pueden utilizarse para reembolsarle a usted, a su pareja y a sus dependientes por muchos gastos de atención médica, como:

- Tarifas y copagos del seguro médico
- El costo de visitas al médico, dentales o de salud de la vista
- Medicamentos recetados y medicamentos de venta libre
- Servicios y productos de salud como atención quiropráctica, anillos Oura y más

Para usar sus fondos, debe inscribirse en el beneficio de SF MRA. Obtenga ayuda para inscribirse en SF MRA en sfmra.org/es/enroll



Obtenga más información sobre su SF MRA

sfmra.org/es/about-us

Si tiene preguntas acerca de SF City Option

Llame a Servicio al Cliente de lunes a viernes, de 8:00am a 5:00pm hora del Pacífico

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

Respuestas a sus preguntas



¿Cuáles son mis siguientes pasos?

Termine de registrarse en su SF MRA para ayudar a mantener su cuenta activa. Debe inscribirse en SF MRA

antes de que pueda acceder a sus fondos. La Ciudad y el Condado de San Francisco cerrará las cuentas sin actividad después de tres años.

¿Puedo usar mis fondos de SF MRA si dejo de trabajar para mi empleador?

Sí. Los fondos en su SF MRA le pertenecen. Puede usar sus fondos para obtener el reembolso de los costos de atención médica cubiertos, incluso si deja su trabajo, el estado o el país. Puede usar sus fondos de SF MRA para recuperar el dinero para muchos costos de salud o bienestar.



Después de enviar su formulario de inscripción, recibirá una actualización sobre su estado de inscripción en 1–3 semanas.

También recibirá información sobre:

- Cómo acceder a sus fondos
- Cómo verificar su saldo
- Cómo obtener un reembolso por los costos de atención médica cubiertos

¿Necesita más ayuda?

- Si tiene preguntas, visite sfmra.org/es/faqs para obtener más información
- Puede enviarnos un correo electrónico a info@sfcityoption.org



¡Inscríbese ahora!

¡Comience a usar sus fondos!
sfmra.org/es/enroll



MAGANDANG BALITA!

Mayroon kang mga Pondo para sa Kalusugan na Naghihintay sa Iyo

Maligayang pagdating sa SF City Option (SFCO)!

Sa San Francisco, kinakailangang magbigay ang ilang employer ng benepisyong pangkalusugan sa mga manggagawa sa SF na kwalipikado. Upang sumunod sa batas, ang dati o kasalukuyan mong employer ay naglagay ng pondo sa programa sa benepisyong pangkalusugan ng SFCO para sa iyo.

Itong benepisyong pangkalusugan sa pamamagitan ng SFCO ay tinatawag na isang San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA).

Paggamit ng Mga Pondo Mo

Maaaring gamitin ang mga pondo sa SF MRA mo upang bayaran ka, ang iyong partner, at ang mga dependent mo para sa iba't ibang gastusin sa kalusugan, tulad ng:

- Mga premium at co-pay sa insurance sa kalusugan
- Ang gastos sa mga pagpapatingin sa doktor, pagpapatingin para sa kalusugan ng ngipin o paningin
- Mga inireresetang gamot at mga gamot na mabibili nang walang reseta
- Mga serbisyong pangkalusugan at produkto tulad ng chiropractic care, Oura rings, at iba pa

Para gamitin ang mga pondo mo, kailangan mong magpatala sa benepisyo ng SF MRA. Humingi ng tulong sa pagpapatala sa SF MRA sa sfmra.org/tl/enroll



Alamin ang higit pa tungkol sa SF MRA mo

sfmra.org/tl/about-us

Para sa mga tanong tungkol sa SF City Option

Tumawag sa Customer Service mula Lunes hanggang Biyernes, 8:00am hanggang 5:00pm Oras sa Pasipiko.

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

Mga Sagot sa Iyong Mga Tanong



Ano ang mga susunod kong hakbang?

Mangyaring kompletuhin ang pagpapatala mo sa

SF MRA upang manatiling aktibo ang account mo. Kailangan mong magpatala sa SF MRA bago mo magamit ang mga pondo mo. Isasara ng Lungsod at County ng San Francisco ang mga account na walang aktibidad pagkalipas ng tatlong taon.

Maaari ko bang gamitin ang aking mga pondo ng SF MRA kung hihinto ako sa pagtatrabaho para sa aking employer?

Oo. Pagmamay-ari mo ang mga pondo sa iyong SF MRA. Maaari mong gamitin ang mga pondo mo upang mabayaran ka para sa mga saklaw na gastusin sa pangangalagang pangkalusugan kahit na umalis ka sa trabaho mo, sa estado, o sa bansa. Magagamit mo ang mga pondo mo para mabawi ang pera para sa maraming gastos sa kalusugan at serbisyo.



Pagkatapos mong isumite ang form mo ng pagpapatala, makakatanggap ka ng update tungkol sa kalagayan ng

pagpapatala mo sa loob ng 1-3 linggo.

Makakatanggap ka rin ng impormasyon sa:

- Paano gamitin ang mga pondo mo
- Paano alamin ang iyong balanse
- Paano mabawi ang pera para sa mga saklaw na gastusin sa pangangalagang pangkalusugan

Kailangan ng higit pang tulong?

- Kung mayroon kang mga tanong, bisitahin ang sfmra.org/lt/faqs para matuto pa
- Maaari kang mag-email sa amin sa info@sfcityoption.org



Mag-enroll na Ngayon!

Simulang gamitin ang mga pondo mo!

sfmra.org/tl/enroll



SF City Option

THE EMPLOYER'S HEALTH CARE CHOICE

TIN VUI! Quý vị Có thể Sử dụng Tiền trong Quỹ Y tế của mình

Chào mừng quý vị đến với SF City Option (SFCO)!

Ở San Francisco, nhà tuyển dụng phải cung cấp quyền lợi y tế cho người lao động SF đủ điều kiện. Để tuân thủ luật pháp, nhà tuyển dụng trước đây hoặc hiện tại của quý vị sẽ đóng góp tiền vào chương trình quyền lợi y tế SFCO cho quý vị.

Quyền lợi y tế được hưởng thông qua SFCO gọi là Tài khoản Bồi hoàn Y tế San Francisco (SF MRA).

Sử dụng Tiền của Quý vị

SF MRA có thể được sử dụng để hoàn lại tiền cho quý vị, bạn đời và người phụ thuộc của quý vị cho nhiều chi phí y tế, như:

- Phí bảo hiểm y tế và khoản đồng thanh toán
- Chi phí khám với bác sĩ, nha khoa hoặc nhãn khoa
- Thuốc kê toa và thuốc không kê toa
- Các dịch vụ và sản phẩm y tế như nắn khớp xương, vòng Oura, v.v.

Để sử dụng tiền trong quỹ của mình, quý vị cần đăng ký quyền lợi SF MRA. Nhận trợ giúp đăng ký SF MRA tại địa chỉ sfmra.org/vi/enroll



**Tìm hiểu thêm
về SF MRA tại
địa chỉ**

sfmra.org/about-us

Mọi thắc mắc về SF City Option xin vui lòng liên hệ.

Vui lòng gọi cho bộ phận Dịch vụ khách hàng từ thứ Hai đến thứ Sáu, từ 8:00 sáng đến 5:00 chiều theo giờ Thái Bình Dương.

1(877) 772-0415

 @sanfranciscocityoption

 @sfcityoption

Giáp đáp Thắc mắc của Quý vị



Tiếp theo, tôi cần phải làm gì?

Vui lòng hoàn tất đăng ký SF MRA để có thể duy trì trạng thái hoạt động cho tài khoản của quý vị. Quý vị phải đăng ký tham gia SF MRA trước thì mới có thể sử dụng tiền trong quỹ của mình. Thành phố và Quận San Francisco sẽ đóng các tài khoản không hoạt động sau ba năm.

Nếu ngừng làm việc cho nhà tuyển dụng thì tôi có thể sử dụng tiền trong SF MRA của mình không?

Có. Tiền trong SF MRA của quý vị là thuộc về quý vị. Quý vị có thể sử dụng quỹ này để được hoàn lại chi phí bảo hiểm chăm sóc sức khỏe kể cả khi quý vị nghỉ việc ở tiểu bang hoặc quốc gia. Quý vị có thể sử dụng quỹ SF MRA để được hoàn lại tiền cho nhiều chi phí và dịch vụ y tế.



Sau khi gửi biểu mẫu đăng ký, quý vị sẽ nhận được thông tin cập nhật về tình trạng ghi danh đăng ký của mình trong vòng 1-3 tuần.

Quý vị cũng sẽ nhận được thông tin về:

- Cách sử dụng tiền trong quỹ
- Cách kiểm tra số dư
- Làm thế nào để được hoàn lại tiền cho chi phí chăm sóc sức khỏe được bao trả

Quý vị cần trợ giúp thêm?

- Nếu quý vị có thắc mắc, hãy truy cập vào sfmra.org/faqs để tìm hiểu thêm
- Quý vị có thể gửi email cho chúng tôi theo địa chỉ info@sfcityoption.org



Đăng ký Ngay!

Bắt đầu sử dụng ngân quỹ của quý vị!

sfmra.org/vi/enroll



SF City Option

THE EMPLOYER'S HEALTH CARE CHOICE

好消息！ 您有健康福利金待領取

歡迎選擇 SF City Option (SFCO)!

在 San Francisco, 某些僱主必須向符合資格的 SF 人員支付健康福利金。為遵守法規, 您以前或當前僱主將福利金存入 SFCO 健康計劃。

這項 SFCO 健康福利叫做 San Francisco 醫療報銷帳戶 (SF MRA)。

使用個人資金

您 SF MRA 賬戶內的資金可用來償付您自己、配偶或子女的多項健康支出, 如:

- 健康保險費和共付額
- 醫生、牙科或視力健康就診費用
- 處方藥及非處方藥
- 健康產品或服務, 如: 脊椎健康療法、Oura 智能戒指等

您需要參保 SF MRA 福利後方可使用此項資金。

若需註冊 SF MRA 福利相關幫助, 請造訪

sfmra.org/zh/enroll



了解 SF MRA
的更多資訊,
請造訪:

sfmra.org/zh/about-us

如對 SF City Option 有疑問

請於週一至週五 8:00am 至 5:00pm(太平洋時間) 致電客戶服務部。

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

解答您的問題



我接下來該怎麼做？

請完成 SF MRA 參保註冊，以保持帳戶激活狀態。您必須先註冊 SF MRA，然後才能使用您的資金。San Francisco 市與縣會關閉三年內沒有活動的帳戶。

離職後，是否可以使用我自己的 SF MRA 資金？

您的 SF MRA 中的資金屬於您。即使您已離職，或不在本州，甚至不在本國，您仍可以使用帳戶資金償付承保範圍內的健康支出。您可使用 SF MRA 資金報銷各種健康相關開支及服務。



提交注册表格後，您將在 1-3 週內收到關於您的注册狀態的更新資訊。

您還將收到以下資訊：

- 如何使用您的資金
- 如何查詢您的餘額
- 如果報銷承保範圍內的健康支出

需要更多幫助？

- 若您有疑問，請造訪 sfmra.org/zh/faqs 了解詳情
- 您可以傳送電郵至 info@sfcityoption.org



立即註冊登記！

開始使用您的資金！

sfmra.org/zh/enroll



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

Your SF MRA Benefit Is Here!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Dear <First Name> <Last Name>,

Welcome to the San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA) benefit program. Your SF MRA is provided by San Francisco City Option (SF City Option). The goal of SF MRA is to help San Francisco workers and their families stay healthy.

Make the Most of Your SF MRA

Your SF MRA funds come from a past or current employer. With SF MRA funds, you can get money back for many health items and services. You can also use SF MRA funds to cover your family's health costs, including:

- Your spouse or partner
- Your children or dependents

To see the full list of eligible health costs, visit sfmra.org/eligibleexpenses.

What's Next?

You can start to use your account funds within three weeks of joining SF MRA. Once your account is ready, you will get a letter and guidebook that explains how to use your SF MRA.

If you have any questions, please call SF City Option Customer Service at **1(877) 772-0415** or email us at info@sfcityoption.org.

Kind regards,
SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

¡Su beneficio de SF MRA ya está aquí!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Estimado(a) <First Name> <Last Name>:

Bienvenida al programa de beneficios de Cuenta de reembolso médico de San Francisco (SF MRA). El beneficio de SF MRA es ofrecido por San Francisco City Option (SF City Option). El objetivo de la SF MRA es ayudar a los trabajadores de San Francisco y a sus familias a mantenerse saludables.

Aproveche al máximo su SF MRA

Sus fondos de la SF MRA provienen de un empleador anterior o actual. Con los fondos de la SF MRA, puede obtener reembolsos en muchos artículos y servicios de salud. También puede usar los fondos de la SF MRA para cubrir los gastos de salud de su familia, que incluyen a:

- Su cónyuge o pareja doméstica
- Sus hijos o dependientes

Para ver la lista completa de gastos de salud elegibles, visite sfmra.org/es/eligibleexpenses.

¿Qué es lo siguiente?

Puede comenzar a usar los fondos de su cuenta en un plazo de tres semanas a partir de la aprobación de SF MRA. Una vez que su cuenta esté lista, recibirá una carta y una guía que explica cómo usar su SF MRA.

Si tiene alguna pregunta, llame a Servicio al Cliente de SF City Option al **1(877) 772-0415** o envíe un correo electrónico a info@sfcityoption.org.

Saludos cordiales,

SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

Narito na ang iyong mga Benepisyo sa SF MRA!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Mahal na <First Name> <Last Name>,

Welcome sa San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA) benefit program. Ibinibigay ng San Francisco City Option (SF City Option) ang iyong MRA. Ang layunin ng SF MRA ay tulungan ang mga manggagawa ng San Francisco at ang kanilang pamilya na manatiling malusog.

Sulitin ang Iyong SF MRA

Ang iyong mga pondo sa SF MRA mula sa iyong dati o kasalukuyang employer. Gamit ang mga pondo ng SF MRA, maaari mong mabawi ang pera para sa maraming gamit at serbisyong pangkalusugan. Maaari mo ring gamitin ang mga pondo ng MRA para tugunan ang mga gastusin sa kalusugan ng iyong pamilya, kabilang:

- Ang iyong asawa o partner
- Ang iyong mga anak o dependent

Upang makita ang buong listahan ng mga kwalipikadong gastusin sa kalusugan, bisitahin ang sfmra.org/tl/eligibleexpenses.

Ano ang Susunod?

Maaari mo nang simulang gamitin ang mga pondo sa iyong account sa loob ng tatlong linggo matapos sumali sa SF MRA. Kapag handa na ang iyong account, makakatanggap ka ng isang liham at guidebook na magpapaliwanag kung paano gamitin ang iyong SF MRA.

Kung mayroon kang anumang tanong, mangyaring tumawag sa Customer Service ng SF City Option sa **1(877) 772-0415** o mag-email sa info@sfcityoption.org.

Bumabati,
SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

Quyền lợi SF MRA của quý vị đã sẵn sàng!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Kính gửi <First Name> <Last Name>,

Chào mừng quý vị đến với chương trình phúc lợi Tài khoản Bồi hoàn Y tế San Francisco (SF MRA). Tài khoản SF MRA của quý vị được cung cấp thông qua Chương trình City Option của Thành phố San Francisco (SF City Option). Mục tiêu của SF MRA là giúp người lao động San Francisco và gia đình họ khỏe mạnh.

Tận dụng tối đa SF MRA của quý vị

Quỹ SF MRA của quý vị là do chủ lao động trước đây hoặc hiện tại đóng vào. Với quỹ SF MRA, quý vị có thể nhận lại tiền cho nhiều mặt hàng và dịch vụ y tế. Quý vị cũng có thể sử dụng quỹ SF MRA để trang trải chi phí y tế của gia đình, bao gồm:

- Vợ/chồng hoặc bạn đời của quý vị
- Con hoặc người phụ thuộc của quý vị

Để xem danh sách đầy đủ các chi phí y tế đủ điều kiện, hãy truy cập sfmra.org/eligibleexpenses.

Bước tiếp theo là gì?

Quý vị có thể bắt đầu sử dụng quỹ trong tài khoản của mình trong vòng ba tuần sau khi tham gia SF MRA. Khi tài khoản của quý vị đã sẵn sàng, quý vị sẽ nhận được một lá thư và sách hướng dẫn giải thích cách sử dụng SF MRA của quý vị.

Nếu có bất kỳ thắc mắc nào, vui lòng gọi cho Dịch vụ Khách hàng SF City Option theo số **1(877) 772-0415** hoặc gửi email đến info@sfcityoption.org.

Trân trọng,
SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

您的 SF MRA 福利現已生效!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

尊敬的 <First Name> <Last Name>:

歡迎加入舊金山醫療報銷帳戶 (SF MRA) 福利計劃。您的 SF MRA 由 San Francisco City Option (SF City Option) 提供。SF MRA 旨在協助舊金山的員工及其家人保持健康。

充分利用您的 SF MRA

您的 SF MRA 中的資金來自您的前僱主或現僱主。使用 SF MRA 資金，您可以報銷多種醫療用品和服務費用。您亦可使用 SF MRA 資金支付您家人的醫療費用，包括：

- 您的配偶或伴侶
- 您的孩子或受供養者

如需查看符合條件的醫療費用的完整清單，請造訪 sfmra.org/zh/eligibleexpenses。

接下來該怎麼做？

您可以在加入 SF MRA 福利計劃三週內啟用您的帳戶資金。帳戶註冊完畢後，您將收到一封信函和指南，其中載有關於如何使用 SF MRA 的說明。

若您有任何疑問，請致電 SF City Option 客戶服務部電話 **1(877) 772-0415** 或傳送電子郵件至 info@sfcityoption.org。

誠摯問候！

SF City Option

Responsive Record for #26-4243

Question Description	Answer	Notes
1a. Total sum of active SF MRA balances, most current	\$537.6 M	Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026.
1b. Total sum of 'inactive' SF MRA balances by years of inactivity, most current		Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026. Note that years of inactivity have been corrected.
1 to less than 2 years	\$52.9 M	
2 to less than 3 years	\$29.8 M	
3 years and more	\$101.6 M	
1c. Total sum of Pool, most current	\$294.3 M	Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026.
2. Number of unique participants with 'inactive' SF MRA balances, by years of inactivity		Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026. Note that years of inactivity have been corrected.
1 to less than 2 years	24,911	
2 to less than 3 years	13,697	
3 years and more	81,807	
3a. Count of “new enrollment notifications”		These are notifications sent to participants whose enrollment forms resulted in status of “Approved for SF MRA”. Source: ESRM database; around 95% of notifications are via email, with the rest via mail and autocal. Autocal audience is the same as mail audience (i.e., they have the same N), so that the total is more than number of approved enrollment forms.
In calendar year 2024	38,420	
In calendar year 2025	30,229	
3b. Count of “enrollment activations completed” by employer industry		These are counts of submitted enrollment forms that resulted in status of “Approved for SF MRA”, as this status triggers submission of participant funds to PSF to be enrolled in SF MRA. Source: SFCO Enrollment Forms Dashboard. See below for breakdown by industry.
In calendar year 2024	37,004	
In calendar year 2025	29,030	
7. Records sufficient to show the projected dollar value of MRA balances expected to transfer to the City General Fund on or about May 21, 2026, and the methodology used to project that figure	\$97.5 M.	Source is Escheatment Funds Monitoring Dashboard as of 6/2/2026. Dashboard draws data from ESR and balance from HQY Activity File as of 4/30/2026.

3a. Notifications by Employer Industry. Note that these values do not show all possible employer industries in cases where a participant has multiple employers.

	2024	2025
Industry Name	Count	
Finance and Insurance	2625	1859
Retail Trade	7946	5685
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	842	706
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	2	6
Public Administration	24	13
Health Care and Social Assistance	2963	2618
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	4263	3162
Utilities	66	63
Manufacturing	337	270
Unknown	92	46
Construction	131	148
Transportation and Warehousing	1569	1115
Management of Companies and Enterprises	871	679
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	21	20
Other Services (except Public Administration)	10793	8229
Accommodation and Food Services	4296	3413
Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	291	304
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	1449	1323
Information	941	639
Wholesale Trade	142	116
Educational Services	1866	1518

From: [Barklee Sanders](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DPH, Health Commission \(DPH\); HCSO \(ADM\)](#)
Subject: Follow-up: full records packet attached -- keep SF City Option / SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 4:23:09 PM
Attachments: [HCSO_SF_City_Option_Worker_Health_Funds_Outreach_Packet.pdf](#)
[NextRequest_26-4243_DPH_SFCD_MRA_Production.zip](#)

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

Dear President and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am following up with a cleaner first-person packet and the full records production attached.

I am asking the Board to consider legislation or a budget policy requiring reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds to remain dedicated to worker-health-care purposes instead of becoming unrestricted General Fund revenue.

Why I am asking you to make this change:

- HCSO requires covered employers to make health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. Source: SF.gov HCSO page, fetched June 12, 2026: <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/...https://www.sf.gov/information--health-care-security-ordinance...YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6b3pkMzA3Njc3YTl0DhmYTgyM2Q5NGQ4OGFhYjYyZmMxMTc3OmM2MjQ6OTcyNzVlM2UzNmRlY2M5ZTl0MTcwMDA5OTM0OTkwN2I2MzI0MzRlZGRhZmNjY2FlYyYxNTc4YTpwOQ6Tg>
- SF.gov says SF City Option contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs and never return to the employer. Source: SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched June 12, 2026: <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/...https://www.sf.gov/information--section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance...YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6b3pkMzA3Njc3YTl0DhmYTgyM2Q5NGQ4OGFhYjYyZmMxMTc3OmM2MjQ6OTcyNzVlM2UzNmRlY2M5ZTl0MTcwMDA5OTM0OTkwN2I2MzI0MzRlZGRhZmNjY2FlYyYxNTc4YTpwOQ6Tg>
- DPH records produced in NextRequest 26-4243 identify active, inactive, and Pool balances and a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer. I am attaching the full production bundle.
- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053 says the legislative body "may" transfer qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. Source: California Legislative Information, fetched June 12, 2026: https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/...https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053&lawCode=GOV...YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6b3pkMzA3Njc3YTl0DhmYTgyM2Q5NGQ4OGFhYjYyZmMxMTc3OmM2MjQ6OTcyNzVlM2UzNmRlY2M5ZTl0MTcwMDA5OTM0OTkwN2I2MzI0MzRlZGRhZmNjY2FlYyYxNTc4YTpwOQ6Tg

My requested fix is simple: create a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund, require stronger worker notice and employer onboarding, and keep reclaimed HCSO / SF City Option money tied to worker health care.

- Attachments:
1. HCSO / SF City Option Worker Health Funds Outreach Packet.pdf
 2. NextRequest 26-4243 DPH SFCD MRA Production.zip

Respectfully,
Barklee Sanders
barkleesanders@gmail.com
San Francisco, CA

HCSO / SF City Option Worker Health Funds Outreach Packet

Prepared: June 12, 2026

This packet summarizes the requested SF City Option / HCSO policy change, the verified official sources, the public-records status, and the exact outreach text sent to public agencies and media.

Requested change in one sentence: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds dedicated to worker health care, and require stronger worker notice/employer onboarding so funds reach the employees they were created for.

Ground-truth note: stakes-bearing factual claims cite primary/current sources fetched on June 12, 2026 unless marked as media coverage.

Records status: no duplicate CPRA request needed now

Live NextRequest dedupe found existing requests already covering this issue:

- 26-4243 — DPH — balances, inactive age bands, Pool, worker notice text, projected General Fund transfer methodology. Closed; responsive record received.
- 26-4244 — Controller / City Services Auditor — audits, correspondence, budget treatment, legal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4922 — Controller — derivation of \$200–240M budget figure, revenue recognition, General Fund treatment, legal/fiscal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4923 — DPH — Health Commission policy, program data, outreach records, notice delivery metrics, complaints, correspondence. Open.
- 26-4924 — Treasurer & Tax Collector — escheatment notice, legal authority, account/fund transfer mechanics, post-escheat recovery process. Open.
- 26-5157 — DPH — OLSE referral follow-up, internal memos, transfer mechanism/destination. Open.
- 26-5219 — DPH / SF City Option Program — program records and communications on inactive-MRA transfer assumption and HCSO irrevocability. Open.

Official recipients

1. Board of Supervisors / public comment
 - To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

- Source: <https://sfbos.org/participate-and-submit-public-comments> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

2. San Francisco Health Commission

- To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org
- Optional CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/departments-san-francisco-health-commission> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org and Director of Health Commission Affairs mark.morewitz@sfdph.org.

3. OLSE / HCSO

- To: hcsosf@sfgov.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-contact-office-labor-standards-enforcement> and <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12; pages list HCSO email hcsosf@sfgov.org.

4. SF City Option program

- To: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists employer services and employee contacts.

Media contacts and coverage

1. Mission Local — David Mamaril Horowitz

- To: david@missionlocal.com
- Optional general: info@missionlocal.com
- Coverage: "SF to close workers' idle healthcare benefit accounts and pocket the funds"
- Article/source: <https://missionlocal.org/2023/01/sf-city-option-escheatment-sfmra-to-close-idle-medical-reimbursement-accounts-and-pocket-workers-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page metadata/mailto shows David Mamaril Horowitz and david@missionlocal.com.
- Contact page: <https://missionlocal.org/contact/> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@missionlocal.com.

2. Gazetteer SF — Olivia Peluso

- To: oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co
- Optional tips/general: info@gazetteer.co
- Coverage: "San Francisco could absorb \$240M of unused worker health reimbursement funds"

- Article/source: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/san-francisco-could-absorb-240m-of-unused-worker-health-reimbursement-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Olivia Peluso; page source exposed oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co.
- Tips page: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/tips> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@gazetteer.co and text tip line (415) 787-6570.

3. The Voice of San Francisco — Liz Le / general newsroom

- To: info@thevoicesf.org
- Coverage: “City Hall to tap \$200M unused health care mandate dollars to fill budget gap”
- Article/source: <https://thevoicesf.org/san-francisco-sweep-240m-unused-health-care-funds-general-fund-budget-gap> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Liz Le; page/contact lists info@thevoicesf.org.
- Contact page: <https://thevoicesf.org/contact-us/> — fetched 2026-06-12; contact form/general route.

4. NBC Bay Area — Christie Smith / newsroom tip route

- Contact route: NBC Bay Area “Email us” / Investigative Tips phone 888-996-8477; no direct email verified.
- Coverage: “Deadline approaching to claim funds under the SF City Option program”
- Article/source: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/deadline-approaching-claim-funds-sf-city-option/4084440> — fetched 2026-06-12; article says Christie Smith reports.
- Contact page: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists main phone 408-432-6221 and investigative tips 888-996-8477.

Core sources

- SF.gov HCSO page: covered employers must make required health care expenditures quarterly “on behalf of all covered employees.” <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov City Option guidance: employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA; employees can obtain reimbursements; contributions never return to employer. <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov worker deadline notice: inactive accounts close/transfer to General Fund; more than 160,000 people may have unclaimed/inactive funds; employees can keep funds indefinitely if active. <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF City Option employer page: employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees; inactive account funds revert to the City General Fund; employees notified at least three times before closure. <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> — fetched 2026-06-12.

- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053: legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV — fetched 2026-06-12.
- NextRequest 26-4243: DPH responsive production gave current figures: \$537.6M active SF MRA balances, \$184.3M inactive balances, \$294.3M Pool, and projected \$97.5M transfer to General Fund on/about May 21, 2026. Live API checked 2026-06-12 earlier in session; responsive record found.

1. Board of Supervisors / legislative ask

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org CC: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org; hcso@sfgov.org
Subject: Request for Board action: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care

Dear President and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am asking the Board to consider legislation or a budget policy requiring reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds to remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes instead of becoming unrestricted General Fund revenue.

Why the Board should make this change:

1. The money starts as a worker-health-care mandate. SF.gov states that covered employers must satisfy the Health Care Security Ordinance by making required health care expenditures “on behalf of all covered employees.”
2. SF City Option is supposed to create an irrevocable worker health benefit. SF.gov’s City Option guidance says the employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA and that employees can obtain reimbursement for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums.
3. The current transfer policy changes the practical character of the money. Records produced by DPH in NextRequest 26-4243 identify approximately \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.
4. State law appears to leave the policy choice with the City. California Government Code § 50053 says the legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. “May” is discretionary; it does not require San Francisco to treat reclaimed worker-health money as ordinary unrestricted revenue.

5. Stronger notice and employer onboarding requirements would make the program work better before money is forfeited. SF City Option's own employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. That should be a required compliance step, not just an optional best practice.

Requested action:

Please introduce or request legislation creating a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund, with language substantially like:

"Employer contributions made under the Health Care Security Ordinance and SF City Option shall remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes. Any funds that become City property under California Government Code §§ 50050 et seq. shall be deposited into a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund and may not be used for unrelated General Fund purposes. The Fund may be used only for worker health-care reimbursements, outreach, account reactivation, notice, claims assistance, and health-care services for affected covered-worker populations."

The legislation should also require:

- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer-forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access notice;
- employer onboarding notices explaining SF City Option, how to activate an SF MRA, and how to keep funds active;
- separation notices when workers leave employment;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding for workers with City Option contributions;
- a public dashboard showing employer contributions, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, notices sent/delivered/returned, and any transfers; and
- annual Controller/DPH reporting on whether reclaimed funds are being used for worker-health purposes.

This is not a request to weaken HCSO. It is a request to preserve the purpose of HCSO: worker health care.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12:

<https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12:

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV

- NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

2. Health Commission / DPH policy ask

To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org; employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: Public comment: strengthen SF City Option notice and keep reclaimed SF MRA funds restricted to worker health care

Dear San Francisco Health Commission,

Please accept this written public comment concerning the SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account program and the treatment of inactive or unclaimed SF MRA balances.

I am asking the Health Commission to revisit the program's closure/transfer policy and recommend that reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA money remain restricted to worker-health-care purposes.

Why the Health Commission should make this change:

1. SF City Option exists to deliver worker health-care benefits. SF.gov states that HCSO-covered employers must make health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees, and City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs.
2. The current closure/transfer process risks converting a worker-health benefit into General Fund revenue. DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer.
3. The City's own public notice says workers can keep their funds indefinitely as long as the account remains active, but accounts that remain inactive will be closed and transferred to the General Fund under state law. That makes notice and access the central fairness issue.
4. SF City Option's employer page already recognizes that employers can help by downloading enrollment reports and contacting employees. The Health Commission should recommend making this a required compliance practice for employers using City Option.

Requested policy changes:

- Require "super-notice" before closure/transfer: 180-day and 60-day notices through mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access materials.
- Require employers using City Option to provide onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices.
- Require employer proof that notices were actually provided to affected employees.

- Create a late-claim reserve for workers whose notice was defective, undelivered, or not language-accessible.
- Restrict reclaimed funds to worker reimbursements, outreach, claims help, reactivation, and health-care services for covered-worker populations.
- Publish dashboards showing contributions, notices, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

The Commission can preserve the program's purpose without rejecting state unclaimed-money law. Cal. Gov. Code § 50053 says the legislative body may transfer qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund; it does not require unrestricted use.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

3. OLSE / employer-notice implementation ask

To: hcsosf@gov.org CC: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: HCSO implementation improvement: require City Option activation notice at onboarding, quarterly contribution, and separation

Dear Office of Labor Standards Enforcement,

I am asking OLSE to strengthen HCSO employer notice requirements for employers who satisfy the Employer Spending Requirement through SF City Option.

Why OLSE should make this change:

1. The employer is usually the only actor with a direct relationship to the worker when the money is created.

2. SF.gov's HCSO page says covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employees are offered SF MRAs, and employer contributions are deposited in irrevocable reimbursement accounts.
3. The practical failure point is notice and activation. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. If this is optional, many workers may never understand that funds exist, how to activate them, or how to keep them active.
4. DPH records in NextRequest 26-4243 show significant active, inactive, and Pool balances, plus a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer. That makes worker notice a core compliance issue, not just a customer-service issue.

Requested HCSO notice requirements for City Option employers:

- Onboarding notice: explain that the employer may satisfy HCSO through SF City Option; funds may be available through an SF MRA; and the worker must activate/access the account.
- Quarterly contribution notice: state the dollar amount contributed on the worker's behalf and the exact activation/access steps.
- Annual notice: remind workers to search the SF MRA Funds Finder and keep the account active.
- Separation notice: when employment ends, explain that SF MRA funds may remain available and how to keep them active.
- Language-access notice: at least English, Spanish, Chinese, Filipino/Tagalog, Vietnamese, and any other languages already used by the program.
- Delivery proof: employers should retain records showing notices were provided, not merely posted.
- Anti-forfeiture disclosure: clear warning that inactive accounts may be closed and transferred unless the worker acts, with the exact steps to avoid that result.

If City Option remains an HCSO compliance path, worker access should be a legal requirement built into employer compliance, not a passive option workers may discover years later.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

4. Media pitch

To: david@missionlocal.com; oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co; info@thevoicesf.org CC: info@missionlocal.com; info@gazetteer.co Subject: Tip: new DPH records show \$97.5M SF City Option / SF MRA General Fund transfer; policy fix is discretionary

Hello,

I'm sharing a public-records update because you have covered SF City Option / SF MRA inactive funds and the pending transfer of worker health-care money to San Francisco's General Fund.

New DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify:

- \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances;
- \$184.3 million in inactive SF MRA balances;
- \$294.3 million in SF City Option Pool funds awaiting MRA assignment; and
- a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the City General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.

The policy issue is sharper than "state law requires this." California Government Code § 50053 says that when qualifying unclaimed money becomes local-agency property and is in a special fund, the legislative body may transfer it to the General Fund. "May" is discretionary. That means San Francisco can choose to keep reclaimed HCSO / SF City Option money restricted to worker health care rather than treating it as ordinary General Fund revenue.

The worker-access issue is also concrete. SF.gov says HCSO-covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs and workers can use them for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment.

A policy fix could require:

- a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund for reclaimed money;
- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- employer onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding;
- language-access and disability-accessible notice;
- a late-claim reserve for defective or undelivered notices; and
- public dashboards showing contributions, activation rates, notices, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

I can provide the DPH production, the Google Doc analysis, and the related open NextRequest IDs covering Controller, Treasurer, DPH, and OLSE/SF City Option follow-up records.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Thank you, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

Note: NBC Bay Area also covered this through Christie Smith, but I did not find a verified direct email. Verified route is NBC Bay Area contact/tip channel: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us>, investigative tips 888-996-8477.



SF City Option

THE EMPLOYER'S HEALTH CARE CHOICE

GREAT NEWS! You Have Funds Waiting for You

<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Dear <<First Name>> <<Last Name>>,

Welcome to SF City Option (SFCO)!

In San Francisco, certain employers must give health benefits to SF workers who qualify. To follow the law, your past or current employer put funds into the SFCO health benefit program for you.

Your health benefit through SFCO is called a San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA).

Using Your Funds

Funds in your SF MRA can be used to pay back you, your partner, and your dependents for a many health costs, like:

- Health insurance premiums and co-pays
- The cost of doctor, dental, or vision health visits
- Prescription and over-the-counter medications
- Health services and products like chiropractic care, Oura rings, and more

To use your funds, you need to enroll in the SF MRA benefit. Get help enrolling in SF MRA at sfmra.org/enroll



Enroll Now!

Start using your existing funds!
sfmra.org/enroll

For questions about SF City Option

Call Customer Service Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 5:00pm Pacific Time

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

Answers to Your Questions



What are my next steps?

Please finish enrolling in your SF MRA to help keep your account active.

You must enroll in SF MRA before you can use your funds. The City and County of San Francisco will close accounts that have no activity after three years.

Can I use my SF MRA funds if I stop working for my employer?

Yes. Funds in your SF MRA belong to you. You can use your funds to get paid back for covered health care costs even if you leave your job, the state, or the country. You can use your SF MRA funds to get money back for many health costs and services.



After you submit your enrollment form, you'll get an update about your enrollment status in 1–3 weeks.

You'll also get information on:

- How to use your funds
- How to check your balance
- How to get money back for covered health care costs

Need more help?

- If you have questions, visit sfmra.org/faqs to learn more
- You can email us at info@sfcityoption.org



Obtenga esta carta en español

sfmra.org/es/welcome



取得這封信的中文版本

sfmra.org/zh/welcome



Kunin ang liham na ito sa Tagalog

sfmra.org/tl/welcome



Nhận bức thư này bằng tiếng Việt

sfmra.org/vi/welcome





¡BUENAS NOTICIAS! Tiene fondos de salud esperándolo

¡Bienvenido a SF City Option (SFCO)!

En San Francisco, ciertos empleadores deben otorgar beneficios de salud a los trabajadores de SF que califiquen. Para cumplir con la ley, su empleador actual o anterior destinó fondos al programa de beneficios de salud de SFCO en su nombre.

Este beneficio de salud a través de SFCO se llama Cuenta de reembolso médico de San Francisco (SF MRA).

Cómo usar sus fondos

Los fondos de su SF MRA pueden utilizarse para reembolsarle a usted, a su pareja y a sus dependientes por muchos gastos de atención médica, como:

- Tarifas y copagos del seguro médico
- El costo de visitas al médico, dentales o de salud de la vista
- Medicamentos recetados y medicamentos de venta libre
- Servicios y productos de salud como atención quiropráctica, anillos Oura y más

Para usar sus fondos, debe inscribirse en el beneficio de SF MRA. Obtenga ayuda para inscribirse en SF MRA en sfmra.org/es/enroll



Obtenga más información sobre su SF MRA

sfmra.org/es/about-us

Si tiene preguntas acerca de SF City Option

Llame a Servicio al Cliente de lunes a viernes, de 8:00am a 5:00pm hora del Pacífico

1(877) 772-0415

 @sanfranciscocityoption

 @sfcityoption

Respuestas a sus preguntas



¿Cuáles son mis siguientes pasos?

Termine de registrarse en su SF MRA para ayudar a mantener su cuenta activa. Debe inscribirse en SF MRA

antes de que pueda acceder a sus fondos. La Ciudad y el Condado de San Francisco cerrará las cuentas sin actividad después de tres años.

¿Puedo usar mis fondos de SF MRA si dejo de trabajar para mi empleador?

Sí. Los fondos en su SF MRA le pertenecen. Puede usar sus fondos para obtener el reembolso de los costos de atención médica cubiertos, incluso si deja su trabajo, el estado o el país. Puede usar sus fondos de SF MRA para recuperar el dinero para muchos costos de salud o bienestar.



Después de enviar su formulario de inscripción, recibirá una actualización sobre su estado de inscripción en 1–3 semanas.

También recibirá información sobre:

- Cómo acceder a sus fondos
- Cómo verificar su saldo
- Cómo obtener un reembolso por los costos de atención médica cubiertos

¿Necesita más ayuda?

- Si tiene preguntas, visite sfmra.org/es/faqs para obtener más información
- Puede enviarnos un correo electrónico a info@sfcityoption.org



¡Inscríbese ahora!

¡Comience a usar sus fondos!
sfmra.org/es/enroll



MAGANDANG BALITA!

Mayroon kang mga Pondo para sa Kalusugan na Naghihintay sa Iyo

Maligayang pagdating sa SF City Option (SFCO)!

Sa San Francisco, kinakailangang magbigay ang ilang employer ng benepisyong pangkalusugan sa mga manggagawa sa SF na kwalipikado. Upang sumunod sa batas, ang dati o kasalukuyan mong employer ay naglagay ng pondo sa programa sa benepisyong pangkalusugan ng SFCO para sa iyo.

Itong benepisyong pangkalusugan sa pamamagitan ng SFCO ay tinatawag na isang San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA).

Paggamit ng Mga Pondo Mo

Maaaring gamitin ang mga pondo sa SF MRA mo upang bayaran ka, ang iyong partner, at ang mga dependent mo para sa iba't ibang gastusin sa kalusugan, tulad ng:

- Mga premium at co-pay sa insurance sa kalusugan
- Ang gastos sa mga pagpapatingin sa doktor, pagpapatingin para sa kalusugan ng ngipin o paningin
- Mga inireresetang gamot at mga gamot na mabibili nang walang reseta
- Mga serbisyong pangkalusugan at produkto tulad ng chiropractic care, Oura rings, at iba pa

Para gamitin ang mga pondo mo, kailangan mong magpatala sa benepisyo ng SF MRA. Humingi ng tulong sa pagpapatala sa SF MRA sa sfmra.org/tl/enroll



Alamin ang higit pa tungkol sa SF MRA mo

sfmra.org/tl/about-us

Para sa mga tanong tungkol sa SF City Option

Tumawag sa Customer Service mula Lunes hanggang Biyernes, 8:00am hanggang 5:00pm Oras sa Pasipiko.

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

Mga Sagot sa Iyong Mga Tanong



Ano ang mga susunod kong hakbang?

Mangyaring kumpletuhin ang pagpapatala mo sa

SF MRA upang manatiling aktibo ang account mo. Kailangan mong magpatala sa SF MRA bago mo magamit ang mga pondo mo. Isasara ng Lungsod at County ng San Francisco ang mga account na walang aktibidad pagkalipas ng tatlong taon.

Maaari ko bang gamitin ang aking mga pondo ng SF MRA kung hihinto ako sa pagtatrabaho para sa aking employer?

Oo. Pagmamay-ari mo ang mga pondo sa iyong SF MRA. Maaari mong gamitin ang mga pondo mo upang mabayaran ka para sa mga saklaw na gastusin sa pangangalagang pangkalusugan kahit na umalis ka sa trabaho mo, sa estado, o sa bansa. Magagamit mo ang mga pondo mo para mabawi ang pera para sa maraming gastos sa kalusugan at serbisyo.



Pagkatapos mong isumite ang form mo ng pagpapatala, makakatanggap ka ng update tungkol sa kalagayan ng

pagpapatala mo sa loob ng 1–3 linggo.

Makakatanggap ka rin ng impormasyon sa:

- Paano gamitin ang mga pondo mo
- Paano alamin ang iyong balanse
- Paano mabawi ang pera para sa mga saklaw na gastusin sa pangangalagang pangkalusugan

Kailangan ng higit pang tulong?

- Kung mayroon kang mga tanong, bisitahin ang sfmra.org/lt/faqs para matuto pa
- Maaari kang mag-email sa amin sa info@sfcityoption.org



Mag-enroll na Ngayon!

Simulang gamitin ang mga pondo mo!

sfmra.org/tl/enroll



SF City Option

THE EMPLOYER'S HEALTH CARE CHOICE

TIN VUI! Quý vị Có thể Sử dụng Tiền trong Quỹ Y tế của mình

Chào mừng quý vị đến với SF City Option (SFCO)!

Ở San Francisco, nhà tuyển dụng phải cung cấp quyền lợi y tế cho người lao động SF đủ điều kiện. Để tuân thủ luật pháp, nhà tuyển dụng trước đây hoặc hiện tại của quý vị sẽ đóng góp tiền vào chương trình quyền lợi y tế SFCO cho quý vị.

Quyền lợi y tế được hưởng thông qua SFCO gọi là Tài khoản Bồi hoàn Y tế San Francisco (SF MRA).

Sử dụng Tiền của Quý vị

SF MRA có thể được sử dụng để hoàn lại tiền cho quý vị, bạn đời và người phụ thuộc của quý vị cho nhiều chi phí y tế, như:

- Phí bảo hiểm y tế và khoản đồng thanh toán
- Chi phí khám với bác sĩ, nha khoa hoặc nhãn khoa
- Thuốc kê toa và thuốc không kê toa
- Các dịch vụ và sản phẩm y tế như nắn khớp xương, vòng Oura, v.v.

Để sử dụng tiền trong quỹ của mình, quý vị cần đăng ký quyền lợi SF MRA. Nhận trợ giúp đăng ký SF MRA tại địa chỉ sfmra.org/vi/enroll



**Tìm hiểu thêm
về SF MRA tại
địa chỉ**

sfmra.org/about-us

Mọi thắc mắc về SF City Option xin vui lòng liên hệ.

Vui lòng gọi cho bộ phận Dịch vụ khách hàng từ thứ Hai đến thứ Sáu, từ 8:00 sáng đến 5:00 chiều theo giờ Thái Bình Dương.

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

Giáp đáp Thắc mắc của Quý vị



Tiếp theo, tôi cần phải làm gì?

Vui lòng hoàn tất đăng ký SF MRA để có thể duy trì trạng thái hoạt động cho tài khoản của quý vị. Quý vị phải đăng ký tham gia SF MRA trước thì mới có thể sử dụng tiền trong quỹ của mình. Thành phố và Quận San Francisco sẽ đóng các tài khoản không hoạt động sau ba năm.

Nếu ngừng làm việc cho nhà tuyển dụng thì tôi có thể sử dụng tiền trong SF MRA của mình không?

Có. Tiền trong SF MRA của quý vị là thuộc về quý vị. Quý vị có thể sử dụng quỹ này để được hoàn lại chi phí bảo hiểm chăm sóc sức khỏe kể cả khi quý vị nghỉ việc ở tiểu bang hoặc quốc gia. Quý vị có thể sử dụng quỹ SF MRA để được hoàn lại tiền cho nhiều chi phí và dịch vụ y tế.



Sau khi gửi biểu mẫu đăng ký, quý vị sẽ nhận được thông tin cập nhật về tình trạng ghi danh đăng ký của mình trong vòng 1-3 tuần.

Quý vị cũng sẽ nhận được thông tin về:

- Cách sử dụng tiền trong quỹ
- Cách kiểm tra số dư
- Làm thế nào để được hoàn lại tiền cho chi phí chăm sóc sức khỏe được bao trả

Quý vị cần trợ giúp thêm?

- Nếu quý vị có thắc mắc, hãy truy cập vào sfmra.org/faqs để tìm hiểu thêm
- Quý vị có thể gửi email cho chúng tôi theo địa chỉ info@sfcityoption.org



Đăng ký Ngay!

Bắt đầu sử dụng ngân quỹ của quý vị!

sfmra.org/vi/enroll



SF City Option

THE EMPLOYER'S HEALTH CARE CHOICE

好消息！ 您有健康福利金待領取

歡迎選擇 SF City Option (SFCO)!

在 San Francisco, 某些僱主必須向符合資格的 SF 人員支付健康福利金。為遵守法規, 您以前或當前僱主將福利金存入 SFCO 健康計劃。

這項 SFCO 健康福利叫做 San Francisco 醫療報銷帳戶 (SF MRA)。

使用個人資金

您 SF MRA 賬戶內的資金可用來償付您自己、配偶或子女的多項健康支出, 如:

- 健康保險費和共付額
- 醫生、牙科或視力健康就診費用
- 處方藥及非處方藥
- 健康產品或服務, 如: 脊椎健康療法、Oura 智能戒指等

您需要參保 SF MRA 福利後方可使用此項資金。

若需註冊 SF MRA 福利相關幫助, 請造訪

sfmra.org/zh/enroll



了解 SF MRA
的更多資訊,
請造訪:

sfmra.org/zh/about-us

如對 SF City Option 有疑問

請於週一至週五 8:00am 至 5:00pm(太平洋時間) 致電客戶服務部。

1(877) 772-0415



@sanfranciscocityoption



@sfcityoption

解答您的問題



我接下來該怎麼做？

請完成 SF MRA 參保註冊，以保持帳戶激活狀態。您必須先註冊 SF MRA，然後才能使用您的資金。San Francisco 市與縣會關閉三年內沒有活動的帳戶。

離職後，是否可以使用我自己的 SF MRA 資金？

您的 SF MRA 中的資金屬於您。即使您已離職，或不在本州，甚至不在本國，您仍可以使用帳戶資金償付承保範圍內的健康支出。您可使用 SF MRA 資金報銷各種健康相關開支及服務。



提交注册表格後，您將在 1-3 週內收到關於您的注册狀態的更新資訊。

您還將收到以下資訊：

- 如何使用您的資金
- 如何查詢您的餘額
- 如果報銷承保範圍內的健康支出

需要更多幫助？

- 若您有疑問，請造訪 sfmra.org/zh/faqs 了解詳情
- 您可以傳送電郵至 info@sfcityoption.org



立即註冊登記！

開始使用您的資金！

sfmra.org/zh/enroll



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

Your SF MRA Benefit Is Here!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Dear <First Name> <Last Name>,

Welcome to the San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA) benefit program. Your SF MRA is provided by San Francisco City Option (SF City Option). The goal of SF MRA is to help San Francisco workers and their families stay healthy.

Make the Most of Your SF MRA

Your SF MRA funds come from a past or current employer. With SF MRA funds, you can get money back for many health items and services. You can also use SF MRA funds to cover your family's health costs, including:

- Your spouse or partner
- Your children or dependents

To see the full list of eligible health costs, visit sfmra.org/eligibleexpenses.

What's Next?

You can start to use your account funds within three weeks of joining SF MRA. Once your account is ready, you will get a letter and guidebook that explains how to use your SF MRA.

If you have any questions, please call SF City Option Customer Service at **1(877) 772-0415** or email us at info@sfcityoption.org.

Kind regards,
SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

¡Su beneficio de SF MRA ya está aquí!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Estimado(a) <First Name> <Last Name>:

Bienvenida al programa de beneficios de Cuenta de reembolso médico de San Francisco (SF MRA). El beneficio de SF MRA es ofrecido por San Francisco City Option (SF City Option). El objetivo de la SF MRA es ayudar a los trabajadores de San Francisco y a sus familias a mantenerse saludables.

Aproveche al máximo su SF MRA

Sus fondos de la SF MRA provienen de un empleador anterior o actual. Con los fondos de la SF MRA, puede obtener reembolsos en muchos artículos y servicios de salud. También puede usar los fondos de la SF MRA para cubrir los gastos de salud de su familia, que incluyen a:

- Su cónyuge o pareja doméstica
- Sus hijos o dependientes

Para ver la lista completa de gastos de salud elegibles, visite sfmra.org/es/eligibleexpenses.

¿Qué es lo siguiente?

Puede comenzar a usar los fondos de su cuenta en un plazo de tres semanas a partir de la aprobación de SF MRA. Una vez que su cuenta esté lista, recibirá una carta y una guía que explica cómo usar su SF MRA.

Si tiene alguna pregunta, llame a Servicio al Cliente de SF City Option al **1(877) 772-0415** o envíe un correo electrónico a info@sfcityoption.org.

Saludos cordiales,

SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

Narito na ang iyong mga Benepisyo sa SF MRA!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Mahal na <First Name> <Last Name>,

Welcome sa San Francisco Medical Reimbursement Account (SF MRA) benefit program. Ibinibigay ng San Francisco City Option (SF City Option) ang iyong MRA. Ang layunin ng SF MRA ay tulungan ang mga manggagawa ng San Francisco at ang kanilang pamilya na manatiling malusog.

Sulitin ang Iyong SF MRA

Ang iyong mga pondo sa SF MRA mula sa iyong dati o kasalukuyang employer. Gamit ang mga pondo ng SF MRA, maaari mong mabawi ang pera para sa maraming gamit at serbisyong pangkalusugan. Maaari mo ring gamitin ang mga pondo ng MRA para tugunan ang mga gastusin sa kalusugan ng iyong pamilya, kabilang:

- Ang iyong asawa o partner
- Ang iyong mga anak o dependent

Upang makita ang buong listahan ng mga kwalipikadong gastusin sa kalusugan, bisitahin ang sfmra.org/tl/eligibleexpenses.

Ano ang Susunod?

Maaari mo nang simulang gamitin ang mga pondo sa iyong account sa loob ng tatlong linggo matapos sumali sa SF MRA. Kapag handa na ang iyong account, makakatanggap ka ng isang liham at guidebook na magpapaliwanag kung paano gamitin ang iyong SF MRA.

Kung mayroon kang anumang tanong, mangyaring tumawag sa Customer Service ng SF City Option sa **1(877) 772-0415** o mag-email sa info@sfcityoption.org.

Bumabati,
SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

Quyền lợi SF MRA của quý vị đã sẵn sàng!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

Kính gửi <First Name> <Last Name>,

Chào mừng quý vị đến với chương trình phúc lợi Tài khoản Bồi hoàn Y tế San Francisco (SF MRA). Tài khoản SF MRA của quý vị được cung cấp thông qua Chương trình City Option của Thành phố San Francisco (SF City Option). Mục tiêu của SF MRA là giúp người lao động San Francisco và gia đình họ khỏe mạnh.

Tận dụng tối đa SF MRA của quý vị

Quỹ SF MRA của quý vị là do chủ lao động trước đây hoặc hiện tại đóng vào. Với quỹ SF MRA, quý vị có thể nhận lại tiền cho nhiều mặt hàng và dịch vụ y tế. Quý vị cũng có thể sử dụng quỹ SF MRA để trang trải chi phí y tế của gia đình, bao gồm:

- Vợ/chồng hoặc bạn đời của quý vị
- Con hoặc người phụ thuộc của quý vị

Để xem danh sách đầy đủ các chi phí y tế đủ điều kiện, hãy truy cập sfmra.org/eligibleexpenses.

Bước tiếp theo là gì?

Quý vị có thể bắt đầu sử dụng quỹ trong tài khoản của mình trong vòng ba tuần sau khi tham gia SF MRA. Khi tài khoản của quý vị đã sẵn sàng, quý vị sẽ nhận được một lá thư và sách hướng dẫn giải thích cách sử dụng SF MRA của quý vị.

Nếu có bất kỳ thắc mắc nào, vui lòng gọi cho Dịch vụ Khách hàng SF City Option theo số **1(877) 772-0415** hoặc gửi email đến info@sfcityoption.org.

Trân trọng,
SF City Option



SFMRA

YOUR ACCOUNT FOR HEALTH COSTS

您的 SF MRA 福利現已生效!



<<First Name>> <<Last Name>>
<<Address Line 1>>
<<Address Line 2>>
<<City>>, <<State>> <<Zip Code>>

尊敬的 <First Name> <Last Name>:

歡迎加入舊金山醫療報銷帳戶 (SF MRA) 福利計劃。您的 SF MRA 由 San Francisco City Option (SF City Option) 提供。SF MRA 旨在協助舊金山的員工及其家人保持健康。

充分利用您的 SF MRA

您的 SF MRA 中的資金來自您的前僱主或現僱主。使用 SF MRA 資金，您可以報銷多種醫療用品和服務費用。您亦可使用 SF MRA 資金支付您家人的醫療費用，包括：

- 您的配偶或伴侶
- 您的孩子或受供養者

如需查看符合條件的醫療費用的完整清單，請造訪 sfmra.org/zh/eligibleexpenses。

接下來該怎麼做？

您可以在加入 SF MRA 福利計劃三週內啟用您的帳戶資金。帳戶註冊完畢後，您將收到一封信函和指南，其中載有關於如何使用 SF MRA 的說明。

若您有任何疑問，請致電 SF City Option 客戶服務部電話 **1(877) 772-0415** 或傳送電子郵件至 info@sfcityoption.org。

誠摯問候！

SF City Option

Responsive Record for #26-4243

Question Description	Answer	Notes
1a. Total sum of active SF MRA balances, most current	\$537.6 M	Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026.
1b. Total sum of 'inactive' SF MRA balances by years of inactivity, most current		Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026. Note that years of inactivity have been corrected.
1 to less than 2 years	\$52.9 M	
2 to less than 3 years	\$29.8 M	
3 years and more	\$101.6 M	
1c. Total sum of Pool, most current	\$294.3 M	Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026.
2. Number of unique participants with 'inactive' SF MRA balances, by years of inactivity		Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026. Note that years of inactivity have been corrected.
1 to less than 2 years	24,911	
2 to less than 3 years	13,697	
3 years and more	81,807	
3a. Count of “new enrollment notifications”		These are notifications sent to participants whose enrollment forms resulted in status of “Approved for SF MRA”. Source: ESRM database; around 95% of notifications are via email, with the rest via mail and autocal. Autocal audience is the same as mail audience (i.e., they have the same N), so that the total is more than number of approved enrollment forms.
In calendar year 2024	38,420	
In calendar year 2025	30,229	
3b. Count of “enrollment activations completed” by employer industry		These are counts of submitted enrollment forms that resulted in status of “Approved for SF MRA”, as this status triggers submission of participant funds to PSF to be enrolled in SF MRA. Source: SFCO Enrollment Forms Dashboard. See below for breakdown by industry.
In calendar year 2024	37,004	
In calendar year 2025	29,030	
7. Records sufficient to show the projected dollar value of MRA balances expected to transfer to the City General Fund on or about May 21, 2026, and the methodology used to project that figure	\$97.5 M.	Source is Escheatment Funds Monitoring Dashboard as of 6/2/2026. Dashboard draws data from ESR and balance from HQY Activity File as of 4/30/2026.

3a. Notifications by Employer Industry. Note that these values do not show all possible employer industries in cases where a participant has multiple employers.

	2024	2025
Industry Name	Count	
Finance and Insurance	2625	1859
Retail Trade	7946	5685
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	842	706
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	2	6
Public Administration	24	13
Health Care and Social Assistance	2963	2618
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	4263	3162
Utilities	66	63
Manufacturing	337	270
Unknown	92	46
Construction	131	148
Transportation and Warehousing	1569	1115
Management of Companies and Enterprises	871	679
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	21	20
Other Services (except Public Administration)	10793	8229
Accommodation and Food Services	4296	3413
Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	291	304
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	1449	1323
Information	941	639
Wholesale Trade	142	116
Educational Services	1866	1518

From: [Barklee Sanders](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DPH, Health Commission \(DPH\), HCSO, \(ADM\)](#)
Subject: Follow-up: full records packet attached - keep SF City Option / SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 4:26:44 PM
Attachments: [HCSO_SF_City_Option_Worker_Health_Funds_Outreach_Packet.pdf](#)
[NextRequest_26-4243_DPH_Responsive_Record.pdf](#)

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

Dear President and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am following up with a cleaner first-person packet and the DPH records from NextRequest 26-4243.

I am asking the Board to consider legislation or a budget policy requiring reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds to remain dedicated to worker-health-care purposes instead of becoming unrestricted General Fund revenue.

Why I am asking you to make this change:

- HCSO requires covered employers to make health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees.
- SF.gov says SF City Option contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs and never return to the employer.
- DPH records produced in NextRequest 26-4243 identify active, inactive, and Pool balances and a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer.
- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053 says the legislative body "may" transfer qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. That appears discretionary, not mandatory.

My requested fix is simple: create a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund, require stronger worker notice and employer onboarding, and keep reclaimed HCSO / SF City Option money tied to worker health care.

Attachments and records:

1. HCSO / SF City Option Worker Health Funds Outreach Packet.pdf
2. NextRequest 26-4243 DPH Responsive Record.pdf
3. Full 11-PDF NextRequest 26-4243 production ZIP:
<https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://drive.google.com/file/d/1yValmeZYXIAV_XKaPvoqVzwR8rUeL4N2/view?usp=drivesdk <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://www.sf.gov/information--health-care-security-outlineance___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmZjM2M6ZWRjMjYwYyZmYm3OTQ2NjFjOTNhZmMxNzRiYmE5ZWQ2YmZmNjIzMmQ5MmVwNjcwNGYyODgzYVYwYmNjOTc3MzpwOIQ6Tg
<https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://www.sf.gov/information--section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmU0Mjk6ZjczMzMsMGMwNWVhM2M0DlMDFjNzA1NDU4NGZmMjU5NGRlZGM5YUWUZZjFjYTMxMnY3NTM0MzdhNDU3NzQ1YjpwOIQ6Tg
<https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmVjMTE6NDFlNnlyNmYw0A3ZDhhYjAxNGFkNjYyNTQ0ZmVjOTQzNTBmMGNIODIyVWVhMDI5NzY3MzAu3NzgzNmE5NDIzDpwOIQ6Tg
<https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmVjMTE6NDFlNnlyNmYw0A3ZDhhYjAxNGFkNjYyNTQ0ZmVjOTQzNTBmMGNIODIyVWVhMDI5NzY3MzAu3NzgzNmE5NDIzDpwOIQ6Tg

Sources cited below were re-checked June 12, 2026:
- SF.gov HCSO: <https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://www.sf.gov/information--health-care-security-outlineance___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmZjM2M6ZWRjMjYwYyZmYm3OTQ2NjFjOTNhZmMxNzRiYmE5ZWQ2YmZmNjIzMmQ5MmVwNjcwNGYyODgzYVYwYmNjOTc3MzpwOIQ6Tg
- SF.gov City Option guidance:
<https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://www.sf.gov/information--section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmU0Mjk6ZjczMzMsMGMwNWVhM2M0DlMDFjNzA1NDU4NGZmMjU5NGRlZGM5YUWUZZjFjYTMxMnY3NTM0MzdhNDU3NzQ1YjpwOIQ6Tg
- SF.gov worker deadline notice:
<https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmVjMTE6NDFlNnlyNmYw0A3ZDhhYjAxNGFkNjYyNTQ0ZmVjOTQzNTBmMGNIODIyVWVhMDI5NzY3MzAu3NzgzNmE5NDIzDpwOIQ6Tg
- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053:
<https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/> https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bZowNTBhNk0ZGU0YTnhNWmMjE2NzYwYjVhYjYg0NGMxMDo3OmVjMTE6NDFlNnlyNmYw0A3ZDhhYjAxNGFkNjYyNTQ0ZmVjOTQzNTBmMGNIODIyVWVhMDI5NzY3MzAu3NzgzNmE5NDIzDpwOIQ6Tg

Respectfully,
Barklee Sanders
barkleesanders@gmail.com
San Francisco, CA

HCSO / SF City Option Worker Health Funds Outreach Packet

Prepared: June 12, 2026

This packet summarizes the requested SF City Option / HCSO policy change, the verified official sources, the public-records status, and the exact outreach text sent to public agencies and media.

Requested change in one sentence: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds dedicated to worker health care, and require stronger worker notice/employer onboarding so funds reach the employees they were created for.

Ground-truth note: stakes-bearing factual claims cite primary/current sources fetched on June 12, 2026 unless marked as media coverage.

Records status: no duplicate CPRA request needed now

Live NextRequest dedupe found existing requests already covering this issue:

- 26-4243 — DPH — balances, inactive age bands, Pool, worker notice text, projected General Fund transfer methodology. Closed; responsive record received.
- 26-4244 — Controller / City Services Auditor — audits, correspondence, budget treatment, legal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4922 — Controller — derivation of \$200–240M budget figure, revenue recognition, General Fund treatment, legal/fiscal/risk analysis. Open.
- 26-4923 — DPH — Health Commission policy, program data, outreach records, notice delivery metrics, complaints, correspondence. Open.
- 26-4924 — Treasurer & Tax Collector — escheatment notice, legal authority, account/fund transfer mechanics, post-escheat recovery process. Open.
- 26-5157 — DPH — OLSE referral follow-up, internal memos, transfer mechanism/destination. Open.
- 26-5219 — DPH / SF City Option Program — program records and communications on inactive-MRA transfer assumption and HCSO irrevocability. Open.

Official recipients

1. Board of Supervisors / public comment
 - To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

- Source: <https://sfbos.org/participate-and-submit-public-comments> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

2. San Francisco Health Commission

- To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org
- Optional CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/departments-san-francisco-health-commission> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org and Director of Health Commission Affairs mark.morewitz@sfdph.org.

3. OLSE / HCSO

- To: hcso@sfgov.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-contact-office-labor-standards-enforcement> and <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12; pages list HCSO email hcso@sfgov.org.

4. SF City Option program

- To: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org
- Source: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12; page lists employer services and employee contacts.

Media contacts and coverage

1. Mission Local — David Mamaril Horowitz

- To: david@missionlocal.com
- Optional general: info@missionlocal.com
- Coverage: "SF to close workers' idle healthcare benefit accounts and pocket the funds"
- Article/source: <https://missionlocal.org/2023/01/sf-city-option-escheatment-sfmra-to-close-idle-medical-reimbursement-accounts-and-pocket-workers-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page metadata/mailto shows David Mamaril Horowitz and david@missionlocal.com.
- Contact page: <https://missionlocal.org/contact/> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@missionlocal.com.

2. Gazetteer SF — Olivia Peluso

- To: oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co
- Optional tips/general: info@gazetteer.co
- Coverage: "San Francisco could absorb \$240M of unused worker health reimbursement funds"

- Article/source: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/san-francisco-could-absorb-240m-of-unused-worker-health-reimbursement-funds> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Olivia Peluso; page source exposed oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co.
- Tips page: <https://sf.gazetteer.co/tips> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists info@gazetteer.co and text tip line (415) 787-6570.

3. The Voice of San Francisco — Liz Le / general newsroom

- To: info@thevoicesf.org
- Coverage: “City Hall to tap \$200M unused health care mandate dollars to fill budget gap”
- Article/source: <https://thevoicesf.org/san-francisco-sweep-240m-unused-health-care-funds-general-fund-budget-gap> — fetched 2026-06-12; page identifies Liz Le; page/contact lists info@thevoicesf.org.
- Contact page: <https://thevoicesf.org/contact-us/> — fetched 2026-06-12; contact form/general route.

4. NBC Bay Area — Christie Smith / newsroom tip route

- Contact route: NBC Bay Area “Email us” / Investigative Tips phone 888-996-8477; no direct email verified.
- Coverage: “Deadline approaching to claim funds under the SF City Option program”
- Article/source: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/deadline-approaching-claim-funds-sf-city-option/4084440> — fetched 2026-06-12; article says Christie Smith reports.
- Contact page: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us> — fetched 2026-06-12; lists main phone 408-432-6221 and investigative tips 888-996-8477.

Core sources

- SF.gov HCSO page: covered employers must make required health care expenditures quarterly “on behalf of all covered employees.” <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov City Option guidance: employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA; employees can obtain reimbursements; contributions never return to employer. <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF.gov worker deadline notice: inactive accounts close/transfer to General Fund; more than 160,000 people may have unclaimed/inactive funds; employees can keep funds indefinitely if active. <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> — fetched 2026-06-12.
- SF City Option employer page: employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees; inactive account funds revert to the City General Fund; employees notified at least three times before closure. <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> — fetched 2026-06-12.

- Cal. Gov. Code § 50053: legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV — fetched 2026-06-12.
- NextRequest 26-4243: DPH responsive production gave current figures: \$537.6M active SF MRA balances, \$184.3M inactive balances, \$294.3M Pool, and projected \$97.5M transfer to General Fund on/about May 21, 2026. Live API checked 2026-06-12 earlier in session; responsive record found.

1. Board of Supervisors / legislative ask

To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org CC: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org; hcso@sfgov.org
Subject: Request for Board action: keep reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA funds dedicated to worker health care

Dear President and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am asking the Board to consider legislation or a budget policy requiring reclaimed SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account funds to remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes instead of becoming unrestricted General Fund revenue.

Why the Board should make this change:

1. The money starts as a worker-health-care mandate. SF.gov states that covered employers must satisfy the Health Care Security Ordinance by making required health care expenditures “on behalf of all covered employees.”
2. SF City Option is supposed to create an irrevocable worker health benefit. SF.gov’s City Option guidance says the employer contribution is deposited in an irrevocable SF MRA and that employees can obtain reimbursement for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums.
3. The current transfer policy changes the practical character of the money. Records produced by DPH in NextRequest 26-4243 identify approximately \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.
4. State law appears to leave the policy choice with the City. California Government Code § 50053 says the legislative body “may transfer” qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund. “May” is discretionary; it does not require San Francisco to treat reclaimed worker-health money as ordinary unrestricted revenue.

5. Stronger notice and employer onboarding requirements would make the program work better before money is forfeited. SF City Option's own employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. That should be a required compliance step, not just an optional best practice.

Requested action:

Please introduce or request legislation creating a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund, with language substantially like:

"Employer contributions made under the Health Care Security Ordinance and SF City Option shall remain dedicated to worker health-care purposes. Any funds that become City property under California Government Code §§ 50050 et seq. shall be deposited into a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund and may not be used for unrelated General Fund purposes. The Fund may be used only for worker health-care reimbursements, outreach, account reactivation, notice, claims assistance, and health-care services for affected covered-worker populations."

The legislation should also require:

- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer-forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access notice;
- employer onboarding notices explaining SF City Option, how to activate an SF MRA, and how to keep funds active;
- separation notices when workers leave employment;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding for workers with City Option contributions;
- a public dashboard showing employer contributions, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, notices sent/delivered/returned, and any transfers; and
- annual Controller/DPH reporting on whether reclaimed funds are being used for worker-health purposes.

This is not a request to weaken HCSO. It is a request to preserve the purpose of HCSO: worker health care.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12:

<https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12:

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV

- NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

2. Health Commission / DPH policy ask

To: HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org CC: mark.morewitz@sfdph.org; employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: Public comment: strengthen SF City Option notice and keep reclaimed SF MRA funds restricted to worker health care

Dear San Francisco Health Commission,

Please accept this written public comment concerning the SF City Option / SF Medical Reimbursement Account program and the treatment of inactive or unclaimed SF MRA balances.

I am asking the Health Commission to revisit the program's closure/transfer policy and recommend that reclaimed SF City Option / SF MRA money remain restricted to worker-health-care purposes.

Why the Health Commission should make this change:

1. SF City Option exists to deliver worker health-care benefits. SF.gov states that HCSO-covered employers must make health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees, and City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs.
2. The current closure/transfer process risks converting a worker-health benefit into General Fund revenue. DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances, \$184.3 million in inactive balances, \$294.3 million in Pool funds, and a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer.
3. The City's own public notice says workers can keep their funds indefinitely as long as the account remains active, but accounts that remain inactive will be closed and transferred to the General Fund under state law. That makes notice and access the central fairness issue.
4. SF City Option's employer page already recognizes that employers can help by downloading enrollment reports and contacting employees. The Health Commission should recommend making this a required compliance practice for employers using City Option.

Requested policy changes:

- Require "super-notice" before closure/transfer: 180-day and 60-day notices through mail, email, phone/SMS where available, employer forwarding, Funds Finder notice, and language-access materials.
- Require employers using City Option to provide onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices.
- Require employer proof that notices were actually provided to affected employees.

- Create a late-claim reserve for workers whose notice was defective, undelivered, or not language-accessible.
- Restrict reclaimed funds to worker reimbursements, outreach, claims help, reactivation, and health-care services for covered-worker populations.
- Publish dashboards showing contributions, notices, activation rates, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

The Commission can preserve the program's purpose without rejecting state unclaimed-money law. Cal. Gov. Code § 50053 says the legislative body may transfer qualifying special-fund money to the General Fund; it does not require unrestricted use.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

3. OLSE / employer-notice implementation ask

To: hcsosf@gov.org CC: employerservices@sfcityoption.org; info@sfcityoption.org Subject: HCSO implementation improvement: require City Option activation notice at onboarding, quarterly contribution, and separation

Dear Office of Labor Standards Enforcement,

I am asking OLSE to strengthen HCSO employer notice requirements for employers who satisfy the Employer Spending Requirement through SF City Option.

Why OLSE should make this change:

1. The employer is usually the only actor with a direct relationship to the worker when the money is created.

2. SF.gov's HCSO page says covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employees are offered SF MRAs, and employer contributions are deposited in irrevocable reimbursement accounts.
3. The practical failure point is notice and activation. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment. If this is optional, many workers may never understand that funds exist, how to activate them, or how to keep them active.
4. DPH records in NextRequest 26-4243 show significant active, inactive, and Pool balances, plus a projected \$97.5 million General Fund transfer. That makes worker notice a core compliance issue, not just a customer-service issue.

Requested HCSO notice requirements for City Option employers:

- Onboarding notice: explain that the employer may satisfy HCSO through SF City Option; funds may be available through an SF MRA; and the worker must activate/access the account.
- Quarterly contribution notice: state the dollar amount contributed on the worker's behalf and the exact activation/access steps.
- Annual notice: remind workers to search the SF MRA Funds Finder and keep the account active.
- Separation notice: when employment ends, explain that SF MRA funds may remain available and how to keep them active.
- Language-access notice: at least English, Spanish, Chinese, Filipino/Tagalog, Vietnamese, and any other languages already used by the program.
- Delivery proof: employers should retain records showing notices were provided, not merely posted.
- Anti-forfeiture disclosure: clear warning that inactive accounts may be closed and transferred unless the worker acts, with the exact steps to avoid that result.

If City Option remains an HCSO compliance path, worker access should be a legal requirement built into employer compliance, not a passive option workers may discover years later.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Respectfully, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

4. Media pitch

To: david@missionlocal.com; oliviapeluso@gazetteer.co; info@thevoicesf.org CC: info@missionlocal.com; info@gazetteer.co Subject: Tip: new DPH records show \$97.5M SF City Option / SF MRA General Fund transfer; policy fix is discretionary

Hello,

I'm sharing a public-records update because you have covered SF City Option / SF MRA inactive funds and the pending transfer of worker health-care money to San Francisco's General Fund.

New DPH records produced through NextRequest 26-4243 identify:

- \$537.6 million in active SF MRA balances;
- \$184.3 million in inactive SF MRA balances;
- \$294.3 million in SF City Option Pool funds awaiting MRA assignment; and
- a projected \$97.5 million transfer to the City General Fund on or about May 21, 2026.

The policy issue is sharper than "state law requires this." California Government Code § 50053 says that when qualifying unclaimed money becomes local-agency property and is in a special fund, the legislative body may transfer it to the General Fund. "May" is discretionary. That means San Francisco can choose to keep reclaimed HCSO / SF City Option money restricted to worker health care rather than treating it as ordinary General Fund revenue.

The worker-access issue is also concrete. SF.gov says HCSO-covered employers must make required health-care expenditures on behalf of covered employees. SF.gov's City Option guidance says employer contributions are deposited into irrevocable SF MRAs and workers can use them for medical, dental, vision expenses, and insurance premiums. SF City Option's employer page says employers can download enrollment reports and contact employees to ensure they finish enrollment.

A policy fix could require:

- a restricted Worker Health Care Reinvestment Fund for reclaimed money;
- 180-day and 60-day pre-closure notices;
- employer onboarding, quarterly contribution, annual reminder, and separation notices;
- employer proof of notice/forwarding;
- language-access and disability-accessible notice;
- a late-claim reserve for defective or undelivered notices; and
- public dashboards showing contributions, activation rates, notices, claims paid, inactive balances, Pool balances, and transfers.

I can provide the DPH production, the Google Doc analysis, and the related open NextRequest IDs covering Controller, Treasurer, DPH, and OLSE/SF City Option follow-up records.

Sources: - SF.gov HCSO page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-health-care-security-ordinance> - SF.gov City Option guidance, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/information-section-g-contributing-sf-city-option-hcso-administrative-guidance> - SF.gov worker deadline notice, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://www.sf.gov/news-san-francisco-urges-workers-to-claim-sf-city-option-funds-before-may-2026-deadline> - SF City Option employer page, fetched 2026-06-12: <https://sfcityoption.org/contributions> - Cal. Gov. Code § 50053, fetched 2026-06-12: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=50053.&lawCode=GOV - NextRequest 26-4243 DPH responsive production, live request verified 2026-06-12.

Thank you, Barklee Sanders barkleesanders@gmail.com San Francisco, CA

Note: NBC Bay Area also covered this through Christie Smith, but I did not find a verified direct email. Verified route is NBC Bay Area contact/tip channel: <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/contact-us>, investigative tips 888-996-8477.

Responsive Record for #26-4243

Question Description	Answer	Notes
1a. Total sum of active SF MRA balances, most current	\$537.6 M	Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026.
1b. Total sum of 'inactive' SF MRA balances by years of inactivity, most current		Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026. Note that years of inactivity have been corrected.
1 to less than 2 years	\$52.9 M	
2 to less than 3 years	\$29.8 M	
3 years and more	\$101.6 M	
1c. Total sum of Pool, most current	\$294.3 M	Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026.
2. Number of unique participants with 'inactive' SF MRA balances, by years of inactivity		Source: Age of Funds Dashboard, as of 6/2/2026. Note that years of inactivity have been corrected.
1 to less than 2 years	24,911	
2 to less than 3 years	13,697	
3 years and more	81,807	
3a. Count of “new enrollment notifications”		These are notifications sent to participants whose enrollment forms resulted in status of “Approved for SF MRA”. Source: ESRM database; around 95% of notifications are via email, with the rest via mail and autocal. Autocal audience is the same as mail audience (i.e., they have the same N), so that the total is more than number of approved enrollment forms.
In calendar year 2024	38,420	
In calendar year 2025	30,229	
3b. Count of “enrollment activations completed” by employer industry		These are counts of submitted enrollment forms that resulted in status of “Approved for SF MRA”, as this status triggers submission of participant funds to PSF to be enrolled in SF MRA. Source: SFCO Enrollment Forms Dashboard. See below for breakdown by industry.
In calendar year 2024	37,004	
In calendar year 2025	29,030	
7. Records sufficient to show the projected dollar value of MRA balances expected to transfer to the City General Fund on or about May 21, 2026, and the methodology used to project that figure	\$97.5 M.	Source is Escheatment Funds Monitoring Dashboard as of 6/2/2026. Dashboard draws data from ESR and balance from HQY Activity File as of 4/30/2026.

3a. Notifications by Employer Industry. Note that these values do not show all possible employer industries in cases where a participant has multiple employers.

	2024	2025
Industry Name	Count	
Finance and Insurance	2625	1859
Retail Trade	7946	5685
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	842	706
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	2	6
Public Administration	24	13
Health Care and Social Assistance	2963	2618
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	4263	3162
Utilities	66	63
Manufacturing	337	270
Unknown	92	46
Construction	131	148
Transportation and Warehousing	1569	1115
Management of Companies and Enterprises	871	679
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	21	20
Other Services (except Public Administration)	10793	8229
Accommodation and Food Services	4296	3413
Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	291	304
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	1449	1323
Information	941	639
Wholesale Trade	142	116
Educational Services	1866	1518

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Help to influence the California's \$800 LLC tax burden on small solo businesses
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:12:01 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding taxes on small businesses.

Regards,

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

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

From: Katherine Mendonca <kmendonca@mac.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:08 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Help to influence the California's \$800 LLC tax burden on small solo businesses

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

TO: Board of Supervisors in the City and County of San Francisco

I'm a constituent in San Francisco (94107) and an aspiring home-based solopreneur working to

launch a very small business to help make ends meet, post a tech job layoff. I'm writing to urge you to use your influence to reform California's \$800 annual LLC tax for solo and micro-businesses.

As a laid-off former tech employee, I am trying to find a way to supplement my income by launching a small home-based business making home decor items (not launching an AI company with VC backing or becoming a gig-worker) so that I can remain in CA which has been home for the past 26 yrs. For potential businesses like mine, the annual \$800 fee (tax) does not exist in isolation. It stacks on top of required filing fees, Statement of Information fees, annual registered agent costs, monthly virtual address or mailbox fees to protect a home address, local business license fees, insurance, bookkeeping and tax preparation, and ongoing compliance work. These are significant fixed costs before a business is meaningfully profitable, and they discourage founders from forming LLCs and complying fully from the start. All of this is really giving me pause if I even want to embark on this venture.

I'm not asking to eliminate taxes for large companies. I'm asking for a more reasonable structure for very small entities—such as a phased-in or reduced annual tax, a 1-2 yr exemption, or a revenue threshold before the full \$800 applies, and especially as an annual "tax". This would make it much easier for responsible solo-preneurs to formalize their businesses, protect themselves and their customers, and participate fully in California's economy.

Please help make reform of the \$800 minimum LLC tax for small and early-stage businesses a priority in upcoming sessions.

Thank you for your time and for supporting small businesses in our community.

Sincerely,
Katherine Mendonça
San Francisco, CA 94107
kmendonca@mac.com

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment: Request for Displacement Assessment Prior to Capp & Shotwell Extension Vote
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 12:29:57 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[Public Comment -- Request for Displacement Assessment Prior to Capp & Shotwell Extension Vote.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding Capp Street and Shotwell Street.

Regards,

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

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

From: John Bove <dotchaos@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:37 AM
To: SFMTA Board <mtaboard@sfmta.com>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Gaona, Sasha (BOS) <sasha.gaona@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; Buffa, Andrea (MTA) <Andrea.Buffa@sfmta.com>; Jenkins, Brooke (DAT) <brooke.jenkins@sfgov.org>; Perdomo, Sean (POL) <sean.perdomo@sfgov.org>; Betz, Steven (MYR) <Steven.Betz.MYR@sfgov.org>; David Baker <davidbakerfaia@gmail.com>; Yosh Asato <yosh@yoshasato.com>; David Nguyen <davidnguyenrn@gmail.com>; Kathrin Felder <felderkathrin@gmail.com>; Laurel Coco

<laurelcoco@gmail.com>; Woo, Bryant (MTA) <Bryant.Woo@sfmta.com>; Michele Boscia <michele@omwines.com>; Catharine Burhenne <catharineburhenne@gmail.com>; David Burhenne-Sanderson <david@reelgood.com>; Ellie Korn <elliestollerkorn@gmail.com>; Veronica Benitez <vcristy@outlook.com>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment: Request for Displacement Assessment Prior to Capp & Shotwell Extension Vote

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

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

Please find attached a letter signed by Mission District residents regarding the proposed eighteen-month extension of the Capp and Shotwell Street traffic restrictions scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, June 16.

The letter raises a narrow but important question: what assessment, if any, has been conducted regarding displacement impacts on surrounding blocks, and how those impacts have been incorporated into the City's evaluation of the program.

For convenience, the full text of the letter is included below.

To the SFMTA Board of Directors and the Board of Supervisors:

We are writing regarding the proposed eighteen-month [extension of the Capp Street and Shotwell Street traffic restrictions scheduled for consideration by the SFMTA Board of Directors on Tuesday, June 16](#).

Before extending these measures, we believe the City should answer a fundamental question:

What assessment has been conducted to understand their impacts on the surrounding neighborhood?

The original traffic restrictions were implemented to address serious and well-documented conditions on Capp Street and later on Shotwell Street. Many residents on those blocks understandably sought relief, and many likely experienced it.

However, relief on one block is not the same as resolution.

Prior to installation of the Shotwell barriers, residents on surrounding blocks repeatedly warned City officials that activity would likely shift north into adjacent residential areas unless a broader corridor strategy accompanied the project (See illustration). Those warnings were provided to elected officials, city departments, and public safety leadership

before implementation. [Please see an example message our group shared.](#)

The City proceeded without conducting any public displacement analysis and without engaging many of the blocks most likely to be affected.

In his October 2024 SFMTA presentation, senior traffic engineer Bryant Woo justified the Shotwell project largely on conditions created by displacement from the Capp Street restrictions, specifically around sex trade activity. Yet during the same proceedings, the City maintained there was no evidence that the new barriers would similarly displace activity onto surrounding blocks, despite concerns raised by nearby residents. **If displacement was foreseeable enough to justify the Shotwell barriers, it is difficult to understand why displacement impacts on neighboring blocks were not treated as a foreseeable consequence requiring analysis.**

Illustration shared with city departments prior to the 11/1/24 review



Since then, residents on surrounding blocks have experienced exactly the type of displacement that was predicted. Open-air solicitation, late-night vehicle circulation, noise,

intimidation, sanitation impacts, and associated quality-of-life issues have increasingly affected blocks that were not part of the original intervention area. Additionally, the traffic amendments have concentrated circulation onto already strained streets like 18th Street, creating a sustained physical traffic burden.

The City's outreach was focused primarily on the blocks receiving the intervention. We are unaware of any comparable effort to identify, engage, or assess the blocks most likely to absorb displacement impacts.

As the City considers an eighteen-month extension, those residents still appear to be absent from the outreach process.

This raises a larger concern.

If the City is prepared to extend a temporary intervention for another eighteen months, what evidence has been collected regarding its broader neighborhood impacts? What outreach has been conducted with adjacent blocks? What metrics are being used to evaluate success? How is displacement being measured?

Equally important, how are the interests of vulnerable women involved in the street sex trade being considered when activity is simply pushed from one location to another?

These are not arguments against the barriers. They are questions about responsible public policy.

No intervention should be considered successful simply because a problem becomes less visible in one location. Success requires understanding where the activity went, who absorbed the impacts, and whether overall conditions improved.

If the City believes the barriers have been successful, it should be able to demonstrate that success through data, outreach, and public engagement. If no such analysis exists, extending the program first and studying its impacts later reverses the normal order of responsible policymaking.

Before approving an eighteen-month extension, we respectfully request that the City publicly disclose:

- 1.
- 2.
3. Any displacement analysis that has
4. been conducted regarding the impacts of the Capp and Shotwell restrictions on surrounding blocks.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
8. The geographic area included in the

9. City's outreach efforts and the rationale used to define affected stakeholders.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
13. The criteria and metrics being used
14. to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention.
- 15.
- 16.
- 17.

18. Any plans to assess impacts on adjacent

19. residential blocks, businesses, schools, and public spaces.

- 20.

Residents who have absorbed the consequences of displacement deserve to be recognized as stakeholders before decisions are made that will shape neighborhood conditions for another year and a half.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to a transparent public process.

Sincerely,

John Bove, Resident
Laurel Coco, Resident
Catharine Burhenne-Sanderson, Resident
David Sanderson, Resident
David Baker, Resident
Yosh Asato, Resident
Ellie Korn, Resident
Jorge Palencia, Resident
Kathrin Felder, Resident
Romain Galois, Resident
David Nguyen, Resident
Veronica Benitez, Resident
Juan Gallardo, Resident
Marcia Ruiz, Resident
Roger Ruiz, Resident
Ena Ruiz, Resident
Nora Olivares, Resident
Daniel Garcia, Resident
Ivania Gutierrez, Resident
Enaisa Gutierrez, Resident
Michele Boscia, School Parent

(Full Signatory List To Follow)

Request for Displacement Analysis Prior to Extension of Capp Street and Shotwell Street Traffic Restrictions

To the SFMTA Board of Directors and the Board of Supervisors:

cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie, Supervisor Jackie Fielder, Fielder Staff, Sasha Goana, Julie B Kirschbaum (SFMTA), Andrea Buffa (SFMTA), Brooke Jenkins, Sean Perdomo, Steven Betz, Our Neighbors

We are writing regarding the proposed eighteen-month [extension of the Capp Street and Shotwell Street traffic restrictions scheduled for consideration by the SFMTA Board of Directors on Tuesday, June 16](#).

Before extending these measures, we believe the City should answer a fundamental question:

What assessment has been conducted to understand their impacts on the surrounding neighborhood?

The original traffic restrictions were implemented to address serious and well-documented conditions on Capp Street and later on Shotwell Street. Many residents on those blocks understandably sought relief, and many likely experienced it.

However, relief on one block is not the same as resolution.

Prior to installation of the Shotwell barriers, residents on surrounding blocks repeatedly warned City officials that activity would likely shift north into adjacent residential areas unless a broader corridor strategy accompanied the project (See illustration). Those warnings were provided to elected officials, city departments, and public safety leadership before implementation. [Please see an example message our group shared](#).

The City proceeded without conducting any public displacement analysis and without engaging many of the blocks most likely to be affected.

In his October 2024 SFMTA presentation, senior traffic engineer Bryant Woo justified the Shotwell project largely on conditions created by displacement from the Capp Street restrictions, specifically around sex trade activity. Yet during the same proceedings, the City maintained there was no evidence that the new barriers would similarly displace activity onto surrounding blocks, despite concerns raised by nearby residents. **If displacement was foreseeable enough to justify the Shotwell barriers, it is difficult to understand why displacement impacts on neighboring blocks were not treated as a foreseeable consequence requiring analysis.**

Illustration shared with city departments prior to the 11/1/24 review



Since then, residents on surrounding blocks have experienced exactly the type of displacement that was predicted. Open-air solicitation, late-night vehicle circulation, noise, intimidation, sanitation impacts, and associated quality-of-life issues have increasingly affected blocks that were not part of the original intervention area. Additionally, the traffic amendments have concentrated circulation onto already strained streets like 18th Street, creating a sustained physical traffic burden.

The City's outreach was focused primarily on the blocks receiving the intervention. We are unaware of any comparable effort to identify, engage, or assess the blocks most likely to absorb displacement impacts.

As the City considers an eighteen-month extension, those residents still appear to be absent from the outreach process.

This raises a larger concern.

If the City is prepared to extend a temporary intervention for another eighteen months, what evidence has been collected regarding its broader neighborhood impacts? What outreach has been conducted with adjacent blocks? What metrics are being used to evaluate success? How is displacement being measured?

Equally important, how are the interests of vulnerable women involved in the street sex trade being considered when activity is simply pushed from one location to another?

These are not arguments against the barriers. They are questions about responsible public policy.

No intervention should be considered successful simply because a problem becomes less visible in one location. Success requires understanding where the activity went, who absorbed the impacts, and whether overall conditions improved.

If the City believes the barriers have been successful, it should be able to demonstrate that success through data, outreach, and public engagement. If no such analysis exists, extending the program first and studying its impacts later reverses the normal order of responsible policymaking.

Before approving an eighteen-month extension, we respectfully request that the City publicly disclose:

1. Any displacement analysis that has been conducted regarding the impacts of the Capp and Shotwell restrictions on surrounding blocks.
2. The geographic area included in the City's outreach efforts and the rationale used to define affected stakeholders.
3. The criteria and metrics being used to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention.
4. Any plans to assess impacts on adjacent residential blocks, businesses, schools, and public spaces.

Residents who have absorbed the consequences of displacement deserve to be recognized as stakeholders before decisions are made that will shape neighborhood conditions for another year and a half.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to a transparent public process.

Sincerely,

John Bove, Resident

Laurel Coco, Resident

Catharine Burhenne-Sanderson, Resident

David Sanderson, Resident

David Baker, Resident

Yosh Asato, Resident

Ellie Korn, Resident

Jorge Palencia, Resident

Kathrin Felder, Resident

Romain Galois, Resident

David Nguyen, Resident

Veronica Benitez, Resident

Juan Gallardo, Resident

Marcia Ruiz, Resident

Roger Ruiz, Resident

Ena Ruiz, Resident

Nora Olivares, Resident

Daniel Garcia, Resident

Ivania Gutierrez, Resident

Enaisa Gutierrez, Resident

Michele Boscia, School Parent

(Full Signatory List To Follow)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Suggestion: Reduce Sudden High-Decibel Siren Onset to Protect Pedestrian Hearing
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 2:04:48 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding emergency vehicles.

Regards,

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

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

From: George Soler <gsoler415@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 1:26 PM
To: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; FireAdministration, FIR (FIR) <fireadministration@sfgov.org>; Lacocque, Jeremy (FIR) <jeremy.lacocque@sfgov.org>; Press, DEM (DEM) <dempres@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Suggestion: Reduce Sudden High-Decibel Siren Onset to Protect Pedestrian Hearing

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

Two days ago while waiting at a crosswalk I nearly had my eardrums blown by the abrupt

start of the siren of an SFFD paramedic truck waiting next to me at a stoplight. It was painful and I'm still dealing with the effects. At close range, these sirens can cause true and permanent hearing damage.

If these sirens were designed to start at a lower decibel level and ramp up to the nominal strength in 2-3 seconds it would allow enough time for people nearby to cover their ears and protect their hearing.

Please consider whether a very short automatic siren onset ramp, perhaps 2–3 seconds, could reduce close-range hearing shock to pedestrians without reducing emergency vehicle detectability or compliance with California Title 13 siren performance requirements.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

-George Soler

7 Hallam St. 3A
San Francisco, CA. 94103

(415) 8673290

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Garbage dumping in the streets !!
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 1:24:02 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding illegal refuse dumping.

Regards,

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

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

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

From: Holly Gustafson <hollygberry@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 8:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Garbage dumping in the streets !!

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

Gentlepersons...

I just heard an S/F Supervisor on the news discussing dumping. I have heard much the same story from other cities and just don't see how our representatives can't figure this out !

Take a GOOD, LONG look at what is being discarded ! You should now know who and where they live for most of it ! I know I pay about \$70 a month in Sonoma County

for relatively small residential-sized cans (garage, compost, recycle). For many that is out of the question.

And then we must consider the used furniture, mattresses, bikes, etc. that are not put in regular residential cans anyway ! I submit the less fortunate among us have the most secondhand big stuff that they eventually must “toss”! And what indeed are the fees for same if taken to the dump? Sonoma County has some free large item pick-ups at residences. Nice idea but I think you must have garbage service to apply !

The takeaway here is that the less able are creating a load they cannot carry or dispose of properly !

Will your punishing fees really be collected from those same people?

Most earnestly,

Holly Gustafson
Camp Meeker

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: NOPA/Western Addition: Our Neighborhood Cannot Afford to Lose More Essential Services
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 1:26:13 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the North of Panhandle and Western Addition Districts.

Regards,

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

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

From: Bethy Muzzy <bethy25@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 1:46 PM
To: info@missionlocal.com; [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>](mailto:Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>); EthicsandIntegrity@petsmart.com; MediaRelations@petsmart.com; [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>](mailto:Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>](mailto:Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>); customersupport@savemart.com
Subject: NOPA/Western Addition: Our Neighborhood Cannot Afford to Lose More Essential Services

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

Hello,

I am deeply concerned by the loss of essential businesses and the apparent lack of urgency from City leaders in addressing the consequences.

The closure of Lucky on McAllister, the impending closure of PetSmart at City Center on Masonic, and the ongoing disappearance of pharmacies are creating a service desert in our neighborhood. These are not simply businesses—they are critical resources that residents rely on every day.

What is particularly troubling about the PetSmart closure is that pet parents received virtually no notice. Many of us entrust our beloved pets to the exceptional employees at the San Francisco Day Camp, who have built relationships with our animals over the years. Their dedication and care have made this location much more than a retail store.

These closures also mean the loss of jobs. Hardworking employees who have served this community are facing uncertainty, and their livelihoods deserve consideration. A thriving neighborhood depends on both the services businesses provide and the people they employ.

Our community includes Mercy Terrace, home to many seniors who rely on nearby grocery stores, pharmacies, and public transportation. Meanwhile, the 6-Haight/Parnassus bus line is continually threatened with cuts. Reducing transit options while essential services disappear only further isolates older adults, families, and those without cars.

I have reached out to the Mayor's Office, My Supervisor, and PetSmart Corporate, and the lack of meaningful action or even acknowledgment is alarming. San Francisco frequently speaks about supporting seniors, preserving neighborhoods, and building community, yet these promises ring hollow when residents are left without access to basic necessities. The only people that seem to matter in San Francisco are the extremely impoverished or the perpetual pandering to the wealthy.

I urge the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and City agencies to stop treating these closures as isolated events. They represent a broader erosion of neighborhood infrastructure and quality of life. We need a plan to preserve grocery stores, pharmacies, pet services, and reliable transit before more resources disappear. The only grocery stores are Bi-Rite, Falletti's, Whole Foods, and Trader Joe's, all of which are expensive.

Neighborhoods are built by the people who live and work in them. Without action, we risk losing both.

Beth Muzzy

Resident of NOPA/Western Addition

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Public Library
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 8:53:10 AM
Attachments: [0427_001.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached regarding the San Francisco Public Library.

Regards,

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

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

My public statement to the S.F. Board of Supervisors
on Tuesday, June 2nd, 2026

" Thank You " for this opportunity for us, the citizenry
to speak. My name is Bill Lo. I am an artist, a graduate of
the Yale School of Art, a long time resident of the S.F. Bay Area.
I love San Francisco !

I am an artist who, owing to this time of political,
environmental, and " existential " crisis , felt the need to
pivot to social justice activism.



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUN 16 AM08:47

I am here to make a formal, if belated complaint about S.F.PUBLIC LIBRARY's "S F AI WEEK " of 12/11-17 of just this year past. Concerned citizens ask that the Pubic Library, and by extension, the City of San Francisco funding it, act more responsibly in providing information to the public not only in regard to the " UP " side, but as well, the " DOW-N " side to Artificial Intelligence. The AI race is taking place here in S.F. We are concerned about the harms and future harms of this e-merging technology that experts in the field of AI including heads of AI companies developing this technology are warning us about . Human ex-tinction due to AI is a distinct possibility, if not a likely probability.

The S F Public Library's promoting

" SF AI WEEK " showed dire Civic Irresponsibility.'

Bill Lo

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Daylighting Issue
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 8:35:21 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding daylighting.

Regards,

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

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

From: Thomas Luchini <thomasluchini@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 10:19 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Daylighting Issue

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

Some of the so-called “daylighting” red curbs that are being implemented—at least in Mission Terrace—are truly absurd. And then there are corners that *aren't* being daylighted but *should* be. Is anyone actually giving any thought to this? Or is the idea to keep SFMTA employees on payroll with busy work? It's no wonder they have a huge budget deficit!

The City needs to pass an ordinance allowing for common sense discretion (and historical *facts*) as to which intersections could benefit from daylighting and by how many feet.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS-District09 Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Parking
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 8:32:03 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding parking.

Regards,

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

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

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

From: Bruce Sanchez <refugiobruce@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 11:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Parking

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

I'm a Resident of District 9. There has to be a better way than eliminating 14,000 parking spaces in the city. California law allows for plenty of exceptions, and a one-size-fits-all approach is not realistic. Please bring some common sense into this, as 20-foot parking-free zones on every intersection will destroy what's left of livability in this city.

Bruce Sanchez

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Oppose Agenda Items #6 and #7 for 6/17/2026
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 10:25:02 AM

Hello,

Please see below communications regarding **File Nos. 260603** and **260604**:

[File No. 260603](#): Municipal Elections Code - Ballot Argument Fees

[File No. 260604](#): Municipal Elections Code - Voter Information Pamphlets

Regards,

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

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

From: todd greenberg <hedgewell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 10:04 AM
To: Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Oppose Agenda Items #6 and #7 for 6/17/2026

Re: Oppose Agenda Items #6 and #7
on today's (6/17/2026) Agenda

Dear Clerk Jalipa, Budget and Appropriations Committee Members: Supervisors: Connie Chan, Matt Dorsey, and Danny Sauter, and SF Board of Supervisors,

I, and many others, oppose the Democracy limiting and denying proposals contained in Agenda Items #6 and #7.

We urge the Committee Members to vote "NO" on these bad idea democracy limiting Agenda Items, which will limit fair presentation of Ballot Measures and Statements unnecessarily by significantly increasing costs and by placing sole discretion of voter read content in a single person's power.

There is no proper justification for these actions.

A cost savings argument has been made ,but any theoretical cost savings has not been fully contemplated, properly elucidated, or equally applied as elsewhere throughout the city's decision making processes .

Even If there were to be any actual cost savings, those theoretical savings would not possibly justify the resulting limitations and thwarting of the City's democratic voting processes.

Should these Agenda Items be passed, they will likely be challenged legally at great cost to SF and as more persons become aware of the democracy limiting actions, cause bad press for the City of San Francisco.

I appeal to your sense of democratic process fairness for all your constituents.

Please vote NO today on Agenda Items #6 and #7.

Sincerely Concerned,

Todd Greenberg

6. 260603 [Municipal Elections Code - Ballot Argument Fees]

Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Municipal Elections Code to increase the filing fee and per-word

fee for paid ballot arguments.

6/1/26; RECEIVED.

6/2/26; ASSIGNED to the Budget and Appropriations Committee.

6/7/26; NOTICED.

6/14/26; NOTICED.

7. 260604 [Municipal Elections Code - Voter Information Pamphlets]

Sponsor: Mayor

Ordinance amending the Municipal Elections Code to remove the requirement that the Department of Elections publish the legal text of ballot measures in the Voter Information

Pamphlet sent to voters before each election, and to allow the Director of Elections to determine the format of the Voter Information Pamphlet without the Ballot Simplification

Committee's approval.

6/1/26; RECEIVED.

6/2/26; ASSIGNED to the Budget and Appropriations Committee.

6/12/26; REFERRED TO DEPARTMENT.

This email message is intended only for the named recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. Taking notice of this message by third parties is not permitted. Any review, dissemination, copying, printing or other use of this e-mail by persons or entities other than the addressee is prohibited. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by return e-mail and delete this message and any attachments from any computer, cloud storage, or other method of receipt or storage. Any unauthorized use or dissemination of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: [Bullock, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 21 Letters Regarding Cigarettes
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:11:43 PM
Attachments: [21 Letters Regarding Plastic Cigarette Filters.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 21 letters regarding the banning of plastic cigarette filters.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Annie Hu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 12:11:04 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Annie Hu
anniemhu@gmail.com
830 Hyde St
CA, California 94109

From: [Mavis Read-Kinney](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 1:14:33 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Mavis Read-Kinney
mavisreadkinney@gmail.com
2551 31st Ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Madeleine Robins](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 2:55:07 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Madeleine Robins
madrobins@gmail.com
548 Arlington Street
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Terrence Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 4:46:04 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Terrence Wong
twong211@gmail.com
1470 39th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Will Hassinger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 5:01:01 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Will Hassinger
will@willbuilt.com
237 , 18th.ave.
San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Lara Lavinsky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:53:59 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Lara Lavinsky
nominlavinsky@gmail.com
3321 Vicente st
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Dasith Wanasinghe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:45:07 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Dasith Wanasinghe
dassithwanasinghe7@gmail.com
3035 Virginia Ave S
Saint Louis Park, Minnesota 55426

From: [J BICKERS](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:57:04 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

J Bickers/SF
Refuse-Refuse Volunteer

J BICKERS

sfkoolbrit@gmail.com
680 Mission Street-22D
San Francisco, California 94105

From: [Stacie Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:13:51 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Stacie Smith
ssmithcrna@gmail.com
2131 44th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94116-1532

From: [No'eau Kamakani](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 5:48:10 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

No'eau Kamakani
nkamakani@gmail.com
3066 25TH ST
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Olivia Cowley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 7:29:49 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Olivia Cowley
omcowley82@gmail.com
646 Funston Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Allie Sullberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 12:34:38 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Allie Sullberg
fascia_rebuke.1f@icloud.com
2936 Anza St Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Cece Chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 12:37:49 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Cece Chen
chencalvin99@gmail.com
1941 15th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Priscilla Giler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 1:22:06 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Priscilla Giler
priscilla.lpz@gmail.com
1546 Baker St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Kristine Andarmani](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 3:37:23 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kristine Andarmani
kristine.andarmani@gmail.com
35995 Fremont Blvd.
Fremont , California 94536

From: [Robert Neal](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Banning Plastic Cigarette Filters Should be Non-Contentious
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 9:06:56 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to you as a casual smoker. I love a cigarette or two after a night of drinking just as much as the next guy, but I don't want nor need plastic filters in my ciggies. I urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

(by the way, also avoid banning smoking in more places. as a scientist, I can assure you the worries about second hand smoke are greatly exaggerated and the science doesn't support banning cigarettes in, for example, outdoor patios)

Back to the topic, each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Robert Neal
me@robertjneal.com
338 Divisadero St
SF, California 94117

From: [Michael Mangner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 1:43:55 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Michael Mangner
mjman5775@gmail.com
2340 Fulton St
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Angela Summers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 5:39:38 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Angela Summers
summersangela284@gmail.com
81 9th Street, 207
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Jen Kiatta](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 8:42:43 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jen

Jen Kiatta
jkiatta@gmail.com
11 Littlefield Terrace

San Francisco, California 94107

From: [Trynne Miller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 4:14:44 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Trynne Miller
trynnemiller@gmail.com
1220 Diamond Street
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Eliot Gillum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 1:46:27 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Eliot Gillum
eliotgillum@hotmail.com
451 Crestmont Drive
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding File No. 260132
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:04:21 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding File No. 260132.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 Letters regarding [File No. 260132](#): Planning Code - Transit-Oriented Residential Development.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Eli Halloran](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: District 9 Residents Oppose SB 79 Alternative Plan Exemptions
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 6:57:22 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing as a resident of District 9 to express my strong opposition to the city's SB 79 Alternative Plan, which the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved earlier this month. I am deeply concerned that this plan exempts swaths of our neighborhood from increased housing capacity.

All parts of District 9 should be able to benefit from new housing. This plan delays desperately needed housing in areas with excellent transit access along Mission Street's BART and Muni corridors. Our neighborhood has some of the best transit infrastructure in the city, and it's inconceivable that we would shield it from the very housing that SB 79 was designed to enable.

The claim that this exemption protects low-income residents is backwards. Delaying housing construction near transit will only make our housing crisis worse, driving up rents and displacing even more residents. The best way to prevent displacement is to build enough housing so that people aren't competing desperately for too few homes.

I urge you to reconsider this Alternative Plan and allow SB 79's transit-oriented development standards to apply to all of District 9 immediately. Our neighborhood is ready to welcome new neighbors.

Sincerely,
Eli Halloran

Eli Halloran
eli@halloran.net
150A San Carlos St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: [Mario Guerrieri](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: District 9 Residents Oppose SB 79 Alternative Plan Exemptions
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 7:22:11 PM

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

Board of Supervisors Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing as a resident of District 9 to express my strong opposition to the city's SB 79 Alternative Plan, which the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved earlier this month. I am deeply concerned that this plan exempts swaths of our neighborhood from increased housing capacity.

All parts of District 9 should be able to benefit from new housing. This plan delays desperately needed housing in areas with excellent transit access along Mission Street's BART and Muni corridors. Our neighborhood has some of the best transit infrastructure in the city, and it's inconceivable that we would shield it from the very housing that SB 79 was designed to enable.

The claim that this exemption protects low-income residents is backwards. Delaying housing construction near transit will only make our housing crisis worse, driving up rents and displacing even more residents. The best way to prevent displacement is to build enough housing so that people aren't competing desperately for too few homes.

I urge you to reconsider this Alternative Plan and allow SB 79's transit-oriented development standards to apply to all of District 9 immediately. Our neighborhood is ready to welcome new neighbors.

Sincerely,

Mario Guerrieri
mario@guerrieri.codes
150A San Carlos St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 31 Letters Regarding File No. 260442
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:12:25 PM
Attachments: [31 Letters Regarding File No. 260442.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 31 letters regarding **File No. 260442:**

Resolution authorizing the Sheriff's Office to contract with the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project (SF Pretrial) for Pretrial Services for a three year period from July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2029, for a contract total not to exceed amount of \$22,532,145, with two one-year options to extend.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Allegra Dimperio](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Preserve SF Pretrial funding
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 12:20:22 PM

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

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

From: [Ben Turchiarelli](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 1:38:15 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer. Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future. Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Benjamin Turchiarelli

From: [Spencer Shubert](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 2:26:37 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Spencer

--

Spencer Shubert
415-233-0455

From: [Catherine Terry](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; davidm
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 3:42:10 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely cost-effective public safety programs in the city and its success is well evidenced. 93% safety rate. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023— at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale and backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. **There is no legal mandate for this transfer.**

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Catherine

Hates Valley Resident

From: [Jessica](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 4:55:08 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Jessica

From: [Melissa Belbahri](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 5:05:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Melissa Belbahri

From: [Gorav Kalyan](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:15:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
[Your name]

From: [Nibha Akireddy](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 6:20:44 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Nibha Akireddy

From: [VRoy Lefcourt](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 8:19:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
V.Roy Lefcourt

From: [Rebecca Young](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Please don't fix what is not broken
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 9:51:30 PM

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

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

As a 40 year practitioner at the Hall of Justice in San Francisco (19 years as a deputy public defender) I have survived the administrations of five District Attorneys, four APD Chiefs and countless presiding judges, I solemnly swear that Pretrial Services (PTS) under David Mauroff's leadership **is the best mechanism for ensuring that the majority of our clients make their court dates and get directed to therapy and ancillary services that help break the cycle of drug addiction, homelessness and jail.**

There is no question that drug and alcohol addiction combined with mental health impairment is the 1-2 punch that lands nearly 2/3 of our clients in jail. Drug addiction can be a nearly impenetrable iron curtain - dealing with an addicted client means being on a roller coaster. But, I've seen clients decide to get off the roller coaster with the firm guidance of PTS providers.

The service providers at PTS are trained to offer firm guidance, but with compassion. They are effective and it is possible to reach a PTS staffer by phone. Imagine that! Based on everything we have learned in the last 20 years about human behavior and motivation to change, compassion is more effective than incarceration for low-level offenders - and that is PTS's population, by and large.

While APD officers serve an important function for the courts, they are sworn peace officers with powers of arrest (punishment) and can impose severe sanctions not limited to incarceration. I have seen APD officers INSIST on fines and fees against homeless people. I've seen them ask for 5 days jail when a client misses a court date, when what that person probably needs is a hot meal, a shower and bus fare. Asking APD to supervise and manage an out of custody population who they only view as lawbreakers will lead to *chaos*.

Obviously, the public is not being told the reason for this Machiavellian move to transfer PTS to APD because on the surface it makes zero sense.

This is a move based on something other than sound public policy, efficiency and fiscal responsibility.

Please preserve SF Pretrial Services by approving their contract and maintaining their vital services to a very vulnerable population. I pray that the right thing happens here.

Respectfully,
Rebecca Susan Fengyi Young
Attorney at Law
SBN 121179

From: [Hanna Rachel Gerry](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:09:44 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Hanna

From: [Victoria Bernhart](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2026 10:59:34 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Victoria Bernhart

From: [Howard](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: SAVE PRETRAIL DIVERSION PROGRAM
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 7:05:16 AM

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

SAVE PRETRIAL DIVERSION PROGRAM

TO: Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and Court Judicial Leadership

RE: SUPPORT AND SAVE SF PRETRAIL DIVERSION PROGRAM

Since 2007, as a lead adjudicator for the first SF Community Courts and current Neighborhood Courts, I have been witness to the effectiveness of the Pretrial Diversion Program---and its continual evolution adapting to changing needs and times.

In no small part, due to the Pretrial Diversion Program's effective staff and resources, have I stayed active in Neighborhood Courts.

The alternatives to the regular court system have changed people's lives. Personal testimony and data highlight such transformational interventions.

Best Regards, Howard Wong, AIA

From: [Annie Lin](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 8:01:42 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Annie

Annie Lin (she/they)
annie.yin.lin@gmail.com

From: [Rachel Cooke](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 9:43:55 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,

Rachel Cooke
Inner Sunset Resident

From: [Claire Palmquist](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:08:34 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Claire

From: [Karen Hernández](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:38:43 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Karen Hernandez
Former resident of SF, now based in Anaheim CA
(213) 422-3630

From: cookedy@yahoo.com
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:44:55 AM

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

Dear Supervisor, I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer. Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint and will cost more money in the future. Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing. Thank you, Dr. Deanna Cooke

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

From: [Rvaughn576](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 1:45:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
Rashaun Vaughn

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Andrew Pospeshil](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 2:27:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract at the June 12 budget hearing.

Thank you,
[Your name]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Paige Thomson](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 4:27:48 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

Today, June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard:
<https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/>

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
Paige Thomson, OTR/L
ott-sf.org

From: [Abbreail Navarro](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Friday, June 12, 2026 7:27:13 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard:
<https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/>

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
[Your name]

From: [Helen Song](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Opposition to Dismantling SF Pretrial Diversion
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 10:38:43 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

As a victims' rights attorney that works with survivors of human trafficking, I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard:
<https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/>

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
Helen Song

From: [Cera Culbert](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mekuar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Haish, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Trager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macle, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejov, Benil \(BOS\)](#); [Gabona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fisher, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tim \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [camilaj@sfpretial.org](#); [gavdm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 11:33:51 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard: https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/_https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/_YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bz05NzAzM2NmYmMyNmFhOWEzMzUyNTZlT0MDVkyWRhMjo3OmU0YzE6MGRmMmQ1MDU0ZWU0N2FmN2EwYzclOGUzNzg1NDJjNzgxOWZlOTkyODdiMGE0Y2RjMWI2MTMwVjAzYzhNWU5YTPwOIQ6TG

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
Sarah Lynn Culbert

From: [Amanda Tan](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2026 8:00:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard:
<https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/>

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
Amanda

From: [Braden Neal](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tia \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejow, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Garcia, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fisher, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, THT \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); [ramiaj@sfpretrial.org](#); [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 9:52:36 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard:

https://url.lavanan.click/v2/r01/___https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzplOD44ZTc2ODY5ZDUxZGU0MWH1MTU1ZDUyNThZTZmZDc3OmU1YjM6YTZkY2M0MmU1YWVmM2E0ZTIhZW5kNzVjNmMwNjA4N2U5NmM2NGEzZGE3OTJhMzg0YjM2MTViNjU4YzllOGExMTpwOjQ6TG

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
[Your name]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Lupe Velez](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 9:59:32 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard: <https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/>

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer. Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future. Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,

Lupe Velez

From: [Elana Muroff](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpretrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2026 10:05:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I work in San Francisco and I am writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard:
<https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/>

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
Elana Muroff

From: mikeycube1391@gmail.com
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Monday, June 15, 2026 9:25:30 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial. On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard: <https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/> [SF](#)

Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer. Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future. Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
Michael Newman

From: [Alison Purvis](#)
To: [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: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Macfie, William \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Tiff \(BOS\)](#); [Jessica Cen \(BOS\)](#); camilaj@sfpreatrial.org; [davidm](#)
Subject: Don't dismantle SF's most uniquely effective public safety program
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 9:16:51 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to approve the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project's contract and deny Adult Probation's budget request to eliminate SF Pretrial.

On June 12, the San Francisco Sheriff publicly refuted the Superior Court's attempt to undermine SF Pretrial's data, noting that the court's analysis failed to use national standards. The Sheriff's letter to city officials is reported in the SF Standard:
<https://sfstandard.com/2026/06/12/sf-court-pretrial-diversion-metrics-sheriff/>

SF Pretrial is one of the most uniquely effective public safety programs in the city. 93% rate of no new charges while enrolled. 96% court appearance rate across 19,000+ court dates. 630,394 jail bed days saved in 2023 — at a fraction of the cost of comparable probation. It is a national model, one of a small handful of independent, community-based pretrial programs in the country at this scale — backed by the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

AB 102 includes a named carve-out allowing San Francisco to contract with the existing pretrial services office — not a probation department. There is no legal mandate for this transfer.

Funding Adult Probation expands the city's budget deficit and government footprint — and will cost more money in the future.

Please vote to preserve SF Pretrial's contract.

Thank you,
Alison Purvis

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 4 Letters Regarding File No. 260565
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 12:07:14 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding File No. 260565.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters regarding **File No. 260565**:

Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., to consider the Department of Public Health's budget reducing medical and health care services provided by the City and County of San Francisco for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2026-2027 and 2027-2028, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code, Section 1442.5(a) (The Beilenson Act).

Regards,

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

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

From: [Daniel Grobani](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please restore youth clinic funding
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 11:33:38 AM

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing as a San Francisco resident to urge you to restore funding for the Cole Street Youth Clinic and the Michael Baxter Larkin Street Youth Clinic, two community health programs that serve some of our city's most vulnerable young people.

These clinics have been part of the fabric of San Francisco for over 30 years. They provide integrated medical care, reproductive health services, and mental health support to young people who are homeless, unhoused, undocumented, LGBTQ+, and otherwise marginalized — young people who have nowhere else to turn and who will not navigate the adult health system on their own.

What makes these clinics unique is that they are embedded inside community organizations — Huckleberry Health Center and Larkin Street Youth Services — where young people can access case management, food, housing support, and employment resources all in one place, on the same day, without having to travel across a city they can barely afford. There are no other clinics like these in San Francisco. Once they close, they are gone.

San Francisco prides itself on being a city that takes care of its most vulnerable residents. Closing these clinics sends the opposite message — that when budgets get tight, it is the young people with the least who pay the price.

I am asking you to use the add-back process to restore funding for Cole Street and Larkin Street Youth Clinics. This is a small investment with an enormous return — in human dignity, in community health, and in the kind of city San Francisco wants to be.

Thank you for your service to our community and for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Daniel Grobani
San Francisco

From: [Sophia Padilla](#)
To: [Sophia Padilla](#)
Subject: Oppose the Closure of CHPY Clinics and Reevaluate the Underutilization Narrative
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 1:43:17 PM
Attachments: [CHPY Staff HC Mtg Presentation.pptx](#)

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing as a behavioral health clinician, City employee, and subject-matter expert in Transitional Age Youth (TAY) mental health to urge you to oppose the planned closure of the CHPY clinics, the Michael Baxter Larkin St Clinic, and the Cole St Youth Clinic.

Attached is a presentation by CHPY staff for the Health Commission Meeting in May that outlines many of the concerns raised by staff, patients, and community members throughout this process. I hope you will take the time to review it and carefully examine the assumptions being used to justify these closures.

A central argument supporting the closure of these clinics has been that they are "underutilized." As someone who has worked within this system, I believe that characterization is both incomplete and misleading.

For years, these clinics have operated under chronic staffing shortages and limited resources. Vacant positions have remained unfilled, staff have been stretched thin, and our ability to provide services has been constrained by factors outside of our control. When a clinic lacks adequate staffing, it inevitably has fewer available appointments, reduced outreach capacity, and diminished ability to serve the community at its full potential.

It is therefore inaccurate to view lower service numbers as evidence that a clinic is unnecessary. What is being presented as underutilization is more accurately the result of underinvestment.

The question should not be, "Why aren't these clinics serving more people?" The question should be, "What could these clinics accomplish if they were adequately staffed and supported?"

Despite these challenges, CHPY staff have continued to provide essential services to some of San Francisco's most vulnerable residents. The clinics serve individuals who often face significant barriers to accessing care, including Transitional Age Youth navigating mental health challenges, community members experiencing instability, and patients who depend on trusted relationships with their providers.

Closing these clinics does not eliminate the need for these services. It simply shifts the burden elsewhere while disrupting established care, reducing access points, and

increasing the likelihood that vulnerable individuals will fall through the cracks.

I am also concerned that the discussion has focused heavily on utilization metrics while giving insufficient consideration to the broader impacts on patients, staff, and communities. Healthcare access cannot be evaluated solely through spreadsheets and appointment counts. We must also consider continuity of care, community trust, cultural responsiveness, geographic accessibility, and the long-term costs of disrupting preventive behavioral health and medical services.

As the City continues to face difficult budget decisions, I respectfully ask that alternatives to closure be explored. Before permanently eliminating these community resources, I urge you to consider strategies that would strengthen clinic operations through adequate staffing, operational support, and targeted investment rather than reducing service capacity.

The decision to close these clinics will have lasting consequences for patients, families, staff, and the communities we serve. I hope the Board will carefully examine the underlying assumptions behind these closures and advocate for solutions that preserve access to care while addressing the City's fiscal challenges.

Thank you for your time, your service, and your consideration of this issue. I would be happy to discuss these concerns further or answer any questions regarding the impacts these closures will have on patients and the behavioral health system.

Sincerely,

Sophia Padilla, MA, LMFT
Behavioral Health Clinician
Michael Baxter Larkin St Clinic

--

Sophia Esperanza Padilla | she/ her/ hers
Licensed Marriage & Family Therapist #161898
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/sophiaepadilla



For Public Comment: CHPY Health Commission Presentation

May 18, 2026

DPH management has proposed to close our youth clinics this summer. They have incorrectly claimed the following:

“Underutilization”

Our CHPY clinics have been described as “underutilized”

- Larkin: 355 “Unique” Patients
- Cole: 257 “Unique” Patients

“Realignment of resources”

Our CHPY clinics are losing 5 FTE positions

- Nurse Practitioner
- Registered Nurse
- Behavioral Health Clinician (x2)
- Medical Evaluations Assistant

These positions have been **eliminated** within CHPY and staff has been “involuntarily reassigned”

“Seamless Transition”

The city has promised that staff and patients will experience a “seamless transition,” with little collaboration with the clinic and CBOs about what that might look like.

A Brief History of



COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH

We provide accessible medical care, mental health counseling, and sexual health services specifically designed for youth and young adults between the ages of 12 and 24.

CHPY was born out of a need for low-barrier youth-based services in San Francisco following the AIDS crisis and gaps in primary care.

We represent 30 years of partnership between the Department of Public Health, San Francisco Unified School District, and countless Community-Based Organizations across San Francisco.



Michael Baxter

CHPY Co-Founder and Youth Care
Visionary

Medical Services

Sexual & Reproductive Health (testing, treatment, education, referral); Urgent Care; Wound Care; etc.



Behavioral Health Services

Safe, confidential spaces for youth to receive mental health and substance abuse counseling; referral to psychiatry; crisis support



Partnerships with CBOs

Connection to case management, resources (housing, food, clothing, etc.), community engagement, job readiness

A Youth-Focused Model That Works

A Snapshot of Youth Priorities

130 young people in San Francisco between the ages of 12 – 25 contributed written and electronic surveys to share important health problems affecting youth in San Francisco, top needs that they and their family struggle to meet, what can help them improve their health.

Top Priorities

- **Mental Health Services/ Support Needs**
- **Access to Quality Care/ Affordable Care**
- **Substance Use Prevention/ Education**
- **Homelessness/ Safe & Affordable Housing Resources**

750 California youth aged 14-25 were surveyed online between April and June 2025.

94%

of Gen Z youth report frequent mental health challenges.

98%

of Gen Z youth report frequent mental health challenges.



25%

of those who report their mental health was poor are LGBTQ+.


Most

youth prefer face-to-face mental health care.

Michael Baxter Larkin St Clinic
in partnership with



Data collected in 2024-2025, through Coordinated Entry Assessments



- Loss of medical director after **4 months**
- Elimination of Medical Director, BH Supervisor. & Practice Manager Positions
- New OON policy implemented that increased barriers to accessing care
- Announcement of “reorganization”

COVID-19 Pandemic: Complete closure of CHPY clinics with all staff deployed to COVID emergency response sites.


All CHPY clinics closed during the pandemic with no concrete plan to get youth redirected to services. Only population to experience closures like this.

Between 2023-2026, CHPY has experienced 33 staff losses due to retirement, reassignment, or resignation.

• 7 BHCs	• 3 MEAs	★ 2 Medical Directors (within 1 year)
• 9 Providers (NP + MDs)	• 2 EWs	
• 5 Supervisors (EW, BH, + Practice Manager)	• 3 HWs	
	• 2 RNs	

COVID-19 & CHPY PATIENT ACCESS

Average Monthly Family Planning Visits, 03-05/19 vs 03-05/2020



35% vs 96%


Reduction in the average number of New Gen patients vs. Cole, Larkin, and Balboa patients combined who were seen for a family planning visit during the periods of March-May, 2019 and March-May, 2020.

Source, 2019 Data: Title X

Source, 2020 Data: New Gen Records



If Balboa, Larkin, and Cole Street Clinics had not closed due to COVID-19 activation, is it reasonable to assume that the reduction in monthly visit rates for these clinics might have been closer to that of New Generation Health Center? If yes, this would mean that only 7% of the youth who needed services during this time actually received them.



“Underutilized” or “Under Resourced” & “Unsupported”?

Frequent Staff Turnover

Frequent staff turnover means **loss of provider relationships, decreased reliability of clinic hours, decreased ability for CBO partners to connect patients, disruptions in care, and increased workload of remaining staff.**

Short-Staffing & Day-Of Clinic Closures

Due to **DPH’s inability to provide staff redundancy**, staff is often asked to provide “coverage” to other CHPY clinics, while home clinics function with reduced hours or experience same-day closures.

“Underutilization”

Without context, “underutilization” sounds like “no one is showing up”...


When really, **staff are forced to turn away patients** and refer patients outside of CHPY.

The Numbers Larkin

355 "Unique" Patients

VS.

An acknowledgement that youth-based services are structured around **relationships, building trust, and retention.**




Combined Medical and Behavioral Health Encounters (per year)

The Numbers Cole

257 "Unique" Patients

VS.

An acknowledgement that CHPY clinics have been **chronically understaffed** for 2+ years.




Combined Medical and Behavioral Health Encounters (per year)

Impacts of Our Work

In Spring 2025, SFDPH MCAH Family Planning Program conducted a patient satisfaction survey at all CHPY clinics, and the feedback was **overwhelming positive**.

Despite unstable clinic hours and inconsistent staffing, the staff that are present are dedicated to providing excellent youth care.



What closure would mean

Impacts to staffing, patients
served, and to the greater
community

Insert patient testimonial video
(pending Larkin approval)

Staff

When clinics close, we lose institutional knowledge that cannot be replaced

- Burnout
- Loss of specialized clinicians
- Reassignment away from expertise
- Recruitment/retention problems

Patients

When care is disrupted, patients don't just transfer—they disengage.

- Loss of trusted providers
- Disruption of continuity
- Increased disengagement
- Worsening psychiatric and medical outcomes

Community

When we disrupt care for the most vulnerable, the system does not save money—it shifts suffering.

- More ER utilization
- More psychiatric crises
- More hospitalizations
- Increased street instability
- Greater long-term costs

What does a “seamless transition” look like when...

Patients face barriers like:

- Housing instability
- Transportation challenges
- Mental health crises
- Distrust of large systems due to prior trauma

Disrupting established care relationships increases the risk of:

- Missed appointments
- Loss to follow-up
- Worsening mental health outcomes
- Increased emergency room utilization

Continuity of care requires a plan – not assumptions.



The closure of CHPY clinics doesn't just represent *a line item in a budget*, it represents the loss of **dedicated, specialized staff, CBO relationships** built on decades of advocacy, and **low-barrier accessible services** that *meet marginalized youth where they are*.

From: [Tonya Chaffee](#)
To: [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Keeping San Francisco youth clinics open and increasing revenue from billing
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 1:16:48 PM

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

Dear Mr. Mandelman and others on the Board of SF supervisors,

As a native San Franciscan, I have dedicated my career to serving the youth of this city. Since 1992, I have worked as a pediatrician in San Francisco, and since 1996 I have worked as an adolescent medicine specialist. I currently care for adolescents and young adults at San Francisco General Hospital. Over the years, I have become deeply familiar with the invaluable services provided by San Francisco's youth-serving clinics, now known as the Community Health Programs for Youth (CHPY) clinics. I have cared for many patients who have benefited from these programs and clinical services, and I am very concerned about the harm these closures would cause. These clinics must remain open.

It is important to note that Michael Baxter (Larkin), Cole Street, and many other CHPY clinics were closed for almost two years during the pandemic. There is ample evidence that youth suffered greatly during that period. The consequences included many young people not receiving substance use screening, assessment, and treatment, which is reflected in the widely recognized rise in overdoses and overdose deaths during and after the pandemic. In addition, significant adolescent and young adult mental health needs were not addressed, and this has resulted in a backlog for counseling and psychiatric services for all youth that is still impacting access to mental health services today. And because of the reduced access to primary care and many young people have not received timely preventive care including vaccines, and a noted decline in screening for sexually transmitted infections (STIs), with testing dropping from more than 1,400 annually before 2019 to fewer than 800 per year since. I serve as Co-Chair of the Black/African American Health Initiative Working Group on Sexually Transmitted Infections and am very familiar with these data. These are only some of the consequences of closing youth-serving clinics. If young people do not receive mental health and substance use treatment now, they will only develop more severe mental health and substance abuse problems as adults, requiring more services and resources from our city.

While I recognize the need for budget cuts within the Department of Public Health (DPH), I do not believe DPH leadership has adequately explained why these particular clinics

should close, nor have they fully accounted for the long-term human and financial costs of doing so. The stated rationale of “low patient volume” fails to reflect the reality of youth-serving clinics and ignores the management problems that have contributed to that low volume. Clinics that serve adolescents and young adults typically see fewer patients than clinics serving children or adults because visits often require more time to address complex medical, mental health, social, and psychosocial needs. That has long been my experience at San Francisco General Hospital, and it is consistent with what other adolescent and young adult providers report around the Bay Area and nationally.

In addition, since the pandemic, these clinics have not been adequately staffed. On some days, there is no clinician available to see patients, and the clinic must close. This is largely the result of constant turnover within the CHPY system, leaving the clinics chronically understaffed. I know this firsthand because I work in one of the CHPY clinics, New Generation Health Center, and we are often asked to see patients who cannot be seen elsewhere because another clinic site has closed. Even then, many patients cannot realistically travel across the city for follow-up care. The staffing instability reflects a broader management problem, not a lack of need. Most concerning, four medical directors for the CHPY clinics have been hired and resigned over the past six years, and there is currently no dedicated medical director overseeing the CHPY clinics. Instead, responsibility has been assigned to medical directors at other primary care sites who do not have specialized backgrounds in adolescent and young adult health. For these reasons, the lower patient volume should be understood as a consequence of systemic staffing and leadership failures—not as justification for closure.

At the same time, DPH leadership does not appear to have seriously explored ways to increase revenue by maximizing billing for clinical services that could help offset some of the budget cuts. I recently learned that I have been under billing the services I have provided for decades. Because billing revenue from our clinical services at San Francisco General Hospital goes directly into the City’s General Fund, this raises a significant concern: if I am only one of many physicians who have not been properly trained to bill for the full scope of care we provide, then substantial revenue may have been left uncollected. Before closing clinics that serve vulnerable youth as part of the budget cuts, DPH should first ensure that it is capturing the revenue already available through appropriate billing practices.

I hope that you and the other members of the Board of Supervisors will hold DPH leadership accountable for these issues and, most importantly, oppose the closure of these essential services for San Francisco’s young people.

Thank, you for taking the time to consider this information and I sincerely hope you and the other board of supervisors prevent the closure of these clinics and ensure the department of public health maximizes revenue through appropriate clinical billing

moving forward.

Sincerely

Tonya Chaffee MD, MPH
Adolescent Medicine Specialist

From: [Spencer Miller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please don't cut our youth clinics
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 9:44:51 AM

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

Dear friends,

Thank you for your service to San Francisco.

My name is Spencer and I'm a nurse working at the two clinics that are being closed. The Larkin Street Youth Services clinic and the Huckleberry Youth Center clinic. Whenever there are budget cuts, it's always the people that can't fight back that get the short end of the stick. Prop D would have fixed the budget shortfalls from Trump's tax cuts for the rich. Prop D would have asked for a tiny fraction of that money back to serve our city but Daniel Lurie, who's family owns a large part of one of the companies that would have been taxed here in SF, flooded the airwaves and internet against the proposition. It's self serving and disgusting.

I urge you to not cut funding for our clinics or lay off our workers. We've had enough of billionaires greed.

Thank you,
Spencer Miller RN

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 260565
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 3:07:47 PM
Attachments: [0430_001.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached regarding **File No. 260565**:

Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., to consider the Department of Public Health's budget reducing medical and health care services provided by the City and County of San Francisco for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2026-2027 and 2027-2028, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code, Section 1442.5(a) (The Beilenson Act).

Regards,

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

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



MEMBER ID#:

6300 Canoga Ave
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

AV 01 020529 68834H 50 A**5DGT
[Barcode]

To make the most of your benefits, create your account at blueshieldca.com/register

June 11, 2026

Dear BARRY PEARL,

Thank you for being a Blue Shield of California valued member. We are writing you with an important update to our network.

Effective 06/11/2026, BENJAMIN ROMICK's contract to provide care through your Medicare Advantage plan ended.

You can view all medical providers available to you at Medicare.gov. If you are on an HMO plan, you can reduce costs by choosing contracted providers by logging into your account on blueshieldca.com or using the *Find a doctor* tool at blueshieldca.com/FAD. You can also call Blue Shield Customer Care at (800) 776-4466 (TTY: 711) for help finding a new provider and information about specialty care referrals.

Right to Continued Care

We realize that when you are in a course of treatment, it is important not to interrupt your care. You may be eligible for continuation of covered services for an ongoing course of treatment under the same terms and conditions that applied before the contract termination date.

You can request continuation of covered services from a non-participating provider for the following conditions:

- an acute medical or behavioral health condition, including a maternal mental health condition,
- a serious chronic condition,
- a pregnancy, regardless of trimester, and postpartum care,
- a terminal illness,
- care of a newborn (0 to 36 months),

0205291/2



- inpatient care, or
- a scheduled non-elective surgery or procedure.

If you want to continue seeing your doctor until your current treatment plan ends, Customer Care can help you make a formal request for continuation of care coverage. All continuing care decisions will be made based on current Medicare guidelines.

This change will not affect your current benefits or your ability to receive necessary medical care. Your health care needs are important to us, and we are committed to providing you with exceptional service. In the event you have difficulties getting an appointment or receiving appropriate care, call Blue Shield Customer Care at (800) 776-4466 (TTY: 711) for assistance, 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., seven days a week.

Sincerely,

Blue Shield of California

Enclosures:

Nondiscrimination Notice

Multi-Language Insert

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Smoking Ban
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 11:37:16 AM
Attachments: [Smoking Ban letter 061526.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding **File No. 260361**:

Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit smoking in outdoor patios of bars and taverns; eliminate 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; and repeal suspended and superseded provisions regulating smoking in certain locations.

Regards,

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

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

From: Tina Aguirre <taguirre@castrolgbtq.org>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 5:51 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Garcia, Moises (MYR) <moises.garcia@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Marie, Sophie (BOS) <sophie.marie@sfgov.org>

Subject: Smoking Ban

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

Hi all,

Please see the attached letter from the advisory board of the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District.

Thank you,

Tina

Mx. Tina V. Aguirre
Cultural District Director
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District
pronouns: they/them/theirs



June 15, 2026

To San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Mayor of San Francisco:

The purpose of this letter is to share that the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District advisory board made the following decision with a unanimous vote at our Thursday, June 11, 2026 advisory board meeting.

"We motion to approve that the advisory board write a letter addressed to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor in support of the bar owners' requests to have the legislation tabled until a solution that is more economically sensible to the bars be identified."

This is in reference to Supervisor Myrna Melgar's proposed ordinance that would prohibit smoking on the outdoor patios of local bars and taverns.

Mission: The Castro LGBTQ Cultural District is committed to preserving, sustaining, and promoting the rich cultural legacy of the Castro and its significance to San Francisco's LGBTQ+ community and beyond. Our goals are to highlight the structures and sites important to our history; foster racial, ethnic, gender and cultural diversity among residents and businesses; and create a safe, beautiful, and inclusive space for LGBTQ+ and allied communities, to visit from around the world and call the Castro home. The Castro LGBTQ Cultural District is a fiscally sponsored project of the San Francisco Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Community Center.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tina V. Aguirre". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Tina V. Aguirre
Cultural District Director
Castro LGBTQ Cultural District

www.castro-lgbtq.org

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Post-Passage Report for BF No. 251116
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 2:56:05 PM
Attachments: [Post-Passage Report Jun2026 251116 Interim Controls CUA for Outdoor Laboratory Uses in PDR-1-G.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding Interim Zoning Controls – Conditional Use Authorization for Outdoor Laboratory Uses in PDR-1-G post-passage report.

Regards,

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

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

From: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 2:51 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Bullock, John (BOS) <john.bullock@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Post-Passage Report for BF No. 251116

For C-Pages and BOS-11 dist.

Thanks. JEC

From: Leon-Farrera, Malena (CPC) <malena.leon-farrera@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 4:55 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Flores, Veronica (CPC) <Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org>; Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Hamilton, Dylan (CPC) <dylan.hamilton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Post-Passage Report for BF No. 25116

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Please find attached the first Planning Department post-passage report for BF No. 251116, Interim Zoning Controls – Conditional Use Authorization for Outdoor Laboratory Uses in PDR-1-G.

Sincerely,

Malena Leon-Farrera, Senior Planner (she/her)
Housing | Community Planning Division
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7474 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

Date: June 16, 2026
Report Name: Interim Zoning Controls – Conditional Use Authorization for Outdoor Laboratory Uses in PDR-1-G
Case Number: 2025-011833PCA
Board File: 251116
Staff Contact: Malena Leon-Farrera, Senior Planner
malena.leon-farrera@sfgov.org, 628-652-7474
Reviewed by: Jeremy Shaw, Principal Planner
jeremyh.shaw@sfgov.org, 628-652-7449

Statement of Purpose

This report was prepared in response to a resolution (BF 251116), introduced by Supervisor Fielder on November 4, 2025, and enacted into law on December 16, 2025 (enactment number 600-25). The resolution imposed interim zoning controls for an 18-month period to require a Conditional Use authorization and specified findings for proposed Laboratory Uses that contain development and/or engineering laboratories that operate outdoors and/or outside of an enclosed structure in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair) District. The resolution also urged the Planning Department, with input from the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), to study whether additional controls would ensure that Laboratory Uses are consistent with the City's PDR goals.

The resolution directs the Planning Department to submit a written report to the Clerk of the Board six months after the effective date, and every six months thereafter the resolution is in effect. The final report, after 18 months, should describe the measures taken to alleviate the conditions that led to the adoption of resolution 600-25. Upon receipt of the report, a hearing is required pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.7(i) for the Land Use and Transportation Committee to consider this report.

Background

According to the adopted resolution, the interim controls were enacted in response to increasing community concerns regarding the proliferation of office-like spaces and other non-PDR uses within PDR-1-G districts. Community members, labor advocates, and neighborhood organizations raised concerns that certain land uses are functioning like offices, are in fact offices, or are otherwise inconsistent with the purpose of PDR districts.

As originally introduced, the interim zoning controls proposed requiring Conditional Use Authorization for all new Laboratory Uses within PDR-1-G districts. The proposal reflected concerns that some Laboratory Uses, while technically distinct from Office Uses under the Planning Code, may operate more like offices and contribute to the conversion of industrial space away from PDR activities.

During the legislative process, stakeholders expressed concern that applying interim controls to all Laboratory Uses would affect a broad range of emerging, scientific, research, testing, and prototyping activities that are permitted in PDR districts. In response, the interim controls were narrowed to require Conditional Use Authorization only for development and/or engineering laboratories conducted partially or wholly outside enclosed structures. This narrower approach sought to address potential land use compatibility concerns associated with outdoor laboratory operations while avoiding unnecessary impacts on indoor laboratory activities.

Against this backdrop, the resolution directs the Planning Department, in consultation with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, to study whether additional controls are necessary to ensure that Laboratory Uses remain consistent with the City's goals for PDR space.

PDR Background

PDR districts protect light industrial and other businesses from economic competition and operational conflict inherent with uses like housing, office and large-scale retail. PDR activities include manufacturing, warehousing and logistics, auto repair, food production and other producers. PDR districts also allow for business activities like construction contracting, job training and trade schools, testing laboratories, and research in emerging industries.

Historically, PDR land was concentrated throughout San Francisco's waterfront, where proximity to shipping and port facilities supported industrial activity. Today, the concentrations of PDR are in Bayview-Hunters Point, the Central Waterfront, Dogpatch, the Mission, and South of Market (SoMa).

PDR uses were a major economic driver in San Francisco since its founding and through the 1970s. At their peak, PDR industries accounted for approximately 165,000 jobs, representing roughly one-third of all jobs in the city. Since that time, suburbanization, globalization, and the limited availability of industrial land have contributed to a significant decline in both PDR businesses and employment. By 2018, PDR employment had fallen to approximately 103,000 jobs¹, representing 14 percent of the city's total employment.

In response to these trends, San Francisco adopted a series of policies aimed at preserving industrial activities and increasing the diversity of jobs in the City. In particular, the Eastern Neighborhoods plans created a series of PDR districts to protect the large, flexible spaces needed by light industrial businesses and emerging industries. These districts include:

¹ <https://sfplanning.org/news/2018-commerce-industry-inventory-report-published>

District	Purpose	% of Land Zoned
PDR-1-B (Buffer)	Buffer between neighborhoods and industry, primarily in Bayview Hunters Point. Allows for typically smaller producers and uses that are less intensive, with limited delivery activity	0.10%
PDR-1-D (Design)	Retain and encourage clusters of design-related businesses and lower-intensity PDR. May include furniture makers, home décor, industrial design, and prototyping.	0.17%
PDR-1-G (General)	Retain and encourage existing production, distribution, and repair activities and promote new business formation. More intensive than PDR-1-B and PDR-1-D, but less than PDR-2. Includes the above, as well as larger manufacturing, distribution, lab, and other uses.	0.88%
PDR-2 (Core Industrial)	Encourage the introduction, intensification, and protection of a wide range of light and contemporary industrial activities. Typically larger floorplates or open-air activities and uses that require trucking operations. Prohibits heaviest industrial uses.	2.63%

Planning for PDR in the Mission District

The Mission Area Plan (hereinafter “the Plan”) was adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process. At the time, policymakers were increasingly concerned about the loss of industrial land to housing, office development, biotechnology, and other mixed-use projects. To address these concerns, the Plan established policies intended to preserve industrial land while recognizing the growing role of the knowledge-based economy.

The Plan identified the "Knowledge Sector" as including industries that create value primarily through expertise and intellectual property, including information technology, digital media, publishing, professional services, financial services, environmental technologies, and life sciences and biotechnology.

Although the Plan recognized the economic importance of these industries and their ability to generate jobs and tax revenue, it also acknowledged that knowledge-sector uses functioning as office uses could increase the risk of displacing PDR and other activities. Accordingly, the Plan generally supported R&D uses that involve production, fabrication, testing, manufacturing, or other industrial components while recommending that office-only research activities be regulated similarly to traditional office uses.

By 2015, the Mission Action Plan 2020, and later Mission Action Plan 2030, also included strategies aimed at preserving PDR districts, protecting working-class jobs, and maintaining critical community-serving economic resources within the Mission. These concerns and conditions form much of the context for the interim controls in PDR-1-G districts, which comprise a substantial portion of the Mission District's industrial land. Particular attention has been directed toward Laboratory or other uses that resemble office operations.

Laboratory Uses

Planning Code Section 102 defines a Laboratory Use as follows:

Laboratory. *A Non-Retail Sales and Services Use intended or primarily suitable for scientific research. The space requirements of uses within this category include specialized facilities and/or built accommodations that distinguish the space from Office uses, Light Manufacturing, or Heavy Manufacturing. Examples of laboratories include the following:*

- (a) Chemistry, biochemistry, or analytical laboratory;*
- (b) Engineering laboratory;*
- (c) Development laboratory;*
- (d) Biological laboratories including those classified by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and National Institutes of Health (NIH) as Biosafety level 1, Biosafety level 2, or Biosafety level 3;*
- (e) Animal facility or vivarium, including laboratories classified by the CDC/NIH as Animal Biosafety level 1, Animal Biosafety level 2, or Animal Biosafety level 3;*
- (f) Support laboratory;*
- (g) Quality assurance/Quality control laboratory;*
- (h) Core laboratory; and*
- (i) Cannabis testing facility (any use requiring License Type 8—Testing Laboratory, as defined in California Business and Professions Code, Division 10).*

Laboratory Uses encompass a wide spectrum of activities and therefore present a range of land use and policy considerations. They are distinguished from other uses in that they are primarily focused on research or testing and contain specialized facilities for those purposes. Some laboratories have machinery and tools dedicated to product testing, prototyping, or development. Others may have wet labs dedicated to biotechnology research, food testing, or contamination analysis. Additionally, other labs are designed for research primarily on computers in environments that resemble office space.

Another factor is that research or laboratory uses can represent just one stage of a business that eventually evolves into a production or light manufacturing use. Many businesses innovating in the sustainability, energy, and food sectors develop in this way and ultimately create PDR jobs in San Francisco.

To get a sense of how many laboratory businesses are in San Francisco, the Planning Department filtered the San Francisco Business Registration database by the North American Industry Classification System, or NAICS code. NAICS is used by federal, state and local agencies to classify businesses by their primary industry and collect economic data. These codes are self-reported by the businesses. The Department used the following NAICS codes to identify laboratory businesses in San Francisco:

- 541713: Research and Development in Nanotechnology
- 541714: Research and Development in Biotechnology
- 541715: Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences

The results yielded 343 registered laboratory businesses, as shown in the following table.

Industry	Registered Lab Businesses
Biotechnology R&D	190
Physical/Engineering/Life Sciences R&D	152
Nanotechnology R&D	1

The businesses are distributed over 253 unique addresses. The majority of businesses are in District 6, with 111 businesses (32%) and District 10, with 84 (24%). By neighborhood, the Financial District/South Beach leads with 76, followed by Potrero Hill (62) and Mission Bay (36).

In a preliminary look at building permits between 2014-2026, 460 permits were sought on PDR-1-G-zoned parcels. 28 (6%) of these permits contain laboratory uses. 16 of the 28 (57%) permits involved a change of use. The projects show that laboratories in the PDR-1-G zone often contain other uses as well: of the 28 lab sites, 22 (79%) include PDR/industrial use and 14 (50%) include office use. The 28 lab sites are concentrated in District 10 (15 sites) and District 9 (11), with only 2 in District 6.

Outdoor Laboratory Uses

The emergence of new forms of technological research and development has also introduced operational characteristics that were not necessarily contemplated during the Eastern Neighborhoods process. The interim controls in this Case were in response to possible outdoor drone testing at 1960 Folsom Street. Building Permit Application No. 202512010636 proposed minor interior alterations and a change of use from Light Manufacturing to a Laboratory Use. The permit for indoor Laboratory Uses only was issued on February 23, 2026. Building Permit Application No. 202512010638 for the adjacent property at 1942 Folsom also proposed a change of use to a Laboratory Use.

The interim controls require Conditional Use Authorization for outdoor development and/or engineering Laboratory Uses in the PDR-1-G district, pending reports on the controls at six, 12 and 18 months. The Planning Department has not yet received a CUA required under these interim controls. The Resolution directs the Planning Department to evaluate whether additional controls are necessary and to evaluate what controls are best suited to ensure that Laboratory Uses in the PDR-1-G are consistent with the goals of the district.

Next Steps

In December 2026, the Planning Department, in collaboration with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), will present existing conditions related to laboratory uses and related permit applications in the Mission District with PDR-1-G zoning. The Department expects to utilize the following sources, among others that may become available:

- Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection records, including permits for alterations, new construction, changes of use, and code enforcement actions;
- Local business registration data to identify businesses operating on parcels zoned PDR-1-G;
- Commercial real estate data and analytics;
- Labor market, employment, wage, and unemployment data published by the California Employment Development Department (EDD); and
- Publicly available business and land-use mapping data.

Throughout this process, the Planning Department will also collaborate with Supervisor Fielder's Office and engage stakeholders involved in the Map 2030 planning process.

Environmental Review

This Report was determined not to be a project per State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2), because it does not result in a physical change to the environment.

Report Conclusion

The Planning Department has begun analyzing data to establish existing conditions within the PDR-1-G District and is conducting research on potential policy approaches. The Department anticipates publishing its next report in mid-December 2026.

Required Board Action

The Board may approve or disapprove this report.