

FILE NO. 260826

Petitions and Communications received from July 9, 2026, through July 16, 2026, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on July 21, 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 San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Police Code to provide penalties for the prohibited discharge of fireworks, including that a first offense is punishable as an infraction with a fine not less than \$125 or more than \$250, and a second and any subsequent offenses within five years of a prior offense are punishable as misdemeanors with a fine not less than \$250 or more than \$750, or imprisonment in the County Jail of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. File No. 260543. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), submitting the Full Citizens' Advisory Committee's (CAC) adopted Resolution regarding Salmon Restoration Projects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Jackie Fielder at the June 30, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Jackie Fielder at the June 30, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting agendas for the Visual Arts, Civic Design Review and Street Artists committee meetings. 3 Agendas. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305(c), submitting Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026. 6 Reports. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24(e), submitting Sole Source Contracts Reports for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026. 5 Contracts. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 21G.3, submitting Sole Source Grand Award Contracts Report for Calendar Year (CY) 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

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 June 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA), regarding advancing protections for immigrant communities at San Francisco International Airport (SFO). Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) agenda for the July 23, 2026, ISCOTT hearing. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting Police Commission Resolution No. 26-41: Approval to Adopt a Resolution Urging the Board of Supervisors to Authorize the Police Department to Accept and Expend a Gift of \$3,000,000 from the San Francisco Police Community Foundation to Support the Real Time Investigation Center for Technology, Software and Infrastructure Needs. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a Notice of Findings of Candidacy to list southern resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) as an endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Linda Bazau, regarding AT&T's landline phone service in California. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Anna Gracia, regarding Various Codes - Streamlining Reporting Requirements and Procedures, Removing Obsolete Programs and Requirements, and Other Code Cleanup. File No. 250630. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Robb Fleischer, regarding housing. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Coalition on Homelessness, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing ("PSH") that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents ("Drug-Free PSH") to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; require that City funding for new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness be used for Drug-Free PSH except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, where the funding is for new construction, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding requirement based on specific findings; require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH's strategies to meet PSH residents' demands; and require HSH to adopt rules and regulations establishing

standards and protocols for evictions from City-funded Drug-Free Housing. File No. 251003. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Eileen Boken, regarding Charter Amendment - Department, Board, Commission, and Advisory Body Updates; and the proposed Resolution supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 1448, authored by Assembly Member Gregg Hart, Coastal Resources: California Coastal Sanctuary: Tidelands and Submerged Lands: Oil and Gas Development, to preserve the state's coastline, safeguard the economy, protect marine environments and public health, and advance California's climate resilience goals. File No. 260536; 260803. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Alexia Rotberg, regarding the Hearing on Formal Policy Discussions on July 14, 2026 pursuant to Charter, Sections 2.103 and 3.100(7), and Administrative Code, Section 2.11. File No. 260805. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From members of the public, regarding Various Codes - Cannabis Cafés. File No. 260281. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution affirming San Francisco's support for the Speed Safety System Pilot Program and urging the exploration of changes to strengthen the program, including increasing the number of allowable speed camera locations, with priority given to corridors on the High Injury Network and other locations with demonstrated safety need. File No. 260499. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding Planning, Administrative, Building Codes - Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions; Development Impact Fee Reductions. File No. 260538. 7 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution authorizing the Recreation and Park Department to issue an amended permit allowing Another Planet Entertainment to hold ticketed concerts at the Golden Gate Park Polo Field, to take place on the Friday, Saturday, and Sunday either following or preceding the Outside Lands Festival in 2027, 2028 and 2029, in exchange for a minimum permit fee of \$1,530,000 per year for two-day events and \$2,295,000 per year for three-day events through 2029, and with options to extend the permit until 2035 and with increased minimum permit fees during any such extensions; affirming a categorical exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act; and authorizing the Recreation and Park Department General Manager to enter into amendments or modifications to the permit that do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities to the City and are necessary to effectuate the purposes of the permit or this Resolution. File No. 260614. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to halt the closure of the National Archives at San Francisco and the relocation of the facility's records and artifacts to

ensure that local communities continue to have direct access to evidence of their history and stories in the United States. File No. 260804. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From members of the public, regarding the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From a member of the public, regarding the Department of Emergency Management (DEM). Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Hayes Valley Safe, regarding Hayes Valley. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Imani Jaldin Hartsough, regarding the renovation of Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From Allen Jones, regarding the San Francisco Centre. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From Michael Astanehe, regarding the Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on July 21, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., to consider renewal and expansion of a property-based business improvement district, known as the Downtown Community Benefit District, pursuant to the California Property and Business Improvement District Law of 1994 (Streets and Highways Code, Sections 36600 et seq.), and City and County of San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, Article 15; scheduled pursuant to Resolution No. 295-26 (File No. 260466); adopted on May 19, 2026. File No. 260469. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From Renatta Harrison, regarding various subjects. 7 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From members of the public, regarding banning retail animal sales. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT). 35 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to simplify and streamline procedures for local compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including removing shadow analysis as a specific type of environmental impact, reducing the time to appeal CEQA determinations to the Board of Supervisors from 30 to 15 days, and removing some procedures for environmental documents that are not required by CEQA; to implement recent changes

in state law regarding the timing of compliance with CEQA; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under CEQA. File No. 260539. 20 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Motion ordering submitted to the voters at an election to be held on November 3, 2026, an Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to impose an excise tax, commencing in tax year 2027, on persons keeping vacant or using differently parcels last used, in whole or in part, as formula retail grocery stores or formula retail pharmacies on or after January 1, 2017; and increasing the City's appropriations limit by the amount collected under the tax for four years from November 3, 2026. File No. 260693. 11 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SFFD Letter of Support – File No. 260543
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 8:04:36 AM
Attachments: [7-14-26_SFFD's letter of support to BOS_Discharge of Fireworks.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached letter of support from the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) for **File No. 260543**:

Ordinance amending the Police Code to provide penalties for the prohibited discharge of fireworks, including that a first offense is punishable as an infraction with a fine not less than \$125 or more than \$250, and a second and any subsequent offenses within five years of a prior offense are punishable as misdemeanors with a fine not less than \$250 or more than \$750, or imprisonment in the County Jail of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

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: Lee, Tiff (BOS) <tiff.lee@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 5:33 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-

operations@sfgov.org>

Cc: Crayton, Monique (BOS) <monique.crayton@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

Subject: SFFD Letter of Support – File No. 260543

Hello Clerks,

Please find attached a letter of support from the San Francisco Fire Department for File No. 260543.

Kind regards,
Tiff

Tiff Lee | Legislative Aide

Office of Supervisor Alan Wong, District 4

tiff.lee@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7460

DEAN M. CRISPEN
CHIEF OF DEPARTMENT



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

July 14, 2026

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

Subject: 260543 – Police Code – Penalties for Prohibited Discharge of Fireworks

Dear Members of the Board,

The San Francisco Fire Department respectfully submits this letter in support of Board of Supervisors File No. 260543, *Police Code – Penalties for Prohibited Discharge of Fireworks*.

Each year, particularly during the weeks surrounding the Fourth of July and New Year's Eve, the San Francisco Fire Department experiences a significant increase in emergency calls related to the illegal discharge of fireworks. These incidents place added demands on emergency response resources and create unnecessary risks to public safety.

Fireworks-related calls routinely include vegetation and grass fires, trash fires caused by discarded fireworks debris and packaging, structure fire responses, and critical traumatic injuries resulting from the use of prohibited fireworks. These preventable emergencies divert fire and emergency medical resources from other urgent incidents throughout the City.

Strengthening penalties for the prohibited discharge of fireworks will help deter illegal activity, reduce preventable fires and injuries, and improve the safety of San Francisco residents, visitors, and first responders.

For these reasons, the San Francisco Fire Department strongly supports File No. 260543 and respectfully urges the Board of Supervisors to approve this important public safety legislation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dean M. Crispin".

Dean M. Crispin
Chief of Department

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: SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee Resolution
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 11:28:55 AM
Attachments: [Resolution on Salmon Restoration Projects.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), submitting the Full Citizens' Advisory Committee's (CAC) adopted Resolution regarding Salmon Restoration Projects.

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: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 11:12 AM
To: Moncrease, Lexus (PUC) <LMoncrease@sfwater.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>
Cc: SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee <CAC@sfwater.org>; Garcia, Lupita (PUC) <LGarcia@sfwater.org>
Subject: RE: SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee Resolution

Lexus:

Through this email I am forwarding your request to BOS Operations. Thank you.

Victor Young

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

phone 415-554-7723 | fax 415-554-5163

victor.young@sfgov.org | www.sf.gov/sfbos

From: Moncrease, Lexus <LMoncrease@sfwater.org>

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2026 3:13 PM

To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>

Cc: SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee <CAC@sfwater.org>; Garcia, Lupita (PUC) <LGarcia@sfwater.org>

Subject: SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee Resolution

Dear Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

The SFPUC Full CAC adopted the attached resolution on May 19, 2026. The resolution urges the SFPUC to work with its partners to expedite early implementation of beneficial projects to assist the recovery of salmon populations along the Tuolumne River.

Please forward the attached resolution to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you!

Best Regards,

Lexus

Lexus Moncrease

CAC Staff Liaison

Cell: 415-517-8465

Pronouns: She/Her

Sfpuc.org Lmoncrease@sfwater.org



Resolution on Salmon Restoration Projects

Whereas, since the inauguration of the Hetch Hetchy System in 1932 salmon populations have been significantly impacted by increasing diversions from the Tuolumne River, creating difficult tradeoffs between water supply for agriculture, the Bay Area cities and counties served by the diversions, and the needs of the salmon populations;

Whereas, in 2009, the state legislature adopted the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act, which directed the State Water Board to develop flow requirements for Delta tributaries, which include the Tuolumne River;

Whereas, the State Water Resources Control Board (Board) published a Scientific Basis Report (2016) and adopted flow requirements (2018) for the Tuolumne River, which have been put on hold pending negotiations between the administration and upstream diverters to establish “voluntary agreements” that may be implemented more quickly;

Whereas, the Board in September 2025 released an updated draft Scientific Basis Report analyzing the impacts of the proposed Tuolumne Voluntary Agreement (TVA, also known as the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program), which is a necessary prerequisite to voting to amend the Bay Delta Plan to allow the flow requirements recommended in the TVA;

Whereas, since the adoption of the Bay-Delta Reform Act in 2009, salmon populations in the Tuolumne River have not recovered; in fact, salmon returns have continued to decline due to many factors, including drought, poor harvest management, straying hatchery fish, and low juvenile outmigration survival, and we are far from reaching State and Federal doubling goals (see figure ES-1 graph). These factors, among others, contributed to the cancellation of the California commercial salmon fishing season in 2023, 2024, 2025 and is now scheduled to be open only on a limited basis for 2026;

Whereas, Fall-run Chinook salmon are present in the Tuolumne and have a three-year migration cycle;

Whereas, continuing to engage in early implementation of habitat improvements and expediting implementation of proposed increased flows on the lower Tuolumne River (pending Board adoption) will provide improved support for spawning, rearing, and outmigration of Fall-run Chinook salmon on the lower Tuolumne River;

Therefore, be it Resolved, that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) urges the SFPUC to work with its partners to expedite early implementation of beneficial projects to assist the recovery of salmon populations on the Tuolumne, regardless of the timing of Board actions on the TVA; and

Further Resolved, the SFPUC CAC supports project funding included in the SFPUC bi-annual budget, to be considered for adoption by the Board of Supervisors in June 2026; and

Finally resolved, that the SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee urges the SFPUC to amend its design drought and drought operations, working with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation districts, as necessary to ensure that 30% minimum flows¹ during salmon season are provided in

at least 5 years in an 8 and a half year drought and that flows below the minimum will not occur for more than two consecutive years.




Figure ES-1. Tuolumne River Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Annual and Decadal Average Escapement from CDFW GrandTab (2025). The Salmon Doubling Goal (17,800) Represents the Estimated Tuolumne River Salmon Escapement Needed to Meet the Narrative Salmon Protection Objective. ⁱⁱ

As adopted by the Full Citizens' Advisory Committee on May 19, 2026.

PROPOUNDED BY: Aaron Hebert

ⁱ In its adoption of the Lower San Joaquin river minimum flow requirements in 2018 (resolution [2018-059](#)), the State Water Board created a tributary numeric objective of 40% unimpaired flow within an adaptive range of 30-50% from February-June.

ⁱⁱ Draft Scientific Basis Report Supplement for the Tuolumne River Voluntary Agreement Proposal, Prepared by the State Water Resources Control board, California Department of Water Resources and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sept. 2025

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: LOI re: SFPD response to pride events
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 8:29:29 AM
Attachments: [LOI Response - Supervisor Fielder - Stud Alley & Trans March.pdf](#)
[Fielder CTA 26.06.30 SFPD_MYR_CON.pdf](#)
[FIELDER - LOI - SFPD Pride Deployment.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Jackie Fielder at the June 30, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting.

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: Nicita, Carl (POL) <carl.nicita@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 5:59 PM
To: Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>
Cc: Gaona, Sasha (BOS) <sasha.gaona@sfgov.org>; Chung Hagen, Sheila (BOS) <Sheila.Chung.Hagen@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; Lew, Derrick (POL) <Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org>; Jones, Nicole (POL) <Nicole.H.Jones@sfgov.org>; Biggs, Scott (POL)

<Scott.Biggs@sfgov.org>; Betz, Steven (MYR) <Steven.Betz.MYR@sfgov.org>; Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>; Stone, Claire (CON) <claire.stone@sfgov.org>

Subject: RE: LOI re: SFPD response to pride events

Supervisor Fielder –

On behalf of Chief Lew, please see the attached response to your Letter of Inquiry regarding the Police Department's response to Stud Alley and the Trans March.

Thank you,
Carl

Carl Nicita | Government Affairs Manager
Government Affairs Unit – Office of the Chief of Staff
San Francisco Police Department

From: Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 9:29 AM

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Lew, Derrick (POL) <Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org>; Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>

Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; david.chiu@sfgov.org <david.chiu@sfgov.org>; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Gaona, Sasha (BOS) <sasha.gaona@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Chung Hagen, Sheila (BOS) <Sheila.Chung.Hagen@sfgov.org>

Subject: LOI re: SFPD response to pride events

Good morning Mayor Lurie, Chief Lew, and Controller Wagner,

Please see the attached Letter of Inquiry into the SFPD's response to Pride events this past weekend. I look forward to seeing your responses by July 14th. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Supervisor Jackie Fielder

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)



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

July 14, 2026

Supervisor Jackie Fielder
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 248
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Letter of Inquiry Response – Stud Alley and Trans March

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Thank you for your June 30, 2026 Letter of Inquiry regarding the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD or Department) response to two incidents occurring during Pride Weekend. I understand these incidents raised real concern in the community, and I appreciate the opportunity to lay out, in detail, what happened.

Your letter describes officers "clashing with residents and visitors participating in Pride activities..." That framing – and the apparent misconception that officers were targeting the transgender community or Pride participants – is not accurate. The arrests in both incidents involved a small number of people, out of many thousands who attended these events peacefully. Officers identified the individuals who were arrested as engaged in specific criminal conduct, including vandalism, unlawful assembly, and, at the Trans March, physically interfering with a lawful arrest.

I want to be clear from the outset: the SFPD is committed to serving and protecting every member of our community, including our lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer community members. That commitment extends beyond Pride Weekend and is written into our policies. Department General Order (DGO) 5.22 governs how officers interact with transgender, gender-variant, and nonbinary individuals (e.g., officers use a person's chosen name and pronouns, and ask, rather than assume, a person's preference when a search is required). We also maintain an LGBTQ+ Advisory Forum, work with community organizations on an ongoing basis, and have transgender officers on the force.

Further, the SFPD supports every person's right to peacefully assemble, celebrate, and exercise their constitutional rights. At the same time, the Department has a responsibility to respond when criminal activity threatens public safety or interferes with the rights of others.

The Stud Alley and Trans March incidents were not representative of Pride Weekend as a whole. The SFPD supported numerous permitted events, drawing hundreds of thousands of residents and visitors, and the large majority concluded without incident.

I addressed these two incidents in my regular report to the Police Commission on July 8, 2026. The responses below reflect that report and, in some places, elaborate on details. Our responses are based on our current understanding of the facts and investigation to date, which remains ongoing.

Regarding SFPD deployment to Stud Alley

1. What were the circumstances surrounding this event? Please share whether SFPD's deployment was in response to calls for service to 9-1-1 or a proactive deployment targeting the Stud Alley event.

At approximately 8:58 p.m. on June 27, 2026, officers assigned to Southern Station Pride Command encountered about 20 people gathered for an unpermitted block party on the 100 block of Kissling Street. Several were wearing full face coverings and standing near spray paint cans and fire extinguishers. The crowd eventually grew to hundreds of participants occupying the public roadway and blocking vehicular traffic and Muni service. A white U-Haul van pulled up and unloaded DJ equipment, and loud amplified sound began playing. Attendees blocked the street using medium and large boulders. SFPD supervisors tried to negotiate with event organizers but were met by a group of about ten individuals who refused to cooperate and responded with verbal aggression.

About an hour later, a patrol lieutenant arrived, declared an unlawful assembly, and officers formed a line and issued multiple dispersal orders over a public address system. The group thinned significantly as most of the crowd complied with the officers' orders to disperse. As the line advanced, officers arrested two individuals who refused repeated orders to leave and pushed back against the advancing officers. Both individuals were cited at the scene and released. Around the same time, a group of individuals surrounded two passing Waymo vehicles and slashed all four tires on each, leaving both inoperable.

The crowd then moved off Kissling Street, but members of the same group, including the DJ and the same U-Haul van, began to set up again two blocks away on Washburn Street, between Mission and Howard. That drew a crowd of roughly 150 to 200 people who built a barricade across the alley out of wood, construction equipment, traffic cones, and sections of pipe. People spray-painted graffiti on nearby buildings and vehicles.

There, officers declared a second unlawful assembly, re-established a line, issued dispersal announcements over a public address system, and moved in to seize the U-Haul van and sound equipment, which was abandoned. A small group refused to leave, and eighteen people were arrested.

2. Please share the total number of officers deployed to the Stud Alley event.

From 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 27 until 3:00 a.m. on Sunday, June 28, Southern Station Pride Command was staffed with approximately 24 personnel (three sergeants and 21 officers) for all Pride activities in the district. However, at this time, we do not have a complete count of the number of officers who responded to the Stud Alley incident.

3. What is the existing SFPD policy regarding police response to Pride/LGBTQ block parties, permitted or non-permitted? To any block party with a noise complaint? Does that policy include deploying officers in full tactical gear?

The Department does not have a policy specific to Pride or LGBTQ+ events. Response to a public gathering depends on the facts and circumstances of the event and public safety considerations, not on who is participating or what viewpoint is being expressed. Operational decisions regarding police response weigh factors that include whether the event is permitted, whether criminal activity is occurring, impacts on public safety and emergency access, crowd behavior, and whether voluntary compliance can resolve the situation. Decisions regarding the deployment of personal protective equipment are made based upon the operational assessment of those circumstances.

4. What is the existing SFPD policy regarding police response to reports of graffiti?

Graffiti reports are investigated consistent with California law and Department policy governing all criminal investigations. The existence of graffiti alone does not dictate a specific enforcement response. Officers evaluate the full circumstances including whether criminal activity is ongoing, public safety concerns, available evidence, and whether a suspect can be identified.

5. How did this deployment rise to the level of deploying officers in full tactical gear? How many officers were deployed to the scene?

The decision to deploy officers in personal protective equipment reflected the operational assessment of what was happening at the scene: a rapidly growing crowd, the unlawful occupation of the roadway, barricades blocking vehicle access, vandalism that had been reported and observed firsthand, and the presence of boulders, glass bottles, and other objects that posed a safety risk to officers and the public alike.

6. According to SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, “When determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall, when feasible, balance the severity of the offense committed and the level of resistance, based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time, with the level of force used and its likely injury outcome.” Who made the judgement call to deploy officers in full tactical gear, and based on what factors?

The decision to deploy officers in personal protective equipment is distinct from the use of force and factors used to determine and appropriate use of force under DGO 5.01. The incident command structure made the deployment decision based on what officers were facing at the scene, including crowd size and behavior, ongoing criminal activity, public safety concerns, and the safety of officers themselves.

7. What is the nature of the reports about any injuries or destruction of property related to the Stud Alley party that led to SFPD deploying officers in tactical gear?

Records show acts of vandalism, including graffiti and unlawful barricades on both Kissling and Washburn Streets. Two Waymo vehicles were also damaged with all four tires slashed on each. Dispatch logged one 911 call regarding Kissling Street and nine separate calls regarding Washburn Street. Two officers sustained minor injuries during the Washburn Street enforcement action.

8. According to SFPD's DGO 5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, "Officers shall, when feasible, employ de-escalation strategies and techniques to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force and to increase the likelihood of a peaceful resolution." Were there other de-escalating strategies used first, to address graffiti or noise complaints that could have been deployed to avoid a clash between armed officers and unarmed party participants?

Yes, officers tried to identify and speak with event organizers, communicated repeatedly with attendees, and issued multiple lawful dispersal orders over a public address system, giving people time to comply voluntarily. Many attendees complied and left before officers advanced.

9. How many individuals were arrested at the Stud Alley event and on what charges?

There were twenty enforcement actions in total. Two people were cited at the scene on Kissling Street, and eighteen were arrested at the scene on Washburn Street, transported to county jail, processed, and cited for alleged violations including Penal Code sections 409 (Remaining Present at an Unlawful Assembly) and 148(a)(1) (Resisting, Delaying, or Obstructing a Peace Officer), before being released.

10. What time were officers first on the scene at the Stud Alley event, and when did the last officer leave the scene?

The incident began at approximately 8:58 p.m. on June 27, 2026, and the scene was clear just before 1:00 a.m. on June 28, totaling just under four hours.

11. And lastly, what is the nature of the complaints about any injuries or destruction of property related to SFPD's deployment of officers to the Stud Alley event?

To the extent there are pending complaints and investigations, the Department cannot comment regarding the substance of pending complaints and investigations, which are generally handled by the Department of Police Accountability.

Regarding SFPD deployment to Trans March

1. What were the circumstances surrounding this event?

- a. Please share whether SFPD's deployment was in response to calls for service to 9-1-1 or a proactive deployment targeting Trans March.**
- b. If a proactive deployment, how many officers were committed to being deployed at Trans March?**

The Trans March was a planned event beginning at Dolores Park. The route ran north on Dolores Street, east on Market Street, and toward Turk and Taylor Streets. As a planned event, four sergeants, 28 officers, and one captain (approximately 33 personnel in total) were assigned to the Trans March. Their objectives were to enforce the law, facilitate pedestrian and vehicular traffic flow for the protection of march participants, and support crowd management, while protecting the First Amendment rights of participants and adhering to Department policy on arrests, citations, and use of force. Additional specialized units were also assigned to support the event.

As the march reached the Market Street corridor at around 7:00 p.m. on June 26, 2026, officers observed several people using Super Soaker-style water guns filled with paint to spray-paint buildings and private security cameras along the route.

A Department drone helped track two vandalism suspects to the area of Turk and Taylor Streets, capturing footage of them placing the water guns into a paper bag, discarding the bag on the sidewalk, and removing their outer clothing and face coverings in an apparent attempt to blend back into the crowd of law-abiding marchers.

When officers moved to detain the two suspects at approximately 7:40 p.m., a crowd immediately surrounded them. Some in the crowd, estimated at roughly 300 people, linked arms, chanted for the suspects' release, and threw glass bottles. As officers attempted to place the two detained individuals into a patrol car, one person climbed onto the roof of the vehicle and was pulled down by officers, and another forced open the rear door in an attempt to free the suspects, while others pushed officers back.

Given the size and intensity of the crowd, additional officers were called in, and a line was formed between the crowd and the arresting officers.

The whole incident lasted about an hour and eight minutes, from when officers first observed the vandalism to when the arrests were completed. However, the march itself proceeded without disruption for most of that time. Active enforcement was concentrated in an approximately 22-minute window. The scene was stabilized by approximately 8:02 p.m., allowing the march to continue safely.

While officers were already assigned to facilitate the Trans March as a planned event, the enforcement action at Turk and Taylor Streets was a response to reported and observed criminal activity and the crowd's interference with a lawful arrest. It was not a response to the march itself. I am aware these events occurred near the site of Compton's Cafeteria, which is of real

significance to the transgender community. Officers responded to that location because that is where the suspects were located.

2. Please share the total number of officers deployed to responding to Trans March.

As noted above, as a planned event, approximately 33 personnel, along with additional specialized units, were assigned to the Trans March. However, at this time, we do not have a complete count of the number of officers who responded to the incident at Turk and Taylor Streets.

3. What is the nature of the reports about any injuries or destruction of property along the Trans March route?

Department reports document vandalism to numerous public and private properties along the march route, including one damaged and one stolen Flock Automated License Plate Reader, graffiti on Mission Dolores Basilica, damage to 24 privately-owned surveillance cameras, damage to a BART station entrance and damage to other public infrastructure. Investigators recovered evidence including water guns containing paint, paint containers, gloves, and other items believed to have been used during the vandalism.

One officer sustained a hand injury during the arrest response, and another was exposed to bodily fluids.

4. According to SFPD's DGO 5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, "Officers shall, when feasible, employ de-escalation strategies and techniques to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force and to increase the likelihood of a peaceful resolution." Were there other strategies deployed first, that could have been deployed to avoid a clash between armed officers and unarmed Trans March participants?

Yes, rather than intervening broadly in the march, officers relied on direct observation, a 911 caller's report, and drone tracking to identify people suspected of criminal conduct and make targeted arrests. During the arrest operation itself, officers gave repeated verbal commands telling the crowd to move back and not interfere.

The SFPD response was directed at specific individuals suspected of crimes and interfering with lawful arrests. It was not aimed at dispersing or stopping the Trans March.

5. How many individuals were arrested at Trans March and on what charges?

There were six arrests associated with the incident. Not every charge applies to every individual, but taken together, the alleged violations include felony vandalism (Penal Code 594), conspiracy (Penal Code 182), resisting, delaying, or obstructing a peace officer (Penal Code 148(a)(1)), resisting an executive officer (Penal Code 69), battery on a peace officer (Penal Code 243(b)), a hate-crime enhancement, and releasing a prisoner from custody.

July 14, 2026

6. What time were officers first on the scene of Trans March and when did the last officer leave?

Officers were assigned to the march from its start at Dolores Park as part of the planned deployment. The vandalism was first observed as the march reached the Market Street corridor at around 7:00 p.m.; the arrest attempt began at approximately 7:40 p.m., and the scene was stabilized by 8:02 p.m.

Thank you again for your inquiry. The Department remains committed to serving every member of our community with professionalism, fairness, and respect. I am personally committed to transparency and accountability, and I appreciate the opportunity to provide this additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'D. Lew', written in a cursive style.

DERRICK J. LEW

Chief of Police

San Francisco Police Department

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

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

July 1, 2026

To: Derrick Lew, Chief
San Francisco Police Department
12541 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Via Email: Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org

Daniel Lurie, Mayor
Office of the Mayor
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlet Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Daniel.Lurie@sfgov.org

Greg Wagner, Controller
Office of the Controller
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlet Place, Room 316
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Greg.Wagner@sfgov.org

Dear Chief Lew, Mayor Lurie, and Controller Wagner,

At the June 30, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Jackie Fielder issued the attached inquiry to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), Office of the Mayor (MYR) and the Office of the Controller (CON). Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests information regarding the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) deployment to the Trans March and an event known as "Stud Alley".

Please contact Sasha Gaona, Sasha.Gaona@sfgov.org, Chief of Staff to Supervisor Fielder, for any questions related to this request, and copy BOS@sfgov.org on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than July 14, 2026.

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

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Angela Calvillo".

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/JKA

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Steven Lopez, SFPD, Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org
Sgt. Stacy Youngblood, SFPD, Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org
Carl Nicita, SFPD, Carl.Nicita@sfgov.org
Giannina Miranda, SFPD, Giannina.Miranda@sfgov.org
ChiaYu Ma, CON, Chiayu.Ma@sfgov.org
Ayesha Hossain, CON, Ayesha.Hossain@sfgov.org
Claire Stone, CON, Claire.Stone@sfgov.org
Nate Horrell, CON, Nate.Horrell@sfgov.org
Adam Thongsavat, MYR, Adam.Thongsavat@sfgov.org
Aly Bonde, MYR, Aly.Bonde@sfgov.org
David Chiu, CAT, CityAttorney@sfcityatty.org
Brad Russi, CAT, Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org
Angela Calvillo, BOS, Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org



JACKIE FIELDER

LETTER OF INQUIRY

To:

SFPD Chief Derrick Lew
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Controller Greg Wagner

CC:

City Attorney David Chiu
Deputy City Attorney Brad Russi
Madame Clerk Angela Calvillo

Dear Chief Lew, Mayor Lurie, and Controller Wagner,

I was deeply concerned to see video footage and reports of San Francisco police officers clashing with San Francisco residents and visitors participating in Pride activities in two separate incidents: Trans March and an event known as “Stud Alley.” According to news reports, officers were deployed to address property destruction, graffiti, and potentially noise complaints. I am submitting this Letter of Inquiry to gain more clarity into the policy, context, and timeline of these events and **I request that you submit your responses to this inquiry by Tuesday, July 14th.**

Regarding SFPD deployment to “Stud Alley”

1. What were the circumstances surrounding this event?
 1. Please share whether SFPD’s deployment was in response to calls for service to 9-1-1 or a proactive deployment targeting the Stud Alley event.
2. Please share the total number of officers deployed to the Stud Alley event.
3. What is the existing SFPD policy regarding police response to Pride/LGBTQ block parties, permitted or non-permitted? To any block party with a noise complaint? Does that policy include deploying officers in full tactical gear?
4. What is the existing SFPD policy regarding police response to reports of graffiti?
5. How did this deployment rise to the level of deploying officers in full tactical gear? How many officers were deployed to the scene?

6. According to SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, “When determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall, when feasible, balance the severity of the offense committed and the level of resistance, based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time, with the level of force used and its likely injury outcome.” Who made the judgement call to deploy officers in full tactical gear, and based on what factors?
7. What is the nature of the reports about any injuries or destruction of property related to the Stud Alley party that led to SFPD deploying officers in tactical gear?
8. According to SFPD’s DGO5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, “Officers shall, when feasible, employ de-escalation strategies and techniques to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force and to increase the likelihood of a peaceful resolution.” Were there other de-escalating strategies used first, to address graffiti or noise complaints that could have been deployed to avoid a clash between armed officers and unarmed party participants?
9. How many individuals were arrested at the Stud Alley event and on what charges?
10. What time were officers first on the scene at the Stud Alley event, and when did the last officer leave the scene?
11. And lastly, what is the nature of the complaints about any injuries or destruction of property related to SFPD’s deployment of officers to the Stud Alley event?

Regarding SFPD deployment to Trans March

1. What were the circumstances surrounding this event?
 - a. Please share whether SFPD’s deployment was in response to calls for service to 9-1-1 or a proactive deployment targeting Trans March.
 - b. If a proactive deployment, how many officers were committed to being deployed at Trans March?
2. Please share the total number of officers deployed to responding to Trans March
3. What is the nature of the reports about any injuries or destruction of property along the Trans March route?
4. According to SFPD’s DGO5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, “Officers shall, when feasible, employ de-escalation strategies and techniques to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force and to increase the likelihood of a peaceful resolution.” Were there other strategies deployed first, that could have been deployed to avoid a clash between armed officers and unarmed Trans March participants?
5. How many individuals were arrested at Trans March and on what charges?
6. What time were officers first on the scene of Trans March and when did the last officer leave?

To the Controller:

- How many regular hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff’s dedicated to responding to first amendment activities from January 1, 2026 to March 30, 2026? From April 1, 2026 to July 1, 2026? How many overtime hours? What is the estimate of how much this has or will cost the city?
- How many regular and overtime hours did SFPD dedicate to responding to the Stud Alley and Trans March incidents, respectively?

Thank you in advance for your response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jackie Fielder". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "J" and "F".

Supervisor Jackie Fielder

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: LOI re: SFPD response to pride events
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 8:41:30 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[D9 - LOI - 06-30-2026 - CON Response.pdf](#)
[Fielder CTA 26.06.30 SFPD_MYR_CON.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the Office of the Controller (CON), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Jackie Fielder at the June 30, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting.

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: Stone, Claire (CON) <claire.stone@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 6:13 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: LOI re: SFPD response to pride events
Importance: High

FYI, my apologies for not CC'ing.

Best,

Claire



Claire Stone (they/them)
Government Affairs & Executive Operations Manager | Executive Office
Office of the Controller | City & County of San Francisco
(415) 554-7500 | claire.stone@sfgov.org
sf.gov/controller

From: Stone, Claire (CON)

Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 4:47 PM

To: Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Gaona, Sasha (BOS) <sasha.gaona@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS)

<jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Chung Hagen, Sheila (BOS) <Sheila.Chung.Hagen@sfgov.org>

Cc: Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>; Ma, ChiaYu (CON) <chiayu.ma@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; Lew, Derrick (POL) <derrick.lew@sfgov.org>; Wu, Kimmie (POL) <Kimmie.Wu@sfgov.org>; Nicita, Carl (POL) <carl.nicita@sfgov.org>; Miyamoto, Paul (SHF) <paul.miyamoto@sfgov.org>; Ramirez, John (SHF) <john.ramirez@sfgov.org>; Betz, Steven (MYR) <Steven.Betz.MYR@sfgov.org>

Subject: RE: LOI re: SFPD response to pride events

Importance: High

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

Please see the Controller's Office response to your Letter of Inquiry (LOI) dated June 30, 2026.

Thank you,

Claire



Claire Stone (they/them)
Government Affairs & Executive Operations Manager | Executive Office
Office of the Controller | City & County of San Francisco
(415) 554-7500 | claire.stone@sfgov.org
sf.gov/controller

From: Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 9:29 AM

To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Lew, Derrick (POL) <Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org>;

Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>

Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; david.chiu@sfgov.org; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Gaona, Sasha (BOS) <sasha.gaona@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Chung Hagen, Sheila (BOS) <Sheila.Chung.Hagen@sfgov.org>

Subject: LOI re: SFPD response to pride events

Good morning Mayor Lurie, Chief Lew, and Controller Wagner,

Please see the attached Letter of Inquiry into the SFPD's response to Pride events this past weekend. I look forward to seeing your responses by July 14th. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Supervisor Jackie Fielder

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Greg Wagner
Controller

ChiaYu Ma
Deputy Controller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Supervisor Jackie Fielder, District 9, Board of Supervisors

FROM: Greg Wagner, Controller, Office of the Controller
ChiaYu Ma, Deputy Controller, Office of the Controller
Claire Stone, Government Affairs & Executive Operations, Office of the Controller

DATE: July 14, 2026

SUBJECT: Response to Letter of Inquiry – SFPD/SF Sheriff Staffing Hours and Costs Related to First Amendment Activities, Stud Alley, and Trans March

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Thank you for your Letter of Inquiry (LOI) regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and San Francisco Sheriff's Office staffing and costs associated with First Amendment activities, including the Stud Alley and Trans March events. This memo responds to the two questions directed to the Controller's Office.

BACKGROUND

The Controller's Office comprises ten divisions, including the Citywide Payroll Division. The Citywide Payroll Division administers bi-weekly payroll for over 36,000 City employees, distributing more than \$4.1 billion annually via direct deposit and pay cards. As the City's central payroll office, it trains and advises departmental payroll staff on compliance with City ordinances, state and federal regulations, and the provisions of more than 50 labor contracts. However, the division's visibility is limited to high-level payroll data; it typically cannot see the granular, operational-level detail behind individual staffing decisions.

Question 1: Regular and Overtime Hours for First Amendment Activities, and Estimated Cost

This data was provided to the Controller's Office by San Francisco Police Department and the Sheriff's Office; the Controller's Office does not independently have visibility into granular data of this kind.

Police Department (POL)

SFPD does not track regular-duty hours by activity, including First Amendment-related events. Overtime is tracked through the Human Resources Management System (HRMS) using specific event codes. Based on payroll data available through June 30, 2026:

- January 1 – March 30, 2026: 864 overtime hours logged under First Amendment-related event codes
- April 1 – May 31, 2026: 1,258 overtime hours logged under First Amendment-related event codes
- Combined total: approximately 2,122 overtime hours. No overtime for First Amendment activities were logged under this coding in June 2026.

At an average overtime rate of \$133 per hour, the combined estimated personnel cost is approximately \$282,160.

Sheriff Department (SHF)

June 26, 2026 – Trans March: The San Francisco Sheriff's Office (SHF) had no dedicated resources assigned to Pride events. However, SHF deputies assigned to DMACC responded to an emergency backup call from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). SHF is calculating the cost of this staffing, though it is expected to be minimal, given the response was unplanned. We have asked SHF to respond directly to the Supervisor's Office with this information.

June 27, 2026 – Stud Alley: SHF provided one transport van staffed by two sworn deputies. No arrestees were transported by SHF personnel. SHF is calculating the cost of this staffing, though it is expected to be minimal. We have asked SHF to respond directly to the Supervisor's Office with this information.

Question 2: Hours Dedicated to the Stud Alley and Trans March Incidents

Both events were staffed with regular-duty personnel and are therefore not separately trackable by hours, for the same system limitation described above. Any overtime connected to arrest responses at these events would be captured under arrest-related coding rather than event-specific coding. For this information, the Controller's Office must refer to SFPD.

A Note on Data Limitations

This is a limitation shared across City departments, not unique to SFPD. The City's payroll and scheduling systems are designed to ensure employees are paid correctly for each pay period. The system is not built to track hours at the level of a specific activity for operational purposes. This limitation extends to other departments, such as DPH, MTA, CPC, PUC, DPW, FIR, AIR, POL, and the PRT, that may need to pool staffing for emergency coverage. These departments provide the Controller's Office with interface files, which limit the level of detail visible to us.

Appendix: List of acronyms for Departments referenced

- DPH – Department of Public Health
- MTA – Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
- CPC – Planning Department (City Planning Commission)
- PUC – Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
- DPW – Department of Public Works
- FIR – Fire Department (SFFD)
- AIR – Airport (San Francisco International Airport)
- POL – Police Department (SFPD)
- PRT – Port of San Francisco
- SHF – Sheriff's Department



JACKIE FIELDER

LETTER OF INQUIRY

To:

SFPD Chief Derrick Lew
Mayor Daniel Lurie
Controller Greg Wagner

CC:

City Attorney David Chiu
Deputy City Attorney Brad Russi
Madame Clerk Angela Calvillo

Dear Chief Lew, Mayor Lurie, and Controller Wagner,

I was deeply concerned to see video footage and reports of San Francisco police officers clashing with San Francisco residents and visitors participating in Pride activities in two separate incidents: Trans March and an event known as “Stud Alley.” According to news reports, officers were deployed to address property destruction, graffiti, and potentially noise complaints. I am submitting this Letter of Inquiry to gain more clarity into the policy, context, and timeline of these events and **I request that you submit your responses to this inquiry by Tuesday, July 14th.**

Regarding SFPD deployment to “Stud Alley”

1. What were the circumstances surrounding this event?
 1. Please share whether SFPD’s deployment was in response to calls for service to 9-1-1 or a proactive deployment targeting the Stud Alley event.
2. Please share the total number of officers deployed to the Stud Alley event.
3. What is the existing SFPD policy regarding police response to Pride/LGBTQ block parties, permitted or non-permitted? To any block party with a noise complaint? Does that policy include deploying officers in full tactical gear?
4. What is the existing SFPD policy regarding police response to reports of graffiti?
5. How did this deployment rise to the level of deploying officers in full tactical gear? How many officers were deployed to the scene?

6. According to SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, “When determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall, when feasible, balance the severity of the offense committed and the level of resistance, based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time, with the level of force used and its likely injury outcome.” Who made the judgement call to deploy officers in full tactical gear, and based on what factors?
7. What is the nature of the reports about any injuries or destruction of property related to the Stud Alley party that led to SFPD deploying officers in tactical gear?
8. According to SFPD’s DGO5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, “Officers shall, when feasible, employ de-escalation strategies and techniques to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force and to increase the likelihood of a peaceful resolution.” Were there other de-escalating strategies used first, to address graffiti or noise complaints that could have been deployed to avoid a clash between armed officers and unarmed party participants?
9. How many individuals were arrested at the Stud Alley event and on what charges?
10. What time were officers first on the scene at the Stud Alley event, and when did the last officer leave the scene?
11. And lastly, what is the nature of the complaints about any injuries or destruction of property related to SFPD’s deployment of officers to the Stud Alley event?

Regarding SFPD deployment to Trans March

1. What were the circumstances surrounding this event?
 - a. Please share whether SFPD’s deployment was in response to calls for service to 9-1-1 or a proactive deployment targeting Trans March.
 - b. If a proactive deployment, how many officers were committed to being deployed at Trans March?
2. Please share the total number of officers deployed to responding to Trans March
3. What is the nature of the reports about any injuries or destruction of property along the Trans March route?
4. According to SFPD’s DGO5.01: Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, “Officers shall, when feasible, employ de-escalation strategies and techniques to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force and to increase the likelihood of a peaceful resolution.” Were there other strategies deployed first, that could have been deployed to avoid a clash between armed officers and unarmed Trans March participants?
5. How many individuals were arrested at Trans March and on what charges?
6. What time were officers first on the scene of Trans March and when did the last officer leave?

To the Controller:

- How many regular hours has SFPD and SF Sheriff’s dedicated to responding to first amendment activities from January 1, 2026 to March 30, 2026? From April 1, 2026 to July 1, 2026? How many overtime hours? What is the estimate of how much this has or will cost the city?
- How many regular and overtime hours did SFPD dedicate to responding to the Stud Alley and Trans March incidents, respectively?

Thank you in advance for your response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jackie Fielder". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Supervisor Jackie Fielder

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

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

July 1, 2026

To: Derrick Lew, Chief
San Francisco Police Department
12541 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
Via Email: Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org

Daniel Lurie, Mayor
Office of the Mayor
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlet Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Daniel.Lurie@sfgov.org

Greg Wagner, Controller
Office of the Controller
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlet Place, Room 316
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via Email: Greg.Wagner@sfgov.org

Dear Chief Lew, Mayor Lurie, and Controller Wagner,

At the June 30, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Jackie Fielder issued the attached inquiry to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), Office of the Mayor (MYR) and the Office of the Controller (CON). Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests information regarding the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) deployment to the Trans March and an event known as "Stud Alley".

Please contact Sasha Gaona, Sasha.Gaona@sfgov.org, Chief of Staff to Supervisor Fielder, for any questions related to this request, and copy BOS@sfgov.org on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than July 14, 2026.

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

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Angela Calvillo".

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/JKA

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Steven Lopez, SFPD, Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org
Sgt. Stacy Youngblood, SFPD, Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org
Carl Nicita, SFPD, Carl.Nicita@sfgov.org
Giannina Miranda, SFPD, Giannina.Miranda@sfgov.org
ChiaYu Ma, CON, Chiayu.Ma@sfgov.org
Ayesha Hossain, CON, Ayesha.Hossain@sfgov.org
Claire Stone, CON, Claire.Stone@sfgov.org
Nate Horrell, CON, Nate.Horrell@sfgov.org
Adam Thongsavat, MYR, Adam.Thongsavat@sfgov.org
Aly Bonde, MYR, Aly.Bonde@sfgov.org
David Chiu, CAT, CityAttorney@sfcityatty.org
Brad Russi, CAT, Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org
Angela Calvillo, BOS, Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org

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: July 15, 2026 Visual Arts Committee Agenda
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 9:46:38 AM
Attachments: [July 15 2026 VAC Agenda.pdf](#)
[Outlook-Logo_Desc.png](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting an agenda for the July 15, 2026, Visual Arts Committee meeting.

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: Cotz, Paris (ART) <paris.cotz@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2026 9:50 AM
To: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peterson, Tara (ART) <tara.peterson@sfgov.org>; Chou, Mary (ART) <mary.chou@sfgov.org>
Subject: July 15, 2026 Visual Arts Committee Agenda

Hello,

Please find the agenda for the Visual Arts Committee Meeting coming up on Wednesday, July 15, 2026 attached via PDF and here: <https://www.sf.gov/meeting--july-15-2026--visual->

[arts-committee-meeting](#)

Thank you,
Paris



Paris Cotz

Program Associate, Public Art

Pronouns: [she/her](#)

Email: paris.cotz@sfgov.org

Mobile: 415-539-6213

San Francisco Arts Commission

401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325

San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sfartscommission.org

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

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

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



City and County of San Francisco

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Agenda for Visual Arts Committee, July 15, 2026



Commissioners

- Chair Suzie Ferras, JD Beltran, J. Riccardo Benavides, Nabil Musleh, Al Perez, Debra Walker.

Date and Time

Wednesday, July 15, 2026

2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Location

City Hall, Room 416,
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place.

Members of the committee will attend this meeting in-person at the location listed above. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in person at the physical meeting location listed above or remotely online.

Members of the public attending the meeting in-person will have an opportunity to provide up to three minutes of public comment on every agenda item.

- Watch on SFGovTV (captioned) [Live Stream – Visual Arts Committee Meeting](#)

Agenda items

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Changes, Land Acknowledgment

1. Call to order
2. Roll call / Confirmation of quorum
3. Agenda Changes
4. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples. As a department dedicated to promoting a diverse and equitable Arts and Culture environment in San Francisco, we are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community.

2. General Public Comment

Discussion

(This item is to allow members of the public to comment generally on matters within the Commission's purview as well as to suggest new agenda items for the Commission's consideration.)

3. Consent Calendar

1. Motion to amend Resolution No. 0601-26-105 to update the loan period and contracting entity name, to now read as: Motion to approve the temporary installation of "Akua," 2025, by Torkwase Dyson, powder-coated steel and aluminum with eight-channel sound, measuring 20 ft. x 36 ft. x 30 ft., at Civic Center Plaza, to be loaned to the Arts Commission by Public Art Fund Creative Partners LLC for a period of approximately six months commencing September 2026, with funding from the Public Art Trust at a total cost not to exceed \$350,000. The Arts Commission will be responsible for maintenance, and the artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection.
2. Motion to amend Resolution No. 0601-26-106 to increase the not-to-exceed amount from \$20,000 to \$25,000, with the additional \$5,000 designated to cover reimbursable expenses associated with artist travel and artwork packing and shipping update the loan period, and update the contracting entity name, to now read as: Motion to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to enter into a loan agreement with Public Art Fund Creative Partners LLC, in an amount not to exceed \$25,000 for the loan of "Akua," 2025, by Torkwase Dyson, for a period of approximately six months commencing September 2026.
3. Motion to approve a Sole Source contract with One Hat One Hand LLC DBA Scene 2 for fine art installation services for the temporary presentation of Torkwase Dyson's "Akua" at Civic Center Plaza, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 6.73, in an amount not to exceed \$334,133.75. One Hat

One Hand LLC's specialized expertise in fine art fabrication and installation, proprietary knowledge of the artwork's assembly and technical requirements, and established working relationships with the original fabricator and project team make these services not reasonably available from another provider without risk of duplicative costs, schedule delays, or potential damage to the artwork.

4. Motion to approve “Tarot, The Fool”, a painted mural by Colette Amirault. The mural will be painted on a SFMTA cabinet on California Avenue and 12th Avenue. The mural measures H71 in. by W36 in. The mural will be maintained by the artist. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection.
5. Motion to approve “Rhythm of the Block”, a painted mural by Egypt Hagan. The mural will be painted on the street surface, along Keith Street between Armstrong Avenue and Bancroft Avenue, directly across from the Southeast Family Health Center. The mural measures H18 ft. by W40 ft. The mural will be maintained by The San Francisco African American Arts & Culture District. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection.
6. Motion to approve “Legacy”, a painted mural by Hungry Ghost Mural Productions (David Burke, Pancho Pescador, Joevic Yeban). The mural will be on the wall of the property located at 1165 Folsom Street. The mural measures H23 ft. by W28 ft. The mural is supported by a Community Challenge Grant and will be maintained by SOMA West Community Benefit District. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection.
7. Motion to extend the installation of “Justice” by André Renay, currently installed in the Southeast Community Center’s exterior

amphitheater, previously approved under Resolution NO. 0205-24-042 by 12 months so that the total installation period is from February 2024 through February 2027. The artwork will not become part of the Civic Art Collection and will be maintained by San Francisco General Hospital Foundation.

Presentation Time: Approximately 3 minutes

Explanatory Documents: Contractor Estimate; Staff Memo; Extension Review Packet; Mural Packet; Contractor Cost Proposal

4. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission: Treasure Island Water Resources Recovery Facility

Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve the final Construction Documents deliverables, including materials samples, for “Cycles of Water and Light,” a ceramic tile mural by Ron Moultrie Saunders for the façade of the Public Utilities Commission’s Treasure Island Water Resource Recovery Facility, located at Avenue M and 10th Street, Treasure Island.

Presenter: Project Manager Marcus Davies

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Explanatory Documents: Site images, material samples

5. Civic Art Collection Loan Requests

Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve the loan of 1960.6, “Untitled”, 1960, fiber rug, by Ida Dean Grae to the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art for the February 13 through November 14, 2027, exhibition “Go Your Own Way: Northern California Craft, 1945-80” in their special exhibition gallery.

Discussion and possible action to approve the loan of 1961.12, “Untitled”, 1961, glazed stoneware with fiber cord, by Ernie Kim to the Fine Arts

Museums of San Francisco for the April 10 through October 27, 2027, exhibition “Made in San Francisco” at the de Young Museum.

Presenter: Senior Registrar Allison Cummings & Registrar Tara Peterson

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Explanatory Document: Artwork Images

6. Minna Natoma Art Corridor

Discussion and Possible Action

- A. Discussion and possible action to approve the Final Design for street surface paving by Barbara Stauffacher Solomon, Mel Vera Cruz, and Muzae Sesay for the Minna Natoma Art Corridor Public Art Project, located on Minna and Natoma Streets between Transbay and Third Street.
- B. Discussion and possible action to approve the Final Design and Construction Documents for sculptural street furniture by Masako Miki for the Minna Natoma Art Corridor Public Art Project, located on Minna Street between Second and Third Streets.
- C. Discussion and possible action to approve the Final Design and Construction Documents for sculptural street furniture by Joye LLC (DBA Jesse Schlesinger) for the Minna Natoma Art Corridor Public Art Project, located on Natoma Street between Second Street and SFMOMA.
- D. Discussion and possible action to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to amend contract with Masako Miki to expand scope from design-only to the design, fabrication, and consultation during installation of sculptural street furniture for the Minna Natoma Art Corridor Project and to increase the artist contract budget from \$67,514 (as authorized by Resolution No.0507-12-143) to an amount not to exceed \$409,525.

- E. Discussion and possible action to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to amend contract with Joye LLC (DBA Jesse Schlesinger) to expand scope from design-only to the design, fabrication, and consultation during installation of sculptural street furniture for the Minna Natoma Art Corridor Project and to increase the artist contract budget from \$83,854 (as authorized by Resolution No.0507-12-143) to an amount not to exceed \$205,365.
- F. Discussion and possible action to amend Resolution No. 0602-25-106 to increase the Public Art Trust allocation by \$50,000, from \$375,000 to \$425,000 to contribute to the implementation of sculptural street furniture for the Minna Natoma Art Corridor Public Art Project, which is a voluntary initiative funded in large part by Public Works. This project is located within the SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Corridor.

Presenter: Project Manager Arianne G. Davidian

Presentation Time: Approximately 15 minutes

Explanatory Document: Final Design; Construction Documents; PAT Funding Request

7. Gene Friend Recreation Center

Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve as-installed “Barrio Fiesta,” an integrated-wall dye-sublimated aluminum 875 square foot artwork by Cece Carpio for the Gene Friend Recreation Center Public Art Project, located at 6th and Folsom Streets in the SOMA Pilipinas Cultural District.

Presenter: Project Manager Arianne G. Davidian

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Explanatory Document: Artwork Images

8. San Francisco International Airport – Terminal 3 West Modernization Project

Discussion and Possible Action

Discussion and possible action to approve the modification of 1987.15, “Dancing on the Brink of the World”, 1987, found metal collage on wood with steel brads, by Tony Berlant as part of the San Francisco International Airport Terminal 3 West Modernization Public Art Project. The top portion of 18 panels of the artwork will be trimmed by approximately twelve inches and the two corner panels will be flattened. The modifications will be performed by a conservator and are reversable. The artist has been notified of these modifications per CAPA/VARA requirements and supports the changes to the artwork.

Discussion and possible action to approve the relocation of 1987.15, “Dancing on the Brink of the World”, 1987, found metal collage on wood with steel brads, by Tony Berlant to San Francisco International Airport, Terminal 3 West, Departures Level, “Meet and Greet” area, Pre-Security, as part of the San Francisco International Airport Terminal 3 West Modernization Public Art Project.

Presenter: Program Manager Amy Owen

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Explanatory Document: Final Artwork Design; Construction Documents

9. Staff Report

Discussion

Presentation of Civic Art Collection and Public Art Program updates.

Presenter: Civic Art Collection & Public Art Program Director Mary Chou

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

10. New Business and Announcements

Discussion

(This item is to allow the Commissioners to introduce without discussion new agenda items for consideration, to report on recent arts activities and to make announcements in accordance with [Prop D.](#))

11. Adjournment

Action

Agenda posted 7/9/2026, 5:25pm, pc

Policies

Accessibility Meeting Policy

Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Program Associates Tara Peterson and Paris Cotz at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org or 415-539-6213, paris.cotz@sfgov.org. Late requests will be honored if possible. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible.

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。

同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料， 和/或者提供閱讀器。此外， 翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求， 請於會議前最少48小時致電415-252-2219向 Tara Peterson, tara.peterson@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求， 若可能的話， 亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Tara Peterson, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gamit upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa.

Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon.

Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay Tara Peterson sa 415-252-2219, tara.peterson@sfgov.org.

Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting.

Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin.

Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

Agenda Item Information/Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;
- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Program Associates Tara Peterson or Paris Cotz at tara.peterson@sfgov.org or paris.cotz@sfgov.org or 415-252-2219 or 415-539-6213. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Archives Available

A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting. [View Visual Arts Committee Meeting Recordings](#)

Cell Phone Or other Electronic Device Use at Hearings

Please silence all cell phones, pagers, and other sound-producing devices before the meeting begins.

If a device does go off during the meeting, please note that the Chair or President may ask the person responsible to step out of the room.

Disability Access

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Tara Peterson or Paris Cotz at tara.peterson@sfgov.org or paris.cotz@sfgov.org or

415-252-2219 or 415-539-6213, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

- Wheelchair accessible entrance is at Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street.
- There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Lobbyist Ordinance

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity.

For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, contact the [Ethics Commission](#).

- 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 252-3100
- Ethics.Commission@sfgov.org

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.

2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.

3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the

Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.

5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. Written comments submitted to and received by Arts Commission staff via email to tara.petrson@sfgov.org or paris.cotz@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. before the date of the meeting will be brought to the attention of the commission and made part of the official record. Comments received after the meeting may also be included in the record. The program associates will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Public Comment

Public comment in regard to specific agenda items will be taken before or during consideration of the item. Each speaker may speak for up to three minutes per agenda item, unless the Chair has announced a different length of time at the beginning of the meeting. Speakers may not transfer their time to another person. Any person speaking during a public comment period may supply a written summary of their comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less.

NOTE: The San Francisco Arts Commission is discontinuing remote public comment for all public meetings starting in December 2023. Public comment will be taken in-person, with remote access provided for those who require an ADA accommodation. Requests for accommodation must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 97.7. Late requests will be honored if possible. Please reach out to art-info@sfgov.org or by calling 415-252-2255 with any questions or to make an accommodation request

Sensitivity to chemical-based products

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

Citizens interested in obtaining a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance can request a copy from by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine/>

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- 1 Dr. Carlton b. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 554-7724

- By fax at 415-554 7854
- sotf@sfgov.org

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: July 20, 2026 SFAC Civic Design Review Agenda Posted
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:42:05 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[July 20 2026 Civic Design Review Agenda.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART) Civic Design Review committee meeting agenda for July 20, 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: Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 11:46 AM
Subject: July 20, 2026 SFAC Civic Design Review Agenda Posted

Hello,

The agenda for the Monday, July 20, 2026, Civic Design Review meeting has been posted:

[Civic Design Review Meeting | San Francisco \(sf.gov\)](#)

[Agenda](#)

Thank you,
Manraj



Manraj Dhaliwal
Commission Secretary
Pronouns: [he/him](#)
Email: manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org
Phone: 415-252-2247
Mobile: 415-940-1803

San Francisco Arts Commission

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

www.sfartscommission.org

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

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

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



City and County of San Francisco

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Agenda for Civic Design Review, July 20, 2026



Commissioners

- Patrick Carney, Chair; Seth Brenzel, Chuck Collins, Al Perez, McKenna Quint, Jessica Rothschild, Janine Shiota.

Date and Time

Monday, July 20, 2026

2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Location

City Hall, Room 416,

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place.

Members of the committee will attend this meeting in-person at the location listed above. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in person at the physical meeting location listed above or remotely online.

Members of the public attending the meeting in-person will have an opportunity to provide up to three minutes of public comment on every agenda item.

- Watch on SFGovTV (captioned) [Live Stream – Civic Design Review Meeting](#)

Agenda items

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Changes, Land Acknowledgment

1. Call to order
2. Roll call / Confirmation of quorum
3. Agenda Changes
4. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples. As a department dedicated to promoting a diverse and equitable Arts and Culture environment in San Francisco, we are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community.

2. General Public Comment

Discussion

(This item is to allow members of the public to comment generally on matters within the Commission's purview as well as to suggest new agenda items for the Commission's consideration.)

3. J Muni Forward: Church & Market – Small Project Review

Discussion and possible action

Discussion and possible action for Small Project Review for J Muni Forward: Church & Market.

Presentation time: Approximately 10 minutes

Project team:

Project Designer(s): James Chai (SFMTA)

Project Manager(s): Ben Volberding (SFMTA)

Architect: Patricia Solis (SFPW)

Landscape Architect: William Bulkley

[J Muni Forward Church Market: Small Project Review, Request for Review](#)

[J Muni Forward: Church & Market Project, CDR Presentation](#)

[J Muni Forward: Church & Market Project, Construction Documents](#)

4. New Business and Announcements

Discussion

(This item is to allow the Commissioners to introduce without discussion new agenda items for consideration, to report on recent arts activities and to make announcements in accordance with [Prop D.](#))

5. Adjournment

Action

Agenda posted 07/14/2026, 11:00 am, mscd

Policies

Accessibility Meeting Policy

Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Late requests will be honored if possible. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible.

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料，和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少 48 小時致電 415-252-2247 向 Manraj Dhaliwal, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de

señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Commission Secretary, Manraj Dhaliwal, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gamit upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa. Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal sa 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin. Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

Agenda Item Information/Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;
- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or

distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Archives Available

A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting.

Cell Phone Or other Electronic Device Use at Hearings

Please silence all cell phones, pagers, and other sound-producing devices before the meeting begins.

If a device does go off during the meeting, please note that the Chair or President may ask the person responsible to step out of the room.

Disability Access

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

- Wheelchair accessible entrance is at Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street.
- There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Lobbyist Ordinance

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist

Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity.

For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, contact the Ethics Commission.

- 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 252-3100
- Ethics.Commission@sfgov.org

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.

2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.

3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.

5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. The Commission Secretary will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Public Comment

Public comment in regard to specific agenda items will be taken before or during consideration of the item. Each speaker may speak for up to three minutes per agenda item, unless the Chair has announced a different length of time at the beginning of the meeting. Speakers may not transfer their time to another person. Any person speaking during a public comment period may supply a written summary of their comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less.

NOTE: The San Francisco Arts Commission is discontinuing remote public comment for all public meetings starting in December 2023. Public comment will be taken in-person, with remote access provided for those who require an ADA accommodation. Requests for accommodation must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 97.7. Late requests will be honored if possible. Please reach out to art-info@sfgov.org or by calling 415-252-2255 with any questions or to make an accommodation request

Sensitivity to chemical-based products

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees

may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

Citizens interested in obtaining a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance can request a copy from by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine/>

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- 1 Dr. Carlton b. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 554-7724
- By fax at 415-554 7854
- sotf@sfgov.org

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: Street Artists Committee Meeting Agenda | July 27, 2026
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 8:26:15 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-Logo_Desc.png](#)
[Street Artists Committee Meeting Agenda - July 27, 2026_bZBd5yg.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please attached and below communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission (ART), submitting an agenda for the July 27, 2026, Street Artists Committee meeting.

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: Sun, Kingsley (ART) <kingsley.sun@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2026 10:14 AM
To: SOTF (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Cc: Te, Coma (ART) <coma.te@sfgov.org>
Subject: Street Artists Committee Meeting Agenda | July 27, 2026

Hello,

The agenda for the July 27, 2026 Street Artists Committee meeting has been posted.
[https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Street_Artists_Committee_Meeting_Agenda -
_July_27_2026_bZBd5yg.pdf](https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Street_Artists_Committee_Meeting_Agenda_-_July_27_2026_bZBd5yg.pdf)

Thanks,



Kingsley Sun

Program Associate

Pronouns: [he/him](#)

Email: kingsley.sun@sfgov.org

Office: 415-252-2228

Mobile: 415-310-8832

San Francisco Arts Commission

401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325

San Francisco, CA 94102

www.sf.gov/artscommission

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

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

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



City and County of San Francisco

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Agenda for Street Artists Committee, July 27, 2026



Commissioners

- Chair Janine Shiota, Seth Brenzel, Suzie Ferras, Nabil Musleh, Marcus Shelby, Debra Walker, Charles Collins

Date and Time

Monday, July 27, 2026

10:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Location

City Hall, Room 416,

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place.

Members of the committee will attend this meeting in-person at the location listed above. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in person at the physical meeting location listed above or remotely online.

Members of the public attending the meeting in-person will have an opportunity to provide up to three minutes of public comment on every agenda item.

- Watch on SFGovTV (captioned) [Live Stream – The Street Artist Committee Meeting](#)

Agenda items

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Changes, Land Acknowledgment

1. Call to order
2. Roll call / Confirmation of quorum
3. Agenda Changes
4. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples. As a department dedicated to promoting a diverse and equitable Arts and Culture environment in San Francisco, we are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community.

2. General Public Comment

Discussion

(This item is to allow members of the public to comment generally on matters within the Commission's purview as well as to suggest new agenda items for the Commission's consideration.)

3. Overview of Art Vendor Disciplinary Procedures

Discussion

Staff Presenter: Anne Trickey, Senior Program Officer

Presentation Time: Approximately 5 minutes

Explanatory Document:

[Art Vendor Disciplinary Procedures and the Role of the Street Artists Committee.pdf](#)

4. Hearing and possible motion to approve revocation of art vendor license for art vendor ZhongYu Wang (9021):

- **Participating in a violent altercation, threats against art vendor Jianfu Wei (8970) and disrupting the business of the market.**

Discussion and Possible Action

Staff Presenter: Anne Trickey, Senior Program Officer

Presentation time: Approximately 5 minutes

Discussion and possible action to approve revocation of art vendor license for art vendor ZhongYu Wang (9021)

Explanatory Document:

ZhongYu Wang Report

5. Adjournment

Action

Agenda posted 7/8/2026, 4:30 pm, KS

Policies

Accessibility Meeting Policy

Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Late requests will be honored if possible. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible.

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料，和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少 48 小時致電 415-252-2247 向 Manraj Dhaliwal, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Commission Secretary, Manraj Dhaliwal, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gamit upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa.

Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon.

Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal sa 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin. Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

Agenda Item Information/Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;

- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Archives Available

A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting.

Cell Phone Or other Electronic Device Use at Hearings

Please silence all cell phones, pagers, and other sound-producing devices before the meeting begins.

If a device does go off during the meeting, please note that the Chair or President may ask the person responsible to step out of the room.

Disability Access

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

- Wheelchair accessible entrance is at Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street.
- There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Lobbyist Ordinance

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity.

For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, contact the [Ethics Commission](#).

- 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 252-3100
- Ethics.Commission@sfgov.org

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.

2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.

3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may

reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.

5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. The Commission Secretary will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Public Comment

Public comment in regard to specific agenda items will be taken before or during consideration of the item. Each speaker may speak for up to three minutes per agenda item, unless the Chair has announced a different length of time at the beginning of the meeting. Speakers may not transfer their time to another person. Any person speaking during a public comment period may supply a written summary of their comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less.

NOTE: The San Francisco Arts Commission is discontinuing remote public comment for all public meetings starting in December 2023. Public comment will be taken in-person, with remote access provided for those who require an ADA accommodation. Requests for accommodation must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 97.7. Late requests will be honored if possible. Please reach out to art-info@sfgov.org or by calling 415-252-2255 with any questions or to make an accommodation request

Sensitivity to chemical-based products

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

Citizens interested in obtaining a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance can request a copy from by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine/>

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- 1 Dr. Carlton b. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 554-7724
- By fax at 415-554 7854
- sotf@sfgov.org

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: 4 Annual Gift Reports
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 12:28:57 PM
Attachments: [4 Annual Gift Reports.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please attached from various departments, submitting Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal Year 2025-2026, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305(c).

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: [Wong, Greg \(DPH\)](#)
To: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kirkpatrick, Kelly \(DPH\)](#); [Conover, Lily \(DPH\)](#); [Chiong, Christina \(DPH\)](#)
Subject: Annual Gifts Report FY2025-2026
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 3:04:14 PM
Attachments: [2026 BOS Annual Report.zip](#)

Hello,

Please find attached the Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal year 2025-2026. Thank you for accepting our report and please advise if anything further is needed.

Sincerely,

Gregory Wong

Administrative Analyst

Department of Public Health

101 Grove Street

San Francisco CA 94102

Email: greg.wong@sfdph.org



London N. Breed
Mayor

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Greg Wong, Fiscal Administrative Analyst, DPH

DATE: Wednesday, July 15, 2026

SUBJECT: Annual Report on Gifts Received by Department of Public Health in Fiscal Year 2026

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.100-201, we are submitting the attached report to notify the Board of Supervisors on all gifts received by our Department during the past fiscal year. If you have any questions related to this report, please kindly give me a call at 628-217-7608 or send me an email at greg.wong@sfdph.org.

Thank you!

Date Received	Donor Name	Donor's Financial Interest involving City, if Any	Nature of Gift	Number of Items (if applicable)	Value (estimate if non-cash)	Division	Description
7/3/2025	Purchaser Business Group on Health (PBGH)	Contractor	Funding	1	950.00	Central	Honorarium for DPH staff to travel and participate in Rady Children's Hospital site visit.
7/11/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	3	162.87	Central	Patient care supplies-bath benches.
7/11/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	37.74	Central	Patient care supplies- nebulizer
7/11/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	78.85	Central	Patient care supplies- microwave
7/11/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	51.72	Central	Patient supplies- cleaning supplies
7/11/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	2	65.16	Central	Patient supplies- egg crate mattresses.
7/14/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	18.46	Central	Patient supplies- rehab patient heating pad.
7/14/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	66.51	Central	Patient supplies- grocery delivery.
7/21/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	6	224.81	Central	Patient supplies- bath benches, step stool, and egg crate mattresses.
8/28/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	54.30	Central	Patient supplies- diabetic shoes for patient at-risk for amputation
9/3/2025	San Francisco General Hospital Foundation	Contractor & Lease of office space	In-kind	1	3,000.00	Central	Hearts of SF- Chinatown Public Health Center Community Heart
10/1/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	300	262.33	Central	Chinatown Child Development Center (CCDC) customized program material client outreach.
10/10/2025	Food and Nutrition Conference Expo	None	In-kind	1	420.00	Central	Registration fee for staff attendance to speak at the Food and Nutrition Conference Expo.
10/17/2025	CalRecycle	None	In-kind	3	2,122.05	Central	Registration, hotel, and parking for staff to attend the CalRecycle/LEA/TEA Hybrid Technical Training Series
11/25/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	321	2,000.00	Central	Promotional items for client outreach at annual Chinatown Community Health Fair
11/25/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	8	99.00	Central	Leadership training books to support professional development.
11/24/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	92.94	Central	Patient supplies- grocery delivery following traumatic injury.
11/24/2025	EPIC Systems Corp.	Contractor	Funding	1	600.00	Central	2025 XGM Safety Net Gift
11/24/2025	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	2	226.24	Central	Patient supplies- small refrigerator and microwave.
2/4/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	Funding	45	4,591.10	Central	Patient supplies- Thanksgiving Food gift cards.
1/21/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	30	1,800.00	Central	Patient supplies-packaged family Thanksgiving meal bags for CCDC clients.
1/13/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	8	883.36	Central	Patient supplies- heating pad, decibel monitoring device, and holiday gift bags.
1/4/2026	SF CAN Kara Lugtu	None	Funding	1	2,500.00	Central	Colorectal & Breast Cancer Quality Improvement Stipend program
1/4/2026	Homes for the Homeless Fund LLC	None	Funding	1	480,000.00	Central	Approved through SF Admin Code21B.3(c):Funding for purchase of Long-Acting Injectable (LAI) buprenorphine for City clinics.
1/22/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	605	174.78	Central	CCDC client outreach supplies- Lunar New Year
3/11/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	1	60.81	Central	Patient supplies- hospital bed hand crank and remote controller.
3/13/2026	Homes for the Homeless Fund LLC	Contractor	Funding	1	24,999.00	Central	Program supplies- purchase of safes for LAI Buprenorphine storage.
3/17/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	2	188.00	Central	Patient supplies- wheelchair side guards.
4/9/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	5	92.71	Central	Patient supplies- heating pads and shoes.
4/14/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	40	1,602.60	Central	Patient supplies- AHA validated blood pressure monitors.
4/15/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	2	36.92	Central	Patient supplies: moist heating pads.
5/1/2026	San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Contractor	In-kind	300	270.83	Central	CCDC customized client outreach supplies.
11/3/2025	Abbey Keck	None	Funding	1	100.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
7/3/2025	Barbara Benjamin	None	Funding	1	200.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital

11/5/2025	Bernard Brasseur	None	Funding	1	500.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
6/7/2026	Elaine M Carney	None	Funding	1	100.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
2/28/2026	Estrella Ibay	None	Funding	1	100.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
1/1/2026	Garrison Properties	None	Funding	1	100.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
1/7/2026	Maureen Leahy Murphy	None	Funding	1	500.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
11/5/2025	Michael Macia	None	Funding	1	25.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
11/5/2025	Milo Hanke	None	Funding	1	500.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
11/12/2025	Roxandra Isear	None	Funding	1	5.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
1/2/2026	Susannah Owen	None	Funding	1	10.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
11/5/2025	Y. Chung	None	Funding	1	200.00	LHH	General benefit and comfort of patients of the Laguna Honda Hospital
1/3/2026	San Francisco General Hospital Foundation	Contractor & Lease of office space	In-Kind	4-pk crayons, 600 coloring/activity books	274.45	ZSFG	Pediatric patient supplies- crayons and coloring/activity books.
2/20/2026	CA Association of Public Hopsitals & Health Systems	None	Funding	1	2,000.00	ZSFG	Patient supplies.
5/8/2026	Abbe & Associates	Contractor	Funding	1	4,683.10	ZSFG	Patient supplies- reusable foodware.

From: [Delmage, Michelle \(REC\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Madland, Sarah \(REC\)](#); [Guerra, Antonio \(REC\)](#); [Bransten, Lisa \(REC\)](#); [Khoury, Daliah \(REC\)](#); [Mangrobang, Melson \(CON\)](#); [Luo, Kelly \(CON\)](#); [Zhu, David \(CON\)](#)
Subject: Annual Report on Gifts (FY26)
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 9:20:58 AM
Attachments: [Memo_Annual Report on Gifts Received up to 10K_FY26.pdf](#)

Hi Angela,

Please see the attached annual report on gifts received by the Recreation and Parks Department in FY 2025-26.

Thanks,
Michelle Delmage
Finance and Accounting Operations Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
415-831-6889 (office)

Daniel Lurie, Mayor



Kat Anderson, Commission President
Sarah Madland, General Manager

Date: July 7, 2026

To: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Antonio Guerra
Director of Administration and Finance

Subject: Annual Report on Gifts Received up to \$10,000 (Fiscal Year 2025-26)

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.100-305, this memo serves to provide the Board of Supervisors with the enclosed Annual Report on Gifts up to \$10,000 received by the Department during the past fiscal year.

Please let me know if you have any questions about the information on the report.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Antonio Manuel Guerra
3AD65566A59C4BC...

Antonio Guerra
Director of Administration and Finance

cc: Sarah Madland, General Manager

Enclosure



Donations Report

\$100 to \$10,000

July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026

Close Date	Account Name	Amount	Website Description	Type
7/1/2025	Bay Area Barns and Trails (BAPT)	\$1,000.00	To provide a cost estimate for the planning phase for a horse facility in Golden Gate Park.	In-kind
7/1/2025	Pier 39 Limited Partnership	\$710.00	To support soccer programs for kids in District 10.	Cash
7/28/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$1,542.66	To support general operations.	Cash
7/28/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$500.00	To support general operations.	Cash
7/31/2025	Olly	\$2,884.11	To support the Volunteer Division and Alamo Square.	In-kind
8/5/2025	Fox Rothschild LLP	\$8,784.22	To support youth sports in San Francisco.	Cash
8/12/2025	HandsOn Bay Area	\$3,101.19	To support volunteer events at Mission Bay Park.	Cash
8/15/2025	Olly	\$5,000.00	To support the volunteer division and Alamo Square.	Cash
8/15/2025	Civic Space Foundation	\$3,479.95	To support volunteer planting events in John McLaren Park.	In-kind
8/15/2025	Civic Space Foundation	\$1,321.19	To support volunteer planting events in John McLaren Park.	In-kind
8/21/2025	San Francisco Beautiful	\$2,500.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
8/26/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$500.00	To support general operations.	Cash
8/26/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$338.00	To support general operations.	Cash
8/26/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$100.00	To support the volunteer division.	Cash
8/28/2025	Kathleen Raffel	\$2,000.00	To support the Tennis & Learning Center program.	Cash
9/5/2025	Alice Russell-Shapiro	\$250.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
9/11/2025	The Friends of Duboce Park	\$266.00	To support the purchase of trees and other plant materials for Duboce Park.	Cash
9/15/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$241.80	To support general operations.	Cash
9/19/2025	Jed Lau	\$500.00	To support general operations.	Cash
9/28/2025	Kunal Patel Foundation	\$5,000.00	To support the Tennis & Learning Center.	Cash
10/14/2025	California State Coastal Conservancy	\$5,125.34	To support the Sunset Dunes Planning project.	Cash
10/20/2025	Civic Space Foundation	\$1,499.02	To support volunteer events at Golden Gate Heights Park.	Cash
10/20/2025	Donald Andreini	\$100.00	To support Sue Bierman park.	Cash
10/23/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$10,000.00	To support San Francisco Children and Nature. This gift was made possible by a generous donation from the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative.	Cash
10/23/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$1,000.00	To support volunteering events. This gift was made possible by a generous donation from Ares Management.	Cash
10/23/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$300.00	To support general operations.	Cash

10/24/2025	Monterey Bay Nursery	\$449.63	To support the tree fern dell of Golden Gate Park.	In-kind
11/3/2025	Greening Projects	\$5,500.00	To support improvements at Bernal Heights Recreation Center.	In-kind
11/3/2025	John Shea	\$200.00	To support recreation programs.	Cash
11/12/2025	Matthew Spindler	\$100.00	To provide picnic tables to States Street Playground.	In-kind
11/13/2025	Tides Center	\$3,959.59	To support McKinley Square Park.	Cash
11/13/2025	Lumpkin Family Fund	\$500.00	To support general operations.	Cash
11/20/2025	Lynne Butcher	\$500.00	To support general operations.	Cash
11/24/2025	James Wendorf	\$500.00	To support Golden Gate Park's chain of lakes area.	Cash
12/3/2025	Miyoshi Family Giving Fund	\$100.00	To support general operations.	Cash
12/3/2025	Debra Kegel	\$100.00	To support parks and open spaces.	Cash
12/9/2025	Jeannine Marie Hensley	\$1,000.00	To support general operations.	Cash
12/11/2025	Jewish Federation Bay Area	\$5,000.00	To support the Randall Museum.	Cash
12/15/2025	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$572.82	To support general operations.	Cash
12/15/2025	Jennifer Herriot-Hatfield	\$500.00	To support general operations.	Cash
12/22/2025	Paul S. Nadler Family Charitable Trust	\$5,000.00	To support general operations.	Cash
12/23/2025	Travis Townsend	\$5,000.00	To support parks and open spaces in San Francisco.	Cash
12/24/2025	Kelvin Mack	\$165.00	To support plantings at Golden Gate Heights Park.	Cash
12/29/2025	Barbara Boyd	\$100.00	To support parks and open spaces in San Francisco.	Cash
12/31/2025	Joyce Lin-Conrad	\$2,000.00	To support general operations.	Cash
1/8/2026	Vaquero Foundation	\$5,000.00	To support general operations.	Cash
1/23/2026	Consulate General of Ireland	\$2,000.00	To support improvements to the GGP Handball Courts.	Cash
1/27/2026	Rachel Kaplan	\$500.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
1/27/2026	Howard Berger	\$100.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
1/28/2026	San Francisco Orchid Society	\$1,703.46	To provide assessment, maintenance, and rewire of the audio system in the County Fair Building.	In-kind
1/29/2026	Susan Messer	\$100.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
1/31/2026	Surfrider Foundation	\$800.00	To support the Ocean Beach Dune Revegetation Project.	In-kind
2/2/2026	Harvey Grossman	\$5,000.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/2/2026	American Gaelic Games (aka US Gaelic Athletic Association)	\$5,000.00	To support the handball courts in Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/2/2026	Merrill Smith	\$100.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/2/2026	David Orloff	\$100.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash

2/3/2026	Sports Basement	\$653.00	To provide support for sports and activity supplies.	In-kind
2/4/2026	Heather Steans	\$1,000.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/4/2026	Caroline Harney	\$200.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/13/2026	Civic Space Foundation	\$1,493.03	To support volunteer events in Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/17/2026	Maria Ferreria	\$500.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/17/2026	The Freemont Group Foundation	\$250.00	To support Willie Woo Woo Wong Playground.	Cash
2/18/2026	Robert Rosenbaum	\$200.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/18/2026	Theodore Koerner	\$150.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/19/2026	Lewis Rosenberg	\$200.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell in Golden Gate Park.	Cash
2/24/2026	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$185.65	To support general operations.	Cash
3/9/2026	Ben Newman	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
3/10/2026	USTA NorCAL	\$8,000.00	To support the Tennis & Learning Center.	Cash
3/16/2026	James Rooney	\$100.00	To support general operations.	Cash
3/23/2026	Greening Projects	\$10,000.00	To support improvements at Bernal Heights Recreation Center.	Cash
3/25/2026	Justine Perez	\$200.00	To provide art supplies.	In-kind
4/6/2026	Sue Mocklin	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
4/7/2026	Magnus Campbell	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
4/7/2026	SF Succulent & Cactus Society	\$2,319.82	To support the Arizona Succulent Garden in Golden Gate Park.	In-kind
4/10/2026	Regina Saisi	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
4/15/2026	Fred Parkin	\$500.00	To support improvements at the Palace of Fine Arts.	Cash
4/22/2026	Nob Hill Association and Foundation	\$500.00	To support a pet waste bag dispenser pilot program at Huntington Park.	In-kind
4/22/2026	Jewel Molejona	\$100.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
4/23/2026	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$233.55	To support general operations.	Cash
4/23/2026	David Frias	\$200.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
4/23/2026	Melissa Heng	\$100.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
4/24/2026	Francis Nufable	\$200.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
4/24/2026	Simon Attley	\$100.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
4/24/2026	Gemma Gattley	\$100.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
4/27/2026	Charlene Thomas	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench program.	Cash
4/29/2026	San Francisco Beautiful	\$2,500.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell of Golden Gate Park.	Cash

5/1/2026	Carine Rompante	\$250.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
5/1/2026	James Attley	\$100.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
5/1/2026	Jill Orhun	\$100.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
5/3/2026	Liam Kenny	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
5/4/2026	SF Gaelic Athletic Association	\$5,000.00	To support the handball courts in Golden Gate Park.	Cash
5/4/2026	David Owens	\$500.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
5/5/2026	Isabel Wade	\$100.00	To support the Tree Fern Dell in Golden Gate Park.	Cash
5/6/2026	Alexander Morozoff	\$105.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
5/12/2026	Friends of Sunset Dunes	\$4,686.51	To provide support for public engagement and adding, repairing & replacing park amenities.	In-kind
5/16/2026	Thomas Horn	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
5/18/2026	Calvin & Faye Taam	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
5/19/2026	Patricia Seligman	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
5/22/2026	Courtney Graham	\$100.00	To support girls basketball.	Cash
5/26/2026	Kaitlyn Carter	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench program.	Cash
5/27/2026	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$5,701.66	To support general operations.	Cash
5/27/2026	Levi Strauss & Co.	\$5,000.00	To support general operations.	Cash
6/2/2026	Laura Boll	\$165.00	To support Golden Gate Heights Park.	Cash
6/3/2026	HandsOn Bay Area	\$1,140.01	To support volunteer events at Mission Bay Park.	Cash
6/3/2026	John Paul Greiten	\$250.00	To support the Rose Garden of Golden Gate Park.	Cash
6/9/2026	Shaper Tools	\$5,708.19	To support Mission Arts and Recreation Center.	In-kind
6/9/2026	Dahlia Society of California - San Francisco	\$5,000.00	To support fence painting services at the Dahlia Dell in Golden Gate Park.	In-kind
6/22/2026	William Hamlin	\$500.00	To support parks and open spaces.	Cash
6/23/2026	Benevity Community Impact Fund	\$556.93	To support the Volunteer Division.	Cash
6/24/2026	Roslyn Payne	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench Program.	Cash
6/25/2026	Caitlin Donahue	\$6,500.00	To support the Commemorative Bench program.	Cash
6/29/2026	Nob Hill Association and Foundation	\$2,788.44	To support the purchase of flowers and plants at Huntington Park.	In-kind

\$255,430.77

From: [McCloskey, Benjamin \(MYR\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Adams, Dan \(MYR\)](#); [Gremer, Andrea \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: MOHCD Annual Reporting: Gifts, Sole Source Contracts, and Sole Source Grants
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 1:42:20 PM
Attachments: [MOHCD Sole Source FY25-26.pdf](#)
[MOHCD Sole Source 21G Grants 2025.pdf](#)
[MOHCD Annual Gift Report FY25-26.pdf](#)

Madam Clerk:

Attached please find MOHCD's 21G.3 sole source report for Calendar Year 2025, 10.100-305(c) gift report for FY25-26, and 67.24(e) sole source report for FY25-26.

Thank you,
Benjamin

Benjamin McCloskey (he/him)
Deputy Director – Finance and Administration
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
benjamin.mccloskey@sfgov.org

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Daniel Adams
Director

July 1, 2026

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
via email

re: Annual Gift Report FY2025-2026, Admin Code 10.100-305(c)

Madam Clerk:

Administrative Code Chapter 10.100-305(c) requires departments to report any gifts received by the department in the previous fiscal year. We received one reportable gift in FY2025-2026 as described below. This gift has previously been reported to the Ethics Commission on SFEC Form 3217. Please reach out to me if you have any questions.

ULI San Francisco, one entry to Housing the Bay Summit 2025, valued at \$150

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Benjamin McCloskey".

Benjamin McCloskey
Deputy Director, Finance and Administration

From: [Garrido, Lorna \(DAT\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Clendinen, Eugene \(DAT\)](#); [Arcelona, Sheila \(DAT\)](#)
Subject: DAT Annual Gift Fund Notice to the Board of Supervisors FY2025-2026
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 12:57:31 PM
Attachments: [DAT Annual Gift Fund Notice to the Board of Supervisors FY 2025-2026.pdf](#)

Good afternoon Angela,

Please find attached the DAT Annual Gift Fund Notice to the Board of Supervisors FY2025-2026.

Please let us know if you have any question.

Thanks,

Lorna

Lorna Garrido

Pronouns: she/her/hers

Grants and Contracts Manager

Office of District Attorney Brooke Jenkins

350 Rhode Island Street

North Building, Suite 400N

San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone: (628) 652-4035

Fax: (628) 652-4001

Email: lorna.garrido@sfgov.org

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.



Brooke Jenkins
District Attorney

Date: July 1, 2026

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Eugene Clendinen, Chief Administrative and Financial Officer 

Subject: Annual Report on Gifts Received in FY2025-2026

In accordance with SF Administrative Code Section 10.100-305(c) this memo serves to provide the Board of Supervisors with a report on gifts received by the Department:

Gift Description	Source	Value	Disposition
10-cases of non-sugar water, 2-big coolers, and 2-big bag of ice	San Francisco Street Violence Intervention Program	\$140.00	To provide clean, refreshing water for adequate hydration to support the "Keepin" It Safe in the City" event held on October 18, 2025
DJ services	San Francisco Police Officers Association	\$650.00	To provide DJ services to support the "Keepin" It Safe in the City" event held on October 18, 2025
115 hamburgers, 115 cheeseburgers, 20 Impossible burgers (veggie)	Marin Street Enterprises, dba The Midway, Fifth House Catering	\$4,449.38	To provide burgers to support the "Keepin" It Safe in the City" event held on October 18, 2025.
50 Golden State Warriors medallions, 50 Golden State Warriors rally towels, 72 Golden State Warriors playoff T-shirts, and 28 Golden State Warriors pins	Golden State Warriors	\$4,458	To support the children and families who participated in the Keepin" It Safe in the City" event held on October 18, 2025.
Funds to support women's initiative program costs	The Chris Larsen Fund/Silicon Valley Community Foundation	\$200,000	To cover a victim advocate position and program costs for victim needs in support of a women's initiative for the purpose of public safety prevention efforts



Brooke Jenkins
District Attorney

Gift Description	Source	Value	Disposition
Reimbursement of estimated travel costs for a representative from the San Francisco District Attorney's Office to participate in the Notre Dame Law School's Spring 2026 Public Interest Meet the Employers (MTE) Reception on April 8, 2026	University of Notre Dame Law School	\$875	To cover the total estimated costs for the trip to Notre Dame, IN which includes \$600 for round-trip airfare and \$275 for one night of lodging to attend the Public Interest MTE Reception that offers students the chance to learn about careers in public interest law, connect directly with employers and attorneys working in public service, and explore internship, fellowship, and post-graduate opportunities.

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: SFPL Annual Gift Report for FY 2025-26
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 8:13:55 AM
Attachments: [SFPL Gift letter and list of FY 2025-26 to BOS.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Public Library (SFPL), submitting an Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal Year 2025-2026, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305(c).

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: Jiang, Feng Ling (LIB) <fengling.jiang@sfpl.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 8:08 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Fernandez, Mike (LIB) <mike.fernandez@sfpl.org>; Lindsley, Lovely (LIB) <lovely.lindsley@sfpl.org>
Subject: FW: SFPL Annual Gift Report for FY 2025-26

Hello,

Please find attached FY 2025-26 Annual Gift Report received by the San Francisco Public Library.

Thank you,
Susan



San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street (Civic Center)
San Francisco, CA 94102

Date: July 14, 2026
To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: San Francisco Public Library-Finance Department
Subject: FY 2025-26 Annual Gift Report

MEMORANDUM

In accordance with [Administrative Code Section 10.100-305](#), this memo serves to provide the Board of Supervisors with a report on gifts received by the Department during FY 2025-2026.

Please find the attached report for your reference.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

Mike Fernandez

FF01AD3ECD1D498...

Mike Fernandez
Chief Financial Officer

cc: File, SFPL-Finance Department

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
GIFT RECORD
FY2025-2026

Date Received by SFPL Finance	Source	Value	Gift description	Disposition
07/03/25	Lucy Quion	\$ 204.55	Check	Gift for Library Services & Program Support
07/11/25	Dana R. Zartner	\$ 420.00	Check	Gift/\$105 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/\$105 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/\$210 for Library Services & Program Support
08/21/25	Fidelity: Richard Lerche	\$ 100.00	Check	Gift for Library Services & Program Support
08/28/25	Feng Huang	\$ 30.00	Cash	Gift/\$7.5 for Books and Materials-Adult Gift/\$7.5 for Books and Materials-Youth Gift/\$15 for Library Services & Program Support
10/24/25	Nakagawa Charitable	\$ 100.00	G2SF EFT - Wire	donation to SF Public Library, where it needed the most.
11/13/25	Yumiko Westland	\$ 150.00	Check	Library Services & Program Support
12/04/25	Jean Wright	\$ 9,000.00	Check	Library unrestricted
12/12/25	Sherilyn Dunklau	\$ 500.00	Check	Library unrestricted
12/18/25	Linda Chodos	\$ 100.00	Check	Library unrestricted
12/18/25	Carolyn Cheung	\$ 1,000.00	Check	Gift for Books and Materials-Youth/Adults
01/08/26	Marilyn Y. Nichols	\$ 50.00	Check	Library unrestricted
01/08/26	Shawn Reed	\$ 500.00	Check	Library unrestricted
01/08/26	Henry and Denise Louie	\$ 200.00	Check	Library unrestricted
01/08/26	Edward F. Connor	\$ 200.00	Check	Library Services & Program Support
01/08/26	Mandy Mum Sum Woo	\$ 100.00	Check	Library Services & Program Support
01/08/26	Ronald Gilson	\$ 1,000.00	Check	Library unrestricted
01/08/26	Susan Mackenzie	\$ 2,000.00	Check	Library unrestricted
01/08/26	Lois Buncher	\$ 10.00	Check	Library unrestricted
01/29/26	Kenneth Lowe	\$ 10.00	Cash	Library unrestricted
02/06/26	Lucille Tashiro	\$ 25.00	Check	Gift for Books and Materials-Adults
02/06/26	Carnegie Libraries	\$ 70,000.00	Check	Carnegie Gift for 7 branch locations (CHI, GGV, MIS, NEV, PRE, RIC, SUN)
03/12/26	Frances Quan	\$ 500.00	Check	Library unrestricted
03/26/26	Judy Wellisch and Ramon Balagot	\$ 99.00	Check	Library unrestricted
06/12/26	Mimi Tong	\$ 25.00	cash	Library unrestricted - Parkside branch
06/24/26	The H.W. Wilson Foundation Inc	\$ 10,000.00	Check	Library unrestricted - Gift for winner of a John Cotton Dana Award for 2026
06/26/26	Lois Ann Lenehan	\$ 200.00	Check	Library unrestricted
06/22/26	Aaron J Vavrek	\$ 5.00	G2SF EFT - Wire	Library unrestricted

\$ 96,528.55

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: FY 2025-26 Annual Gifts Report
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 3:32:29 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[FY 25-26 SFPUC Gift Reporting Memo.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached and below communication from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.100-305(c), submitting an Annual Gifts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 – 2026.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar

Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
justice.alcantar@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 3:22 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>; Halliday, Kylie (PUC) <KHalliday@sfwater.org>
Subject: FY 2025-26 Annual Gifts Report

Hello BOS team,

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100 305(c), this memorandum provides the Board of Supervisors a report on gifts received up to \$10,000 by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission during FY 2025-26.

Best.
Jenny

Jennifer Oliveros Reyes (she/her/ella)
Policy & Government Affairs
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Cellphone: 628-249-8600
joliverosreyes@sfwater.org



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



MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 10, 2026

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

THROUGH: Ronald P. Flynn, Acting General Manager 

FROM: Nancy L. Hom, AGM Business Services and Chief Financial Officer 

SUBJECT: FY 2025-26 Annual Gifts Report

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-305(c), this memorandum provides the Board of Supervisors a report on gifts received up to \$10,000 by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission during FY 2025-26.

Cash Donations:

Donor Name	Amount
TG Zimmerman	\$90

In-Kind Donations:

Donor Name	Gift Description	Total Dollar Value
San Francisco Building Trades and Construction	(2) Tickets for 2025 Public Service Awards	\$800
Milwaukee Tools	Electric Landscaping Equipment and Power Tools	\$9,572
Calpine Community Energy	Harry & David Fruit and Treats	\$129.00 (Item donated to St. Francis Living Room)
Power X	Charcuterie Board Boarderie.com	\$139.00 (Item donated to St. Francis Living Room)

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager



Bond Dealers of America	Comp. ticket for Nikolai Sklaroff to be a guest speaker at their conference	\$600

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: BOS Report for SFPUC Sole Source Contracts FY2025-2026
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 1:31:30 PM
Attachments: [BOS Sole Source Report FY 25-26.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached and below communication from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24, submitting a Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 – 2026.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar

Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
justice.alcantar@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Sanchez, Daniel <DSanchez@sfwater.org>
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2026 1:09 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Cox, Kyndra (PUC) <KCox@sfwater.org>; Herrera, Dennis <GeneralManager@sfwater.org>; Robinson, Stephen (PUC) <SDRobinson@sfwater.org>; Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>; Milton, Shevaghna (PUC) <SMilton@sfwater.org>; Feitelberg, Brittany (PUC) <BFeitelberg@sfwater.org>
Subject: BOS Report for SFPUC Sole Source Contracts FY2025-2026

Ms. Calvillo,

Attached please find a list of all sole source contracts that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) executed or amended during FY 2025- 2026. The enclosed spreadsheet includes all new professional services contracts and amendments, all new grant agreements and amendments, emergency contracts, construction contracts, and technology contracts as well as the relevant information for each contract and/or amendment, including: term, vendor, amount, and sole source justification. Please don't hesitate to contact Kyndra Cox, KCox@sfwater.org, if we may

provide additional information.

Thank you.

Danny Sanchez

Professional Services Contracts Manager

Contract Administration Bureau

525 Golden Gate Avenue, 8th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94102

Desk Phone: (415) 934-5761

Cell Phone: (510) 913-0723





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

Contract Administration Bureau
525 Golden Gate Avenue, 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.551.4603
F 415.554.3225
TTY 415.554.3488

July 6, 2026

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Sunshine Ordinance § 67.24(e) requires that at the end of each fiscal year City departments shall provide the Board of Supervisors with a list of all sole source contracts entered into during the past fiscal year. In response to this reporting requirement, enclosed please find the sole source contracts that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) executed during FY 2025-2026.

The enclosed spreadsheet includes all new professional services contracts and amendments, all new grant agreements and amendments, emergency contracts, construction contracts, and technology contracts as well as the relevant information for each contract and/or amendment, including: term, vendor, amount, and sole source justification.

If you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at kcox@sfgwater.org or by telephone at 415-926-9931.

Sincerely,

Kyndra Cox
Contract Administration Bureau

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

OUR MISSION: To provide our customers with high-quality, efficient and reliable water, power and sewer services in a manner that values environmental and community interests and sustains the resources entrusted to our care.



SFPUC Sole Source Contracts - FY25/26						
Professional Services New Contracts						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
1000036836	CS-1274	Aquarium Support Services	Tenji, Inc.	06/12/2026 - 06/11/2034	\$1,167,328	This agreement was procured as required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 21.5(b), where Commodities or services are available only from a sole source. Tenji, Inc. is the only qualified and authorized contractor to perform these aquarium support services.
1000038087	CS-1276	Owner Advisor Services for SFPUC Collaborative Projects Delivery	Progressive Design-Build Consulting, LLC	03/16/2026 - 03/15/2029	\$500,000	This agreement was procured as required by San Francisco Administrative Code 6.73(c)(2), where documented rights in or singular ownership of data, intellectual property, processes, systems, or similar circumstances make the work or services, or maintenance of such work or services, available from only one source, Progressive Design-Build Consulting, LLC.
1000035452	CS-1265	San Joaquin Pipeline (SJPL) – Buck Ridge Mitigation Bank	Westervelt Ecological Services, LLC	08/11/2025 - 08/10/2026	\$774,500	This agreement was procured as required by San Francisco Administrative Code 21.5(b) where Commodities or services are available only from a sole source. Buck Ridge Conservation Bank service area overlaps with the project location and Westervelt Ecological Services, LLC manages the purchase of conservation bank credits from the Buck Ridge Conservation Bank.
1000035357	CS-1263	Standard Renewable Gas Interconnection	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	07/07/2025 - 07/07/2035	\$5,137,312	This agreement was procured as required by San Francisco Administrative Code 21.04(a)(6), where the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission may directly purchase water, power, or natural gas, the conveyance or transmission of same, or ancillary services such as spinning reserve, voltage control, or load scheduling, as required for assuring reliable services in accordance with good utility practice, to or on behalf of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The competitive solicitation requirement was waived for this contract because PG&E is the investor-owned utility for this region and only PG&E can operate its own facilities.
Professional Services Emergency Contracts						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
N/A						
Professional Services Amendments						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
1000031834	CS-1253	Power Optimization Tool	NextEra Analytics Solutions, LLC	04/14/2025 - 04/13/2028	\$2,524,512	This agreement was procured as required by San Francisco Administrative Code 21.30(d), where a vendor has proprietary rights to software or where maintenance of equipment by a particular vendor is required to preserve a warranty, software support and equipment maintenance agreements entered into with that vendor shall be treated as a sole source for the purposes of any contract requirements included in the Municipal Code.
Grant Agreements New Contracts						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
N/A						
Grant Agreements Amendments						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
N/A						
Construction New Contracts						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
N/A						
Construction Emergency Contracts						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
N/A						
Technology Sole Source New Contracts						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
N/A						
Technology Sole Source Amendments						
PeopleSoft Contract ID	SFPUC Contract #	Title	Vendor	Term	Amount	Sole Source Justification
1000026099	CS-1120	Hydrologic Database Services	KISTERS North America, Inc	08/01/2022 - 07/31/2028	\$204,131.51	This agreement was procured as required by San Francisco Administrative Code 21.30, where a vendor has proprietary rights to software or where maintenance of equipment by a particular vendor is required to preserve a warranty, software support and equipment maintenance agreements entered into with that vendor shall be treated as a sole source for the purposes of any contract requirements included in the Municipal Code.

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: Fiscal Year 2025-26 SFPUC Sole Source Contracts Report
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 12:22:23 PM
Attachments: [Memo to BOS - FY26 SFPUC Sole Source Contracts.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24(e), submitting Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 – 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.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: Huang, Howard (Hao) <HHuang@sfwater.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 1:30 PM
To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chen, Vivian Ai Yi (PUC) <AChen@sfwater.org>
Subject: Fiscal Year 2025-26 SFPUC Sole Source Contracts Report

Good afternoon, Eileen,

Attached please find the FY2026 Sole Source Report and memo from SFPUC.

Best,

Howard Huang

Accounting Operations Manager

SFPUC | 415.487.5294 | hhuang@sfwater.org



MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 10th, 2026

TO: Nancy L. Hom, Chief Financial Officer and AGM for Business Services

THROUGH: Vivian Chen, Deputy Chief Financial Officer
Joyce Chan, Accounting Services Director

FROM: Howard Huang, Accounting Operations Manager

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2025-26 SFPUC Sole Source Contracts

In accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.24(e), all City Departments are required to provide an annual report detailing all Sole Source Contracts awarded during the past fiscal year (July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026) to the Board of Supervisors.

Please find attached, a summary of applicable awarded contracts by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) related to Chapter 21 commodities and general services.

The SFPUC Contract Administration Bureau will soon submit a separate report containing responses for Chapter 6 (Construction) and Chapter 21 Professional Service contracts that meet criteria for reporting.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager



Contract Number	Description	Purchase Order Number	Contract Type	Procurement Authority / Waiver Justification	Start Date	End Date	Not-to-exceed	Supplier Name	Supplier ID	Contract Execution / Amendment / Novation Date	ServiceNow Number/Waiver ID
	PUC_WTR #7969 PQ 021 RENTALSVC	942915	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	2/20/2026		\$ 2,142.66	CULLIGAN WATER OF MODESTO	0000022027		OCAWVR0011970
	PUC_WTR #7994 NOS 040 EQMA/SUP	946272	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	8/19/2025		\$ 686.64	STERIS CORPORATION	0000003079		OCAWVR0011869
	OCA-PUC-Wtr Conserv Campaign	953937	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	7/30/2025		\$ 12,999.00	CHINA BASIN BALLPARK COMPANY LLC	0000042425		OCAWVR0011951
	OCA-PUC-Wtr Conserv Campaign	953937	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	7/30/2025		\$ 57,001.00	CHINA BASIN BALLPARK COMPANY LLC	0000042425		OCAWVR0011951
	OCA-PUC-WST & NRLM Waste Dispo	962782	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	8/27/2025		\$ 100,000.00	PLEASANTON GARBAGE SERVICE	0000013063		OCAWVR0011957
	OCA-PUC-WWE-PUMP	972824	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	12/29/2025		\$ 35,240.66	MuniQuip, LLC	0000027783		OCAWVR0012234
	OCA-PUC-CDD Aclara MTUs	991855	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	12/3/2025		\$ 644,303.77	ACLARA TECHNOLOGIES LLC	0000003429		OCAWVR0011965
	PUC_WTR#8376 P12 040 EQ/MA/SUP	992029	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	12/12/2025		\$ 1,800.13	STERIS CORPORATION	0000003079		OCAWVR0012706
	PUC_WTR #8379P12 040 EQ/MA/SU	992584	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	1/12/2026		\$ 1,534.22	STERIS CORPORATION	0000003079		OCAWVR0012710
	OCATM3-PUC-Power 10000 WF17638	994469	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	12/15/2025		\$ 349,825.00	NEW TECH SOLUTIONS INC	0000014325		OCAWVR0012652
1000000070	YARDI VOYAGER SUBSCR 2026-27	1005324	PO Release	Chapter 21.30 software licenses, support, escrow, finance, equipment maintenance agreements, and content	1/28/2026		\$ 80,164.32	YARDI SYSTEMS INC	0000007980		OCAWVR0008256
1000030085	PUC_FY26 AED Navigator CHLG	1013323	PO Release	NO OTHER SOURCE	3/5/2026		\$ 125.00	DIPIETRO & ASSOCIATES INC	0000021353		OCAWVR0007677
1000030085	PUC-PUC NOS H&S Annual AED PM	1023678	PO Release	NO OTHER SOURCE	4/17/2026		\$ 2,375.00	DIPIETRO & ASSOCIATES INC	0000021353		OCAWVR0007677
	OCA-PUC-WWE ISCO Parts RPM	1036513	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	5/8/2026		\$ 103,523.44	CLIPPER CONTROLS INC	0000003335		OCAWVR0013336
	OCA-PUC-WWE Grit Pumps RPM	1036598	Direct PO	Reg 21.5(b): No Substitute / Only One	5/11/2026		\$ 158,039.55	MuniQuip, LLC	0000027783		OCAWVR0013259
	OCA-PUC-WQD Thermo IC-QQQ	1038132	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	5/15/2026		\$ 585,155.28	THERMO ELECTRON NORTH AMERICA LLC	0000009541		OCAWVR0012791
	OCA-PUC-WWE ISCO Samplers	1039583	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	5/20/2026		\$ 65,232.85	CLIPPER CONTROLS INC	0000003335		OCAWVR0013531
	OCA-PUC-WQD Dulcometers FY26	1045255	Direct PO	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	6/12/2026		\$ 155,500.41	MISCO	0000014977		OCAWVR0013302
1000022598	Crane Ridge Rent		Non-Purchasing Contract (Rents, etc.)	REAL ESTATE - NO OTHER SOURCE UNDER	4/1/2020	3/31/2029	\$ 61,380.25	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	0000022195	2/18/2026	
	OCA-PUC-WWE Centrifuge Parts	970057	Direct PO	Reg 21.5(d) Prop 12: Proprietary Articles / Only One Source (No Bid	9/17/2025		\$ 82,702.66	GEA MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT US, INC.	0000039652		OCAWVR0012202
1000036251	PUC Neptune Water Meters		Purchasing Contract - Term Contract Commodities	Regulation 21.5(b): No Substitute for Product/Service and	1/1/2026	12/31/2029	\$ 4,360,000.00	FERGUSON WATERWORKS	0000020250		OCAWVR0012304
1000036668	TC67300 PUC UV System Maintena		Purchasing Contract- Term Contract General Services	Regulation 21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required) Prop12: Repairs for equipment, including service and parts when repairs must be done by the manufacturer, the installer of equipment or	12/1/2025	11/30/2030	\$ 3,000,000.00	De Nora Water Technologies LLC	0000049249		OCAWVR0012105

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Public Works: Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2025/2026 Memo
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 8:47:16 AM
Attachments: [Memo to Board and re Sole Source Contracts FY2025-2026.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached and below communication from the Department of Public Works (DPW), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24(e), submitting a Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 – 2026.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar

Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
justice.alcantar@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Lam, Dennis (DPW) <dennis.lam@sfdpw.org>
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2026 8:34 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Washington, Ben (DPW) <ben.washington@sfdpw.org>; Loftus, Robert (DPW) <robert.loftus@sfdpw.org>; Robertson, Bruce (DPW) <bruce.robertson@sfdpw.org>; Short, Carla (DPW) <Carla.Short@sfdpw.org>; Docs, SF (LIB) <sfdocs@sfpl.org>; Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>; CON, Controller (CON) <controller.con@sfgov.org>; Fernandez-Ash, Darlene (DPW) <darlene.fernandez-ash@sfdpw.org>
Subject: Public Works: Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2025/2026 Memo

Greetings,

Please see the attached memo to the Board of Supervisors for all Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2025–2026.

Thank you,



Dennis Lam

Contract Administration | San Francisco Public Works |
City and County of San Francisco
49 South Van Ness Ave. Suite 1600 | San Francisco, CA 94103 |

Phone: (628) 271-3136 | www.sfpublicworks.org | twitter.com/sfpublicworks



Carla Short, Director | Director's Office


carla.short@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.3078 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94103

Date: July 9, 2026

To: Board of Supervisors
Attention Clerk of the Board

From: Carla Short, Director

Subject: Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2025/2026

DocuSigned by:

073CF73A4EA6486...

Pursuant to Section 67.24(e) of the Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Public Works has entered into the following sole source contracts:

New Sole Source Contracts

- 1. Contract 1000038006 Preconstruction Engineering and Design Services for Powell St. Improvement Project**
 - Contract Amount: \$3,500,000
 - Notice to Proceed: 4/15/2026
 - Description: Sole source professional services contract awarded to Field Operations, LLC pursuant to Administrative Code Chapter 6.73(c)(3) for final design and construction document services, supported by the consultant's prior project involvement, project-specific knowledge and the need to maintain design continuity for the expedited project schedule.
- 2. Contract 1000032152 – Permitting and Inspections Software-as-a Service Hosting and Licensing**
 - Contract Amount: \$4,003,930
 - Software Subscription Effective Date: 3/15/2025
 - Notice to Proceed: 03/20/2026
 - Description: Sole source contract awarded to Clariti Cloud, Inc. pursuant to Administrative Code Chapter 21.30 for proprietary software licensing, hosting, support, and maintenance associated with the annual SaaS licensing period.
- 3. Contract 1000036468 Tree Watering Workforce Development Grant Program**
 - Contract Amount: \$4,931,307
 - Notice to Proceed: 8/15/2025
 - Description: Pursuant to San Francisco Public Works Commission Resolution No. 2025-0047, a sole source grant was awarded to SF Clean City Coalition to operate a workforce development program that provides participants with hands-on experience in tree watering services. The award was necessary after the prior grantee, San Francisco Conservation Corps, permanently ceased operations. As the only other responsive proposer from the 2023 competitive RFP and a prior provider of these services, SF Clean

City Coalition was uniquely positioned to ensure continuity of essential services without interruption.

New Sole Source Purchase Orders

1. Purchase Order 0001024151 – Statewide Traffic Safety and Signs Inc.

- Purchase Order Amount: \$20,842.24 issued by the Office of Contract Administration for Public Works
- Purchase Order Date: 3/26/2026
- Description: Sole Source Waiver OCAWVR0011997 pursuant to Chapter 21.5(b) was approved for the purchase of crash cushions for installation at 13th Street/Duboce Avenue and the Highway 101 Northbound ramp to enhance roadway safety by slowing or redirecting errant vehicles as requested by the MTA.

2. Purchase Order 0001024171 – Forderer Cornice Works

- Purchase Order Amount: \$143,906.40 issued by the Office of Contract Administration for Public Works
- Purchase Order Date: 3/26/2026
- Description: Sole Source waiver OCAWVR0012074 pursuant to Chapter 21.5(b) was approved for the purchase of 23 Replacement doors that do not have a "pass through" for County Jail 2 as requested by the Sherriff's Department.

3. Purchase Order 0001021715 – Nosaj Disposables Inc.

- Purchase Order Amount: \$76,710.98 issued by the Office of Contract Administration for Public Works
- Purchase Order Date: 3/18/2026
- Description: Sole Source waiver OCAWVR0012783 pursuant to Chapter 21.15(b) was approved for the purchase of Nosaj DRC (Double Re-Creped) wipers.

4. Purchase Order 0001034483 – Landscape Form, Inc.

- Purchase Order Amount: \$35,160.83 issued by the Office of Contract Administration for Public Works
- Purchase Order Date: 5/1/2026
- Description: Sole Source waiver OCAWVR0013288 pursuant to Chapter 21.16(b) was approved for the purchase of ten benches bus stops along Sunset Boulevard as requested by the MTA.

In addition, and in conformance with the requirements of Administrative Code Section 8.16, San Francisco Public Works has submitted two copies of this report to the San Francisco Public Library.

cc: Bruce Robertson, Deputy Director of Financial Management & Administration

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: SFPL Sole Source Report FY25-26
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 9:48:42 AM
Attachments: [SFPL- Sole Source Memo Final to BOS 7.13.26.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello,

Please see the attached and below communication from the San Francisco Public Library (SFPL), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24, submitting a Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 – 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.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: Fernandez, Mike (LIB) <mike.fernandez@sfpl.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 9:35 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lambert, Michael (LIB) <michael.lambert@sfpl.org>; Jiang, Feng Ling (LIB) <fengling.jiang@sfpl.org>; Yoshida, Shirley (LIB) <Shirley.Yoshida@sfpl.org>
Subject: SFPL Sole Source Report FY25-26

Greetings,

Please find attached SFPL's Chapter 67.24(e)(3)(iii) required sole source report for FY25-26.

Best Regards,
SFPL Finance

Mike Fernandez | CFO | San Francisco Public Library | Pronouns: he, him, his
P: 415.557.4243 | E: Mike.Fernandez@SFPL.org | sfpl.org

SFPL | **Finance**



Finance Division
100 Larkin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4733
Tel (415) 557-4243

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2026

TO: The San Francisco Board of Supervisors (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)

FROM: Mike Fernandez, Chief Financial Officer, SFPL
Acting Contracts Manager, SFPL

THROUGH: Michael Lambert, City Librarian, SFPL

SUBJECT: Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2025-2026
San Francisco Public Library (SFPL)

As required by San Francisco Administrative Code 67.24(e)(3)(iii) and *OCAFY25-26 Approved Chapter 21 Solicitation Waivers for BOS Reporting* dated July 10, 2026, please find attached a list of sole-source contracts and purchase orders entered into by the Library during, Fiscal Year 2025-2026.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 415-557-4243, or email me at mike.fernandez@sfpl.org.

Attachment: SFPL_Ch21SoleSource_FY2526_ServiceNow

Contract/PO ID	Document Type	Contract Type	Solicitation Waiver ID	Waiver Description	Total Not-to-Exceed (NTE) Amount	Supplier Name	Supplier ID	Contract Execution/Amendment/ Novation Date	Contract End Date
1000035210	Contract	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	OCAWVR0011397	Hoopla is Midwest Tape's pay-per-circulation media streaming service designed for public libraries. The formats currently offered through this model are eBooks, movies, television series, music albums, and audiobooks via a unique library platform accessible on mobile devices or web browsers. This Agreement adds other potential emerging online formats to be made available by the Licensor, including but not limited to periodicals and eLearning resources. Anytime during the term of this Agreement City may select additional online content (titles) subject to standard terms and pricing. City's Authorized Users may instantly borrow materials and view or listen by streaming or downloading the content.	\$9,900,000.00	MIDWEST TAPE LLC	0000015057	7/8/2025	5/31/2028
1000035955	Contract	21.30: Proprietary Software Licenses and Support and Proprietary Equipment Maintenance	OCAWVR0011752	TIND Technologies-Contract is a Software as a Service (SaaS) agreement between the San Francisco Public Library and TIND Technologies AS. It covers the hosting, maintenance, and support of the Library's Digi Center software, including user access, data management, security, and disaster recovery.	\$518,077.00	Tind Technologies AS	0000053436	9/9/2025	6/30/2030
1000036372	Contract	21.16(b): Reciprocal Agreements with Other Public and Non Profit Agencies	OCAWVR0011886	SFPL requests to engage The SpyGlass Group through OMNIA Partners Con #157548 for a one-time SnapShot Audit of our telecom, mobility, and cloud service accounts	\$1,000,000.00	The SpyGlass Group, LLC	0000058419	3/17/2026	6/30/2027
1000003116	Contract	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	OCAWVR0011937	Siemens Industry, Inc. Sole Source Waiver Request	\$1,554,266.00	SIEMENS INDUSTRY INC	0000003098	10/3/2025	6/29/2026
1000022982	Contract	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	OCAWVR0012280	Extension on Equipment Maintenance agreement w. Lyngsoe, adding Lyngsoe's proprietary libcabinets to agreement	\$756,006.00	LYNGSOE SYSTEMS INC	0000016027	1/28/2026	10/31/2029
1000016811	Contract	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	OCAWVR0012519	Library wishes to exercise option to amend Statista Online Content License Agreement with Statista for a 1 year extension for \$33,156.00.	\$194,410.00	STATISTA INC	0000010466	12/4/2025	10/31/2026
1000016809	Contract	21.5(d): Proprietary Articles and Only One Source (No Bid Required)	OCAWVR0012758	Library wishes to exercise the second option to extend and amend Online Content License Agreement with Rabble.	\$559,378.00	Rabble	0000037720	2/6/2026	2/28/2029

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: MOHCD Sole Source Contract Report
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 12:01:52 PM
Attachments: [MOHCD Sole Source FY25-26.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 67.24(e), submitting Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 – 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.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.*

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Daniel Adams
Director

July 1, 2026

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
via email

re: Sole Source Contracts FY2025-2026, Admin Code 67.24e

Madam Clerk:

Administrative Code Chapter 67.24e requires departments to report any contracts awarded during the preceding fiscal year without following an open and competitive process. MOHCD did not enter into any such new Sole Source contracts in FY2025-2026. Please reach out to me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Benjamin McCloskey".

Benjamin McCloskey
Deputy Director, Finance and Administration

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: MOHCD Sole Source Grants
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 12:07:00 PM
Attachments: [MOHCD Sole Source 21G Grants 2025.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 21G.3, submitting Sole Source Contract Grants Report for Calendar Year (CY) 2025.

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.*

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Daniel Adams
Director

July 1, 2026

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
via email

re: Sole Source Grant Award Contracts Report CY2025, Admin Code 21G.3

Madam Clerk:

Administrative Code Chapter 21G.3 requires departments to report any grants awarded during the preceding calendar year without following an open and competitive process. Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development entered into the below grant and loan agreements pursuant to Administrative Code Chapter 21B in the last two weeks of 2025 and in the first week of 2026. We provided notice regarding these contracts to the Board of Supervisors on December 15, 2025. We are further reporting these grants and loans here with our calendar 2025 21G.3 report.

1. Dalt Site Based Homelessness Prevention Pilot at 34 Turk Street - 117 units - \$2,746,534 grant
2. Derek Silva at 20 Franklin Street - 71 units - \$2,600,000 loan
3. 685 Ellis Street - 67 units - \$3,000,000 loan
4. 835 Turk Street - 106 units - \$26,651,907 loan
5. 1035 Van Ness Avenue - 124 units - \$11,000,000 loan

Our department has no further reportable 2025 contracts under Chapter 21G.3.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ben McCloskey".

Benjamin McCloskey
Deputy Director, Finance and Administration

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
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 June 2026
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 1:09:47 PM
Attachments: [CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for June 2026.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector (TTX), submitting the Pooled Investment Report for June 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: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 1:02 PM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for June 2026

All-

Please find the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of June 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



Treasurer & Tax Collector

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

José Cisneros
TREASURER

Investment Report for the month of June 2026

July 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 June 30, 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 June 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 June 2026	Prior Month Fiscal YTD	Prior Month May 2026
Average Daily Balance (in \$ millions)	17,723.2	18,572.1	17,647.2	18,924.9
Net Earnings (in \$ millions)	665.2	57.3	607.9	59.4
Earned Income Return	3.75%	3.76%	3.75%	3.70%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics: June 30, 2026

Investment Type	% of Portfolio	Book Value (in \$ millions)	Market Value (in \$ millions)	Wtd. Avg. CPN	Wtd. Avg. YTM	WAM
U.S. Treasuries	27.7%	5,156	5,126	3.59%	3.71%	851
Federal Agencies	44.9%	8,344	8,311	3.51%	3.78%	713
Negotiable CDs	10.3%	1,910	1,910	4.04%	4.04%	152
Commercial Paper	5.6%	1,046	1,046	0.00%	3.92%	94
Medium Term Notes	0.9%	163	163	3.98%	4.20%	268
Money Market Funds	8.9%	1,654	1,654	3.57%	3.57%	1
Supranationals	0.8%	142	142	3.32%	4.10%	590
Secured Bank Deposit	0.9%	168	168	3.60%	3.60%	1
Totals	100.0%	18,583	18,519	3.40%	3.78%	584

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	\$ 5,159.0	\$ 5,155.9	\$ 5,125.7	99.41	27.75%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	8,349.4	8,344.4	8,311.3	99.60	44.90%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	-	-	-	-	0.00%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	1,910.0	1,910.0	1,909.5	99.98	10.28%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	1,057.0	1,046.1	1,045.9	99.98	5.63%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	162.8	162.7	162.7	99.98	0.88%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds	1,654.4	1,654.4	1,654.4	100.00	8.90%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	142.3	141.6	141.8	100.13	0.76%	30%	Yes
Secured Bank Deposit	167.7	167.7	167.7	100.00	0.90%	N/A	Yes
TOTAL	\$ 18,602.6	\$ 18,582.7	\$ 18,519.0	99.66	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	912797TX5	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/19/2026	8/20/2026	0.00	100,000,000	98,230,556	99,513,889	99,483,300
U.S. Treasuries	912797TY3	U.S. Treasury Bill	2/26/2026	8/27/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,554,226	24,860,390	24,855,153
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	U.S. Treasury Note	9/28/2021	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,981,314	49,763,670
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,984,456	49,644,530
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,983,576	49,644,530
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/19/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,965,673	49,644,530
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/3/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,006,025	49,451,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/7/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,009,792	49,451,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	49,739,821	49,451,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	U.S. Treasury Note	3/29/2022	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	49,695,430	49,339,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	U.S. Treasury Note	4/6/2022	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,963,672	24,725,585
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	6/26/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,199,219	50,064,140	50,260,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,292,969	50,095,468	50,260,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,906,250	50,322,736	50,260,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,603,516	50,276,777	50,260,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/8/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,667,969	50,329,733	50,260,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/9/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,654,297	50,323,441	50,260,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/15/2027	4.63	50,000,000	50,632,813	50,320,075	50,260,750
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/21/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,203,125	49,453,125	49,589,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/3/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	48,113,281	49,419,471	49,589,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	9/26/2024	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,683,594	49,885,629	49,589,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	7/25/2025	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,398,438	49,689,406	49,589,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	U.S. Treasury Note	11/12/2025	6/30/2027	3.25	50,000,000	49,728,516	49,833,915	49,589,845
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	8/31/2027	3.63	50,000,000	50,035,156	50,023,076	49,716,795
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	U.S. Treasury Note	11/21/2025	8/31/2027	3.63	75,000,000	75,058,594	75,038,520	74,575,193
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	9/15/2027	3.38	50,000,000	49,785,156	49,912,191	49,556,640
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	10/15/2027	3.88	50,000,000	50,273,438	50,185,575	49,830,080
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	U.S. Treasury Note	11/18/2025	10/15/2027	3.88	75,000,000	75,363,281	75,245,841	74,745,120
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPE5	U.S. Treasury Note	11/18/2025	10/31/2027	3.50	75,000,000	74,835,938	74,887,783	74,393,550
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	2/12/2025	11/15/2027	4.13	61,000,000	60,692,617	60,846,614	60,976,173
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	U.S. Treasury Note	11/12/2025	11/15/2027	4.13	70,000,000	70,738,281	70,505,617	69,972,658
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,863,231	49,926,100
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2024	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	49,712,891	49,860,382	49,926,100
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	12/15/2027	4.00	50,000,000	50,425,781	50,307,348	49,926,100
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	U.S. Treasury Note	11/14/2025	2/15/2028	4.25	50,000,000	50,714,844	50,515,938	50,068,360
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	U.S. Treasury Note	11/20/2025	2/15/2028	4.25	90,000,000	91,321,875	90,961,069	90,123,048
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/20/2026	3/15/2028	3.88	40,000,000	40,018,750	40,016,090	39,820,312
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	U.S. Treasury Note	3/20/2026	3/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,021,484	50,018,436	49,775,390
U.S. Treasuries	91282B4N7	U.S. Treasury Note	4/9/2024	5/15/2028	2.88	65,000,000	61,082,227	63,209,915	63,522,264
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	U.S. Treasury Note	5/15/2025	5/15/2028	3.75	70,000,000	69,485,938	69,679,180	69,496,875
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/21/2025	6/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,404,297	50,308,508	49,742,190
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/14/2026	6/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	50,375,000	50,303,652	49,742,190
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/5/2026	6/15/2028	3.88	50,000,000	49,832,031	49,837,925	49,742,190
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/5/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,974,609	49,988,684	49,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,967,536	49,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	1/18/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,904,297	49,957,007	49,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/6/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,677,734	49,853,516	49,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	2/27/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,677,063	49,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2024	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	48,939,453	49,486,946	49,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/8/2026	6/30/2028	4.00	50,000,000	49,843,750	49,848,523	49,861,330

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	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	12/12/2023	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,115,234	50,052,938	50,228,515
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/14/2025	8/31/2028	4.38	50,000,000	50,550,781	50,362,007	50,228,515
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNY3	U.S. Treasury Note	12/19/2025	9/15/2028	3.38	55,000,000	54,817,383	54,852,775	54,106,250
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJF9	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2026	10/31/2028	4.88	50,000,000	50,832,031	50,794,762	50,787,110
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPK1	U.S. Treasury Note	1/27/2026	11/15/2028	3.50	62,000,000	61,752,969	61,790,398	61,094,217
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	1/27/2026	1/31/2029	4.00	55,000,000	55,524,219	55,450,352	54,789,455
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	1/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,927,344	59,949,477	59,770,314
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	U.S. Treasury Note	10/8/2024	1/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,266,602	65,159,859	64,751,174
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	U.S. Treasury Note	4/11/2024	2/15/2029	2.63	50,000,000	45,710,938	47,675,042	48,117,190
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	4/8/2024	2/28/2029	4.25	50,000,000	49,773,438	49,876,639	50,121,095
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	U.S. Treasury Note	5/13/2025	2/28/2029	4.25	75,000,000	75,568,359	75,398,712	75,181,643
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	50,000,000	51,171,875	50,734,820	50,625,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	U.S. Treasury Note	12/20/2024	4/30/2029	4.63	51,000,000	51,448,242	51,291,132	51,637,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	U.S. Treasury Note	10/23/2024	5/31/2029	4.50	50,000,000	51,039,063	50,658,300	50,474,610
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	51,046,875	50,668,243	49,832,050
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	50,000,000	49,888,672	49,927,998	49,832,050
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	U.S. Treasury Note	7/31/2024	7/31/2029	4.00	65,000,000	65,563,672	65,361,032	64,781,665
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/1/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	50,000,000	49,041,016	49,381,869	48,482,420
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	U.S. Treasury Note	10/3/2024	8/31/2029	3.13	65,000,000	63,664,453	64,138,189	63,027,146
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	U.S. Treasury Note	5/30/2025	10/31/2029	4.00	60,000,000	59,988,281	59,991,162	59,700,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	U.S. Treasury Note	11/25/2024	10/31/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,611,328	49,737,145	49,951,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2026	10/31/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,869,141	49,873,302	49,951,170
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	4/10/2025	2/28/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,927,734	49,945,831	49,732,420
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	U.S. Treasury Note	12/10/2025	2/28/2030	4.00	75,000,000	75,785,156	75,681,726	74,598,630
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	5/22/2025	4/30/2030	3.88	50,000,000	49,468,750	49,588,016	49,490,235
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	6/5/2026	4/30/2030	3.88	50,000,000	49,511,719	49,520,628	49,490,235
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	4/30/2030	3.88	60,000,000	60,478,125	60,417,018	59,388,282
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHF1	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	5/31/2030	3.75	65,000,000	65,192,969	65,168,774	64,017,382
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,267,578	50,235,374	49,521,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/9/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,257,813	50,226,784	49,521,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/10/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,251,953	50,221,760	49,521,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,367,188	50,324,334	49,521,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/16/2025	7/31/2030	3.88	50,000,000	50,343,750	50,303,632	49,521,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/22/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,160,156	50,137,784	48,931,640
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,097,656	50,084,108	48,931,640
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	U.S. Treasury Note	10/24/2025	9/30/2030	3.63	50,000,000	50,054,688	50,047,100	48,931,640
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPD7	U.S. Treasury Note	12/8/2025	10/31/2030	3.63	60,000,000	59,779,688	59,804,947	58,692,186
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/16/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	50,000,000	49,703,125	49,730,352	48,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	12/0/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	50,000,000	49,562,500	49,601,744	48,861,330
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	U.S. Treasury Note	1/7/2026	12/31/2030	3.63	60,000,000	59,737,500	59,762,754	58,633,596
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJX0	U.S. Treasury Note	6/8/2026	1/31/2031	4.00	50,000,000	49,408,203	49,416,219	49,607,420
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKF7	U.S. Treasury Note	6/18/2026	3/31/2031	4.13	50,000,000	49,781,250	49,782,878	49,853,515
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKF7	U.S. Treasury Note	6/18/2026	3/31/2031	4.13	50,000,000	49,781,250	49,782,878	49,853,515
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQG9	U.S. Treasury Note	4/8/2026	3/31/2031	3.88	100,000,000	99,433,594	99,459,764	98,671,880
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQK0	U.S. Treasury Note	5/5/2026	4/30/2031	3.88	55,000,000	54,484,375	54,500,515	54,258,787
Subtotals					3.59	5,159,000,000	5,142,601,853	5,155,895,197	5,125,719,186

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	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	10,000,000	9,991,700	9,999,944	10,001,900
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	19,000,000	18,984,800	18,999,897	19,003,610
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/8/2023	7/8/2026	4.75	21,000,000	20,982,780	20,999,883	21,003,990
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,975,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,975,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,975,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,975,000
Federal Agencies	313385ZG4	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/6/2026	7/13/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,729,358	14,982,725	14,979,450
Federal Agencies	313385ZL3	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	5/26/2026	7/17/2026	0.00	35,000,000	34,817,494	34,943,844	34,936,650
Federal Agencies	313385ZS8	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/6/2026	7/23/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,715,375	14,968,375	14,963,700
Federal Agencies	313385ZT6	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/6/2026	7/24/2026	0.00	50,000,000	49,043,694	49,889,472	49,874,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,948,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,948,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,948,750
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,948,750
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	3,000,000	2,991,930	2,999,767	3,002,340
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	9,615,000	9,589,136	9,614,253	9,622,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	16,000,000	15,956,960	15,998,757	16,012,480
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/30/2023	7/30/2026	5.00	25,000,000	24,936,750	24,998,173	25,019,500
Federal Agencies	313385A97	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/13/2026	8/7/2026	0.00	10,000,000	9,800,867	9,964,233	9,960,400
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,920,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,920,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,920,500
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,920,500
Federal Agencies	313385B47	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/13/2026	8/10/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,495,642	24,903,472	24,891,000
Federal Agencies	313385B62	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	1/13/2026	8/12/2026	0.00	51,000,000	49,961,265	50,793,237	50,766,420
Federal Agencies	313385B88	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/17/2026	8/14/2026	0.00	22,900,000	22,500,872	22,801,339	22,792,828
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/14/2023	8/14/2026	4.50	50,000,000	49,885,000	49,995,383	50,038,000
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,734,875	14,920,463	14,911,200
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,558,125	24,867,438	24,852,000
Federal Agencies	313385D29	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/25/2026	8/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,558,125	24,867,438	24,852,000
Federal Agencies	313385D45	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/2/2026	8/26/2026	0.00	51,000,000	50,112,345	50,719,160	50,687,370
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,876,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,876,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,876,750
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,876,750
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	19,000,000	18,974,730	18,997,722	18,990,310
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,000,000	24,966,750	24,997,002	24,987,250
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	25,900,000	25,865,553	25,896,895	25,886,791
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/13/2024	9/4/2026	3.63	50,000,000	49,933,500	49,994,005	49,974,500
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/12/2023	9/10/2026	0.80	28,975,000	26,174,277	28,776,743	28,800,860
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/11/2026	9/11/2026	4.88	11,895,000	11,821,965	11,890,034	11,916,649
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/16/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	15,585,000	15,292,898	15,458,268	15,443,332
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,535,875	24,797,563	24,772,750
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	40,000,000	39,257,400	39,676,100	39,636,400
Federal Agencies	313385G67	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	3/17/2026	9/21/2026	0.00	50,000,000	49,071,750	49,595,125	49,545,500
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,793,108	24,777,500
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,793,108	24,777,500
Federal Agencies	313385G91	Federal Home Loan Bank Disco	2/24/2026	9/24/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,483,986	24,793,108	24,777,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	15,000,000	14,996,850	14,999,567	15,002,100
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,999,279	25,003,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	25,000,000	24,994,750	24,999,279	25,003,500
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/11/2024	10/9/2026	4.00	50,000,000	49,989,500	49,998,558	50,007,000

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	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,000
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,809,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	14,000,000	13,904,940	13,990,373	14,034,580
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/20/2023	10/20/2026	4.88	30,000,000	29,834,100	29,983,198	30,074,100
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/29/2025	11/10/2026	4.00	12,600,000	12,581,352	12,595,356	12,595,338
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,771,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,771,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,771,500
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,771,500
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/17/2023	11/17/2026	4.63	50,000,000	49,911,500	49,988,776	50,128,000
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,726,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,726,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,726,750
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,726,750
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	15,000,000	14,993,850	14,997,068	14,959,650
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	37,000,000	36,984,830	36,992,768	36,900,470
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	12/22/2026	3.50	45,000,000	44,981,550	44,991,205	44,878,950
Federal Agencies	3133ERWR8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/8/2024	1/7/2027	3.50	12,500,000	12,373,750	12,470,783	12,460,375
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	12,000,000	11,973,000	11,995,059	12,004,320
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	12/9/2025	1/15/2027	4.13	20,000,000	20,101,800	20,050,140	20,007,200
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,989,707	25,009,000
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	29,350,000	29,283,963	29,337,916	29,360,566
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	Federal Home Loan Bank	1/29/2024	1/15/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,887,500	49,979,413	50,018,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,992,850	4,998,643	5,002,050
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,986,600	9,997,457	10,004,100
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,968,500	24,994,022	25,010,250
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	35,000,000	34,955,900	34,991,631	35,014,350
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/25/2024	1/25/2027	4.13	50,000,000	49,933,000	49,987,285	50,020,500
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	2,000,000	1,997,860	1,999,320	2,002,780
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	25,000,000	24,974,250	24,991,816	25,034,750
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/18/2025	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,967,600	29,989,703	30,041,700
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/18/2024	2/18/2027	4.25	30,000,000	29,983,500	29,995,343	30,024,300
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	15,000,000	14,980,050	14,991,424	14,970,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	25,000,000	24,967,500	24,986,029	24,951,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	35,000,000	34,950,650	34,978,786	34,931,400
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/22/2025	2/22/2027	3.75	40,000,000	39,946,800	39,977,131	39,921,600
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	10,000,000	9,993,800	9,997,708	9,987,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/23/2025	2/23/2027	4.00	45,000,000	44,972,100	44,989,684	44,941,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,710,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,710,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,710,500
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,710,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/16/2022	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	48,415,018	47,810,890
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/2/2024	3/26/2027	4.50	50,000,000	49,910,000	49,977,831	50,138,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	22,500,000	22,392,338	22,483,600	22,256,775
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	24,500,000	24,377,010	24,481,265	24,235,155
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	25,000,000	24,804,000	24,970,144	24,729,750
Federal Agencies	3130BOTY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	17,000,000	16,955,120	16,988,421	17,081,090
Federal Agencies	3130BOTY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	20,000,000	19,947,200	19,986,377	20,095,400
Federal Agencies	3130BOTY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	40,000,000	39,894,400	39,972,755	40,190,800
Federal Agencies	3130BOTY5	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/11/2024	4/9/2027	4.75	48,000,000	47,873,280	47,967,306	48,228,960

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	3133ERDS7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/13/2024	5/6/2027	4.75	12,727,000	12,740,236	12,730,759	12,796,235
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	4,650,000	4,646,792	4,649,375	4,653,348
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	5,000,000	4,996,550	4,999,328	5,003,600
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,987,001	20,997,467	21,015,120
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/17/2022	5/17/2027	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,750	24,996,638	25,018,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	31,000,000	30,905,760	30,975,590	30,989,150
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/20/2023	5/20/2027	4.00	58,850,000	58,662,269	58,801,373	58,829,403
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	10,000,000	9,986,700	9,993,765	9,978,700
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	13,000,000	12,982,710	12,991,895	12,972,310
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	16,500,000	16,478,055	16,489,712	16,464,855
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	20,000,000	19,973,400	19,987,530	19,957,400
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/13/2025	6/4/2027	3.88	36,000,000	35,952,120	35,977,554	35,923,320
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	10,000,000	10,141,500	10,027,303	9,948,700
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/19/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	12,375,000	12,552,829	12,409,313	12,311,516
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/20/2022	6/11/2027	3.50	21,725,000	22,016,550	21,781,287	21,613,551
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/13/2024	6/11/2027	4.50	11,000,000	10,937,190	10,980,721	11,043,615
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/10/2024	6/11/2027	4.63	20,700,000	20,795,634	20,730,951	20,805,860
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/15/2023	6/15/2027	4.13	28,940,000	28,911,928	28,933,294	28,948,971
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2022	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	27,911,633	27,631,213
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/28/2024	6/28/2027	4.50	30,000,000	29,985,840	29,995,319	30,130,800
Federal Agencies	3133ERV99	Federal Farm Credit Bank	9/30/2024	7/1/2027	3.50	55,000,000	54,925,200	54,972,807	54,705,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,033,250	25,011,306	25,075,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/10/2024	7/8/2027	4.50	25,000,000	25,025,500	25,008,679	25,075,750
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	10,000,000	9,996,500	9,998,763	10,017,200
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/23/2024	7/23/2027	4.25	15,000,000	14,994,750	14,998,145	15,025,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,950	4,994,411	4,975,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	5,000,000	4,989,750	4,994,299	4,975,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETX6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/11/2025	8/11/2027	3.63	7,000,000	6,985,930	6,992,175	6,966,120
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/23/2023	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,993,381	10,000,300
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	20,000,000	19,959,400	19,974,240	19,841,600
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	25,000,000	24,949,250	24,967,800	24,802,000
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	41,000,000	40,916,770	40,947,192	40,675,280
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/9/2025	10/4/2027	3.50	50,000,000	49,898,500	49,935,600	49,604,000
Federal Agencies	3133ET6R3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/8/2026	10/8/2027	3.38	15,000,000	14,977,650	14,983,745	14,855,850
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	5,000,000	4,997,250	4,998,817	4,985,800
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	3.88	8,000,000	7,996,160	7,998,348	7,977,280
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/27/2025	10/27/2027	3.38	9,320,000	9,298,844	9,306,002	9,230,808
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	Federal Farm Credit Bank	10/27/2025	10/27/2027	3.38	60,000,000	59,863,800	59,909,884	59,425,800
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	5,000,000	4,999,350	4,999,682	5,008,950
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	2/4/2025	11/3/2027	4.25	41,880,000	41,877,738	41,878,894	41,954,965
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	27,950,000	27,834,008	27,910,145	28,114,346
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/15/2023	11/15/2027	4.63	33,300,000	33,161,472	33,252,402	33,495,804
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	21,000,000	20,936,790	20,969,383	20,996,430
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	25,505,000	25,428,485	25,467,938	25,500,664
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	33,000,000	32,893,080	32,948,211	32,994,390
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2024	12/10/2027	4.13	38,343,000	38,227,588	38,287,097	38,336,482
Federal Agencies	3133EN5N6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/17/2025	1/6/2028	4.00	50,000,000	50,486,000	50,358,992	49,904,800
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	23,480,000	23,403,690	23,421,422	23,211,389
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/7/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	30,000,000	29,941,500	29,955,524	29,656,800
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/7/2026	1/7/2028	3.38	46,000,000	45,910,300	45,931,803	45,473,760
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/14/2025	1/14/2028	4.25	29,750,000	29,575,963	29,660,677	29,764,280
Federal Agencies	3133ET2W6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/8/2025	1/20/2028	3.50	5,000,000	4,991,800	4,993,975	4,949,800
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/21/2026	1/21/2028	3.50	35,000,000	34,926,150	34,942,437	34,646,150

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	3133EWAU4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/21/2026	1/21/2028	3.50	35,000,000	34,926,150	34,942,437	34,646,150
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	47,000,000	46,976,030	46,987,356	47,057,340
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/31/2025	1/28/2028	4.25	50,000,000	49,974,500	49,986,549	50,061,000
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	13,000,000	12,988,820	12,990,630	12,863,760
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	15,000,000	14,987,100	14,989,188	14,842,800
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	25,000,000	24,978,500	24,981,980	24,738,000
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	30,000,000	29,974,200	29,978,376	29,685,600
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	Federal Home Loan Bank	3/5/2026	3/3/2028	3.50	50,000,000	49,957,000	49,963,960	49,476,000
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2024	3/20/2028	4.25	4,971,000	4,916,667	4,947,321	4,979,948
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	2,000,000	1,998,040	1,998,297	1,989,540
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,978,500	24,981,324	24,869,250
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,976,500	24,979,586	24,869,250
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,975,500	24,978,718	24,869,250
Federal Agencies	3130BB3J2	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/12/2026	6/1/2028	4.13	25,000,000	24,982,500	24,982,962	24,992,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/11/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	7,370,000	7,342,584	7,352,267	7,328,802
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	3.88	25,000,000	24,957,250	24,972,501	24,860,250
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	14,934,000	14,962,076	14,947,765	15,026,292
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/7/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,994,600	14,997,387	15,092,700
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/7/2028	4.50	20,000,000	20,037,600	20,018,435	20,123,600
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	Federal Home Loan Bank	5/14/2025	6/9/2028	4.00	10,000,000	9,996,600	9,997,852	9,971,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	22,500,000	22,424,175	22,449,103	22,338,225
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	25,000,000	24,904,000	24,935,501	24,820,250
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/7/2025	7/3/2028	3.75	50,000,000	49,829,500	49,885,553	49,640,500
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/7/2023	8/7/2028	4.25	19,500,000	19,412,250	19,463,113	19,541,730
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	10,000,000	9,979,100	9,990,974	10,060,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	15,000,000	14,962,800	14,983,935	15,090,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	25,000,000	24,943,500	24,975,600	25,150,000
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	8/28/2023	8/28/2028	4.50	33,000,000	32,904,960	32,958,956	33,198,000
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	9/22/2028	3.50	10,000,000	9,997,600	9,998,056	9,861,100
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/22/2025	9/22/2028	3.50	20,000,000	19,995,200	19,996,112	19,722,200
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	5,000,000	4,972,100	4,985,160	5,003,550
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/20/2024	10/20/2028	4.25	38,000,000	37,785,300	37,885,801	38,026,980
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	5,000,000	4,977,650	4,982,213	4,917,150
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	25,000,000	24,890,000	24,912,455	24,585,750
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/26/2025	10/24/2028	3.38	30,000,000	29,865,900	29,893,275	29,502,900
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/5/2026	11/3/2028	3.88	5,000,000	4,983,750	4,984,765	4,972,250
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/5/2026	11/3/2028	3.88	11,500,000	11,465,385	11,467,546	11,436,175
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	12,000,000	11,984,040	11,992,435	12,106,320
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	20,000,000	19,971,600	19,986,538	20,177,200
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	Federal Farm Credit Bank	11/13/2023	11/13/2028	4.63	55,000,000	54,922,285	54,963,163	55,487,300
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/28/2024	11/27/2028	4.00	47,025,000	46,940,355	46,975,042	46,790,345
Federal Agencies	3133ET2S5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	12/9/2025	11/28/2028	3.38	35,000,000	34,735,750	34,785,434	34,386,450
Federal Agencies	3133EJ5J4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	1/8/2026	1/16/2029	3.19	10,000,000	9,891,400	9,908,516	9,769,000
Federal Agencies	3133EWRQ5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/8/2026	2/28/2029	4.13	11,002,000	10,977,796	10,978,355	10,996,653
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	Federal Home Loan Bank	4/9/2024	3/9/2029	4.50	25,000,000	25,018,750	25,010,258	25,190,500
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/8/2024	3/20/2029	4.13	51,660,000	51,008,309	51,301,877	51,622,805
Federal Agencies	3133EWC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	21,700,000	21,649,005	21,653,472	21,825,209
Federal Agencies	3133EWC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	25,000,000	24,947,250	24,951,870	25,144,250
Federal Agencies	3133EWC3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/27/2026	3/27/2029	3.88	50,000,000	49,882,500	49,892,792	50,288,500
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	27,892,000	28,191,755	28,062,488	28,291,692
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	30,000,000	30,317,400	30,180,523	30,429,900
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/8/2024	4/30/2029	4.75	63,085,000	63,763,795	63,471,069	63,989,008
Federal Agencies	3133EWN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/1/2026	5/1/2029	3.75	25,000,000	24,934,000	24,937,673	24,733,000

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	3133EWN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/5/2026	5/1/2029	3.75	33,950,000	33,710,992	33,723,468	33,587,414
Federal Agencies	3130AWN30	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/5/2026	6/8/2029	4.38	13,500,000	13,603,005	13,600,568	13,581,540
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/31/2025	6/8/2029	4.63	9,705,000	9,943,355	9,886,644	9,832,310
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,980,750	10,028,540
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,980,750	10,028,540
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	10,000,000	9,967,600	9,980,750	10,028,540
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,935,200	19,961,499	20,057,080
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/26/2024	6/11/2029	4.25	29,000,000	28,923,730	28,954,684	29,082,766
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,803,250
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,803,250
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,803,250
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,803,250
Federal Agencies	3136GD3W1	Fannie Mae	4/15/2026	6/15/2029	4.25	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,606,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,849,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,849,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,849,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,849,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD5K5	Fannie Mae	4/24/2026	6/15/2029	4.13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,698,000
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,707,750
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,707,750
Federal Agencies	3130B2XR1	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/2/2024	7/2/2029	4.01	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	64,240,150
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/12/2024	7/12/2029	4.25	20,000,000	19,989,200	19,993,453	20,056,000
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	9/27/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,392,700	15,253,641	14,983,470
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,048,300	15,031,757	14,983,470
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	15,000,000	15,043,200	15,028,404	14,983,470
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	8/11/2025	9/14/2029	4.13	17,000,000	17,204,170	17,159,922	16,981,266
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	Federal Home Loan Bank	10/29/2024	9/14/2029	4.13	25,590,000	25,663,699	25,638,457	25,561,800
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,780,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,780,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,780,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,780,750
Federal Agencies	3136GAVY2	Fannie Mae	10/1/2025	10/1/2029	4.08	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,561,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	10,000,000	9,987,500	9,990,556	9,942,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/9/2025	10/9/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,981,250	14,985,834	14,914,200
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,733,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,733,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,733,500
Federal Agencies	3136GAWY1	Fannie Mae	10/15/2025	10/15/2029	4.00	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,467,000
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,952	24,828,250
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,952	24,828,250
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,952	24,828,250
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	25,000,000	24,998,750	24,998,952	24,828,250
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	Fannie Mae	11/7/2025	11/7/2029	4.05	50,000,000	49,997,500	49,997,904	49,656,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	15,000,000	14,945,400	14,958,577	14,896,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	Federal Farm Credit Bank	5/30/2025	11/30/2029	4.00	23,000,000	22,922,030	22,940,847	22,841,760
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,775,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,775,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,775,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,775,000
Federal Agencies	3136GD2S1	Fannie Mae	4/7/2026	1/7/2030	4.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,550,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,706,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,706,000

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	24,706,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,706,000
Federal Agencies	3136GCFD2	Fannie Mae	1/16/2026	1/16/2030	4.06	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,412,000
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	12,815,000	13,022,219	12,967,706	12,950,583
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/25/2025	1/18/2030	4.50	18,000,000	18,289,620	18,213,430	18,190,440
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	5,000,000	4,989,550	4,991,877	4,974,050
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	14,450,000	14,418,788	14,425,738	14,375,005
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	1/23/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,946,000	24,958,025	24,870,250
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	3/18/2030	4.00	8,695,000	8,671,610	8,677,409	8,619,962
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,993,700	14,995,252	14,909,250
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	32,260,000	32,243,870	32,247,845	32,064,827
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/10/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	43,020,000	42,904,276	42,932,745	42,759,729
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/9/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	46,750,000	46,732,703	46,736,965	46,467,163
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	Federal Farm Credit Bank	4/15/2025	4/1/2030	4.00	50,000,000	49,527,500	49,642,757	49,697,500
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	9,750,000	9,746,100	9,746,875	9,693,645
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,979,496	9,942,200
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	15,000,000	14,998,650	14,998,918	14,913,300
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/10/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	20,000,000	19,945,000	19,956,627	19,884,400
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/23/2025	6/10/2030	4.00	25,000,000	24,965,000	24,972,201	24,855,500
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	7/9/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	12,515,000	12,579,452	12,566,676	12,496,891
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	Federal Home Loan Bank	6/23/2025	6/14/2030	4.13	16,000,000	16,063,200	16,050,226	15,976,848
Federal Agencies	3130AWMP2	Federal Home Loan Bank	11/20/2025	6/14/2030	4.38	31,000,000	31,899,000	31,778,738	31,235,073
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	10,070,000	10,077,855	10,076,297	10,009,862
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	15,000,000	15,012,900	15,010,341	14,910,420
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/9/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	16,944,000	16,937,222	16,938,564	16,842,810
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/8/2025	6/17/2030	4.00	41,000,000	41,035,260	41,028,267	40,755,148
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,687,250
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,687,250
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,687,250
Federal Agencies	3134HCKN8	Freddie Mac	12/24/2025	6/24/2030	4.04	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,374,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,799,750
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,799,750
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,799,750
Federal Agencies	3136GCEC5	Fannie Mae	1/12/2026	7/1/2030	4.11	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,599,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,722,500
Federal Agencies	3136GD4S9	Fannie Mae	4/20/2026	7/1/2030	4.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,445,000
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	7/14/2025	7/8/2030	3.75	20,000,000	19,776,200	19,819,484	19,744,000
Federal Agencies	3133EWGC8	Federal Farm Credit Bank	3/6/2026	9/6/2030	3.50	36,750,000	36,529,500	36,545,183	35,841,173
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,748,750
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,748,750
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,748,750
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,748,750
Federal Agencies	3136GATQ2	Fannie Mae	9/30/2025	9/30/2030	4.03	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,497,500
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	22,742,630
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,720,250
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,720,250
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,720,250
Federal Agencies	3134HCFX2	Freddie Mac	12/23/2025	12/23/2030	4.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,440,500

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	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,732,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,732,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,732,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,732,500
Federal Agencies	3136GCZU2	Fannie Mae	4/6/2026	3/17/2031	4.20	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,465,000
Federal Agencies	3133EWTC4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/18/2026	6/12/2031	4.25	24,750,000	24,835,140	24,834,532	24,773,018
Federal Agencies	3133EWTC4	Federal Farm Credit Bank	6/12/2026	6/12/2031	4.25	25,000,000	24,990,750	24,990,846	25,023,250
Subtotals					3.51	8,349,406,000	8,331,287,029	8,344,379,964	8,311,329,908
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	100,003,000
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	100,002,000
Negotiable CDs	89115DKD7	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	12/11/2025	7/1/2026	3.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,500
Negotiable CDs	89115MA63	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	9/23/2026	4.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,006,000
Negotiable CDs	89115MAA4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	9/24/2026	4.05	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,012,000
Negotiable CDs	89115MAE6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/25/2026	10/5/2026	4.06	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,006,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DUD2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	3/25/2026	10/23/2026	4.05	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,031,000
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	100,020,000
Negotiable CDs	89115MAJ5	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	3/26/2026	10/23/2026	4.07	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,018,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DUX1	Bank of Montreal/CHI	4/1/2026	11/2/2026	4.00	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,999,000
Negotiable CDs	89115M4K9	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	4/2/2026	11/3/2026	4.01	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,997,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DUZ6	Bank of Montreal/CHI	4/2/2026	11/4/2026	4.01	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,600
Negotiable CDs	13606DUU4	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/9/2026	12/3/2026	4.00	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,986,200
Negotiable CDs	13606DUV2	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/9/2026	12/14/2026	4.00	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,988,750
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	99,949,000
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	69,961,500
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	29,974,500
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	99,918,000
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	69,936,300
Negotiable CDs	13606DUN0	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/6/2026	1/11/2027	4.04	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	69,954,500
Negotiable CDs	13606DUP5	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	4/6/2026	1/13/2027	4.04	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	54,963,700
Negotiable CDs	89115M5L6	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	5/5/2026	2/5/2027	3.98	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,938,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DVN9	Canadian Imperial Bank/NY	5/5/2026	2/8/2027	3.98	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,946,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DVT9	Bank of Montreal/CHI	6/16/2026	3/22/2027	4.09	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,935,000
Negotiable CDs	89115M5D4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	6/17/2026	3/22/2027	4.09	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	44,967,600
Negotiable CDs	78015JC96	Royal Bank of Canada/NY	6/22/2026	3/24/2027	4.23	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,021,000
Negotiable CDs	89115M6H4	Toronto Dominion Bank/NY	6/22/2026	3/24/2027	4.21	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,014,000
Subtotals					4.04	1,910,000,000	1,910,000,000	1,910,000,000	1,909,549,150

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	89233HG16	Toyota Motor Credit	10/27/2025	7/1/2026	0.00	70,000,000	68,184,550	70,000,000	69,992,957
Commercial Paper	14912EG68	Caterpillar Financial Svcs	6/18/2026	7/6/2026	0.00	100,000,000	99,816,500	99,949,028	99,929,200
Commercial Paper	24422MG62	John Deere Capital CP	6/18/2026	7/6/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,953,125	24,986,979	24,982,300
Commercial Paper	89233HGE8	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/14/2026	0.00	75,000,000	73,359,375	74,898,438	74,884,575
Commercial Paper	89233HGQ1	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/24/2026	0.00	75,000,000	73,285,833	74,820,792	74,805,975
Commercial Paper	24422MGU9	John Deere Capital CP	6/17/2026	7/28/2026	0.00	100,000,000	99,577,472	99,721,750	99,703,000
Commercial Paper	89233HGV0	Toyota Motor Credit	12/16/2025	7/29/2026	0.00	50,000,000	48,834,375	49,854,944	49,844,150
Commercial Paper	62479MJP9	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/25/2026	9/23/2026	0.00	100,000,000	97,987,889	99,071,333	99,090,300
Commercial Paper	62479MK77	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/30/2026	10/7/2026	0.00	51,000,000	49,931,196	50,451,608	50,453,484
Commercial Paper	62479MKF9	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	3/30/2026	10/15/2026	0.00	11,000,000	10,759,818	10,872,064	10,871,520
Commercial Paper	62479ML27	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/2/2026	11/2/2026	0.00	25,000,000	24,417,444	24,662,444	24,654,025
Commercial Paper	62479ML68	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/2/2026	11/6/2026	0.00	15,000,000	14,643,933	14,790,933	14,785,575
Commercial Paper	62479MLP6	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	4/7/2026	11/23/2026	0.00	90,000,000	87,746,000	88,579,000	88,537,860
Commercial Paper	62479MNR0	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	5/26/2026	1/25/2027	0.00	15,000,000	14,602,483	14,661,133	14,648,880
Commercial Paper	89233HNT7	Toyota Motor Credit	5/22/2026	1/27/2027	0.00	100,000,000	97,250,000	97,690,000	97,716,800
Commercial Paper	62479MNU3	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	5/26/2026	1/28/2027	0.00	25,000,000	24,327,611	24,425,611	24,405,950
Commercial Paper	62479MP80	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	6/16/2026	2/8/2027	0.00	30,000,000	29,215,925	29,265,550	29,247,960
Commercial Paper	62479MPC1	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	6/16/2026	2/12/2027	0.00	15,000,000	14,601,346	14,626,158	14,616,840
Commercial Paper	62479MPG2	MUFG Bank Ltd/NY	6/16/2026	2/16/2027	0.00	25,000,000	24,324,549	24,365,903	24,349,475
Commercial Paper	89233HQ15	Toyota Motor Credit	6/4/2026	3/1/2027	0.00	60,000,000	58,222,500	58,400,250	58,413,840
Subtotals					0.00	1,057,000,000	1,036,041,925	1,046,093,919	1,045,934,666
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	6,452,000	6,270,957	6,434,758	6,441,806
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	Microsoft	7/9/2024	9/15/2026	3.40	13,009,000	12,645,919	12,974,421	12,988,446
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	Caterpillar	9/18/2024	10/16/2026	4.45	18,385,000	18,600,288	18,415,390	18,397,134
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	Toyota Motors	1/9/2025	1/8/2027	4.60	40,000,000	39,978,000	39,994,236	40,102,000
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	Apple	9/18/2024	2/9/2027	3.35	50,000,000	49,586,000	49,894,368	49,742,000
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	John Deere	9/6/2024	7/15/2027	4.20	10,000,000	9,998,600	9,999,491	10,002,400
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	John Deere	6/5/2025	6/5/2028	4.25	25,000,000	24,977,750	24,985,688	24,987,000
Subtotals					3.98	162,846,000	162,057,514	162,698,352	162,660,786
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	6/30/2026	7/1/2026	3.55	114,877,823	114,877,823	114,877,823	114,877,823
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	6/30/2026	7/1/2026	3.58	641,480,639	641,480,639	641,480,639	641,480,639
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	6/30/2026	7/1/2026	3.56	201,997,718	201,997,718	201,997,718	201,997,718
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	6/30/2026	7/1/2026	3.55	15,468,272	15,468,272	15,468,272	15,468,272
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	6/30/2026	7/1/2026	3.57	331,564,938	331,564,938	331,564,938	331,564,938
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	6/30/2026	7/1/2026	3.56	348,964,979	348,964,979	348,964,979	348,964,979
Subtotals					3.57	1,654,354,369	1,654,354,369	1,654,354,369	1,654,354,369
Supranational	459058KC6	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	9/12/2025	11/16/2026	2.25	55,000,000	54,035,300	54,690,399	54,575,950
Supranational	459058KJ1	Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev	7/17/2024	6/15/2027	3.13	12,323,000	11,934,333	12,195,394	12,209,012
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	4/9/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	25,000,000	24,630,000	24,799,662	24,994,250
Supranational	4581X0EN4	Inter-American Development Bank	7/17/2024	2/15/2029	4.13	50,000,000	49,827,000	49,900,789	49,988,500
Subtotals					3.32	142,323,000	140,426,633	141,586,243	141,767,712
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	6/30/2026	7/1/2026	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					3.40	18,602,092,818	18,543,932,771	18,582,171,493	18,518,479,226

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	-	35,048	1,087	-	36,135
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	-1,125	-	33,923
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	-5,557	-	29,491
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	-5,275	-	29,774
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	-6,585	-	28,463
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	-3,903	-	31,145
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	1,042	-	36,090
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	T 0.750 08/31/2026	50,000,000	30,571	9,190	-	39,761
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,861	5,125	-	40,985
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,861	5,415	-	41,275
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	6,850	-	41,898
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	T 0.875 09/30/2026	50,000,000	35,861	11,317	-	47,177
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	-1,189	-	50,040
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	-1,933	-	49,297
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	-	35,048	17,220	-	52,269
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	50,000,000	51,767	49,929	-	101,697
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	50,000,000	51,230	51,351	-	102,581
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	T 2.500 03/31/2027	25,000,000	51,230	3,992	-	55,222
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	178,329	-2,005	-	176,324
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	165,656	465	-	166,121
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	165,656	1,334	-	166,990
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	165,656	1,767	-	167,423
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	165,656	6,020	-	171,676
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	165,656	13,271	-	178,927
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	134,595	45,072	-	179,667
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	134,595	47,846	-	182,441
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	50,000,000	173,234	3,803	-	177,037
U.S. Treasuries	9128284N7	T 2.875 05/15/2028	65,000,000	152,344	78,512	-	230,856
U.S. Treasuries	9128286B1	T 2.625 02/15/2029	50,000,000	108,771	72,655	-	181,426
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	165,656	21,084	-	186,740
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	190,035	-5,513	-	184,522
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	190,035	-8,206	-	181,829
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	134,595	9,426	-	144,022
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	50,000,000	127,378	16,028	-	143,405
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	165,746	-17,804	-	147,942
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLL3	T 3.375 09/15/2027	50,000,000	137,568	5,973	-	143,541
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFJ5	T 3.125 08/31/2029	65,000,000	165,591	22,346	-	187,937
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	65,000,000	215,470	-9,619	-	205,851
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	65,000,000	215,470	-5,075	-	210,395

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	190,035	-27,742	-	162,293
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKT7	T 4.500 05/31/2029	50,000,000	184,426	-18,544	-	165,883
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLC3	T 4.000 07/31/2029	50,000,000	165,746	1,918	-	167,664
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	50,000,000	188,519	-21,320	-	167,199
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	50,000,000	168,139	6,474	-	174,613
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	164,355	7,713	-	172,067
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	164,355	7,873	-	172,228
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKP5	T 4.625 04/30/2029	51,000,000	192,289	-8,447	-	183,843
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	61,000,000	205,129	9,167	-	214,296
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	50,000,000	163,043	1,215	-	164,258
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	60,000,000	198,895	1,604	-	200,499
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKD2	T 4.250 02/28/2029	75,000,000	259,851	-12,293	-	247,557
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHX2	T 4.375 08/31/2028	50,000,000	178,329	-13,712	-	164,616
U.S. Treasuries	91282CND9	T 3.750 05/15/2028	70,000,000	213,995	14,071	-	228,066
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	190,035	-23,792	-	166,244
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	50,000,000	157,948	8,835	-	166,783
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFT3	T 4.000 10/31/2029	60,000,000	195,652	218	-	195,870
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	190,035	-28,344	-	161,691
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	190,035	-27,803	-	162,232
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	50,000,000	190,035	-27,514	-	162,522
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	134,595	25,598	-	160,194
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	148,566	-2,663	-	145,902
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	148,566	-1,626	-	146,940
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPA3	T 3.625 09/30/2030	50,000,000	148,566	-910	-	147,655
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLX7	T 4.125 11/15/2027	70,000,000	235,394	-30,216	-	205,178
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	50,000,000	134,595	13,688	-	148,284
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	T 4.250 02/15/2028	50,000,000	176,105	-26,057	-	150,047
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	T 3.875 10/15/2027	75,000,000	238,217	-15,659	-	222,559
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPE5	T 3.500 10/31/2027	75,000,000	213,995	6,913	-	220,907
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLQ2	T 3.875 10/15/2027	50,000,000	158,811	-11,820	-	146,991
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	50,000,000	147,758	-1,625	-	146,133
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMN8	T 4.250 02/15/2028	90,000,000	316,989	-48,539	-	268,450
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNV9	T 3.625 08/31/2027	75,000,000	221,637	-2,713	-	218,925
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	50,000,000	159,219	-12,944	-	146,274
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPD7	T 3.625 10/31/2030	60,000,000	177,310	3,697	-	181,006
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHF1	T 3.750 05/31/2030	65,000,000	199,795	-3,541	-	196,254
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	60,000,000	189,538	-8,942	-	180,596
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	50,000,000	164,355	-17,332	-	147,023
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	160,566	-4,736	-	155,830

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	160,566	-4,563	-	156,003
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	160,566	-4,462	-	156,104
U.S. Treasuries	91282CGQ8	T 4.000 02/28/2030	75,000,000	244,565	-15,285	-	229,280
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKY6	T 4.625 06/30/2026	-	370,511	-80,915	-	289,596
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	160,566	-6,526	-	154,040
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNN7	T 3.875 07/31/2030	50,000,000	160,566	-6,109	-	154,457
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNY3	T 3.375 09/15/2028	55,000,000	151,325	5,473	-	156,798
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	60,000,000	180,151	4,329	-	184,480
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	50,000,000	159,219	-12,741	-	146,478
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	50,000,000	150,126	4,921	-	155,046
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	50,000,000	150,126	7,267	-	157,393
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJW2	T 4.000 01/31/2029	55,000,000	182,320	-14,297	-	168,024
U.S. Treasuries	91282CPK1	T 3.500 11/15/2028	62,000,000	176,902	7,244	-	184,146
U.S. Treasuries	912797TX5	B 0.000 08/20/2026	100,000,000	-	291,667	-	291,667
U.S. Treasuries	912797TY3	B 0.000 08/27/2026	25,000,000	-	73,479	-	73,479
U.S. Treasuries	912797UA3	B 0.000 06/16/2026	-	-	37,323	-	37,323
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	40,000,000	126,359	-775	-	125,584
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMS7	T 3.875 03/15/2028	50,000,000	157,948	-888	-	157,061
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQG9	T 3.875 03/31/2031	100,000,000	317,623	9,347	-	326,970
U.S. Treasuries	91282CQK0	T 3.875 04/30/2031	55,000,000	173,743	8,495	-	182,238
U.S. Treasuries	91282CLR0	T 4.125 10/31/2029	50,000,000	168,139	3,121	-	171,259
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJF9	T 4.875 10/31/2028	50,000,000	198,709	-27,952	-	170,757
U.S. Treasuries	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	50,000,000	137,927	5,894	-	143,821
U.S. Treasuries	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	50,000,000	136,889	8,909	-	145,798
U.S. Treasuries	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	50,000,000	126,982	4,773	-	131,754
U.S. Treasuries	91282CJX0	T 4.000 01/31/2031	50,000,000	127,072	8,016	-	135,088
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKF7	T 4.125 03/31/2031	50,000,000	73,258	1,628	-	74,886
U.S. Treasuries	91282CKF7	T 4.125 03/31/2031	50,000,000	73,258	1,628	-	74,886
Subtotals			5,159,000,000	15,578,802	453,478	-	16,032,280
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

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	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	18,807	-	86,810
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	24,500,000	53,083	2,022	-	55,105
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	22,500,000	48,750	1,770	-	50,520
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027	25,000,000	54,167	3,222	-	57,389
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	27,865,000	75,236	-3,865	-	71,371
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	12,375,000	36,094	-2,984	-	33,110
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	10,000,000	29,167	-2,374	-	26,792
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	21,725,000	63,365	-4,894	-	58,470
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	21,000,000	72,188	238	-	72,425
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	5,000,000	17,188	63	-	17,251
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	4,650,000	15,984	59	-	16,043
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027	25,000,000	85,938	315	-	86,253
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027	10,000,000	34,375	475	-	34,850
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	-	19,531	521	-	20,052
Federal Agencies	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	-	22,917	596	-	23,513
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	-	18,333	1,000	-	19,334

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	-	12,222	653	-	12,875
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	-	49,583	621	-	50,204
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	-	33,056	393	-	33,449
Federal Agencies	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	28,940,000	99,481	576	-	100,058
Federal Agencies	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	-	40,824	764	-	41,587
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	-	133,681	532	-	134,212
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	-	66,840	266	-	67,106
Federal Agencies	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	-	66,840	266	-	67,106
Federal Agencies	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	-	72,569	1,483	-	74,053
Federal Agencies	3133EPSK2	FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028	19,500,000	69,063	1,441	-	70,503
Federal Agencies	3133EPSW6	FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026	50,000,000	187,500	3,148	-	190,648
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	10,000,000	37,500	343	-	37,843
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	25,000,000	93,750	928	-	94,678
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	15,000,000	56,250	611	-	56,861
Federal Agencies	3133EPUN3	FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028	33,000,000	123,750	1,561	-	125,311
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	19,000,000	75,208	441	-	75,649
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	10,000,000	39,583	241	-	39,824
Federal Agencies	3133EPVP7	FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026	21,000,000	83,125	500	-	83,625
Federal Agencies	3130AXCP1	FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026	11,895,000	48,323	2,069	-	50,392
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	30,000,000	121,875	4,541	-	126,416
Federal Agencies	3133EPZA6	FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026	14,000,000	56,875	2,602	-	59,477
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	25,000,000	104,167	1,890	-	106,057
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	3,000,000	12,500	241	-	12,741
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	9,615,000	40,063	773	-	40,835
Federal Agencies	3133EPZY4	FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026	16,000,000	66,667	1,286	-	67,953
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	27,950,000	107,724	2,382	-	110,106
Federal Agencies	3133EPC60	FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027	33,300,000	128,344	2,845	-	131,188
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	12,000,000	46,250	262	-	46,512
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	20,000,000	77,083	466	-	77,550
Federal Agencies	3133EPC45	FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028	55,000,000	211,979	1,276	-	213,255
Federal Agencies	3130AXU63	FHLB 4.625 11/17/2026	50,000,000	192,708	2,422	-	195,131
Federal Agencies	3133EM4X7	FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026	28,975,000	19,317	83,770	-	103,087
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	31,000,000	103,333	2,267	-	105,601
Federal Agencies	3133EPP66	FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027	58,850,000	196,167	4,516	-	200,683
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	35,000,000	120,313	1,207	-	121,520
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	50,000,000	171,875	1,834	-	173,709
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	25,000,000	85,938	862	-	86,800
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	10,000,000	34,375	367	-	34,742
Federal Agencies	3133EPX91	FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027	5,000,000	17,188	196	-	17,383

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	12,000,000	41,250	749	-	41,999
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	25,000,000	85,938	1,560	-	87,497
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	29,350,000	100,891	1,831	-	102,722
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	50,000,000	171,875	3,119	-	174,994
Federal Agencies	3133EP6K6	FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027	50,000,000	187,500	2,482	-	189,982
Federal Agencies	3133EP5U5	FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029	51,660,000	177,581	10,819	-	188,401
Federal Agencies	3133EP5S0	FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028	4,971,000	17,606	1,131	-	18,737
Federal Agencies	3130AVBD3	FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029	25,000,000	93,750	-313	-	93,437
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	20,000,000	79,167	1,449	-	80,616
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	17,000,000	67,292	1,232	-	68,523
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	48,000,000	190,000	3,478	-	193,478
Federal Agencies	3130B0TY5	FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027	40,000,000	158,333	2,898	-	161,232
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	63,085,000	249,711	-11,201	-	238,510
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	27,892,000	110,406	-4,946	-	105,459
Federal Agencies	3133ERDH1	FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029	30,000,000	118,750	-5,238	-	113,512
Federal Agencies	3133ERDS7	FFCB 4.750 05/06/2027	12,727,000	50,378	-365	-	50,013
Federal Agencies	3130AX4E5	FHLB 4.500 06/11/2027	11,000,000	41,250	1,676	-	42,926
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	15,000,000	56,250	111	-	56,361
Federal Agencies	3130B1BT3	FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026	-	20,087	-305	-	19,782
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	-	47,667	-778	-	46,889
Federal Agencies	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	-	29,792	-462	-	29,330
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	38,000,000	134,583	4,069	-	138,652
Federal Agencies	3133ERHN4	FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028	5,000,000	17,708	529	-	18,237
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	537	-	35,953
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	537	-	35,953
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	20,000,000	70,833	1,073	-	71,907
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	10,000,000	35,417	537	-	35,953
Federal Agencies	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	29,000,000	102,708	1,263	-	103,972
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	20,000,000	75,000	-782	-	74,218
Federal Agencies	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	14,934,000	56,003	-584	-	55,418
Federal Agencies	3133ERJZ5	FFCB 4.500 06/28/2027	30,000,000	112,500	388	-	112,888
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	-912	-	92,838
Federal Agencies	3130B1EF0	FHLB 4.625 06/11/2027	20,700,000	79,781	-2,691	-	77,090
Federal Agencies	3133ERKM2	FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027	25,000,000	93,750	-700	-	93,050
Federal Agencies	3133ERKX8	FFCB 4.250 07/12/2029	20,000,000	70,833	177	-	71,011
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	10,000,000	35,417	96	-	35,513
Federal Agencies	3133ERMB4	FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027	15,000,000	53,125	144	-	53,269
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,000,000	75,521	1,383	-	76,904
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	50,000,000	151,042	2,767	-	153,809

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	19,000,000	57,396	1,051	-	58,447
Federal Agencies	3130B2PJ8	FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026	25,900,000	78,240	1,433	-	79,673
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-6,498	-	45,064
Federal Agencies	3133ERVR9	FFCB 3.500 07/01/2027	55,000,000	160,417	2,235	-	162,652
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	4,613	-	41,072
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	8,000,000	25,833	105	-	25,939
Federal Agencies	3133ERXJ5	FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027	5,000,000	16,146	75	-	16,221
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	15,000,000	50,000	130	-	50,130
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	216	-	83,550
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	25,000,000	83,333	216	-	83,550
Federal Agencies	3130B3A29	FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026	50,000,000	166,667	433	-	167,099
Federal Agencies	3130B3GD9	FHLB 4.000 11/27/2028	47,025,000	156,750	1,703	-	158,453
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-814	-	50,749
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	15,000,000	51,563	-728	-	50,835
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	25,590,000	87,966	-1,241	-	86,724
Federal Agencies	3133ERD24	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	602	-	106,852
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	38,343,000	131,804	3,182	-	134,986
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	25,505,000	87,673	2,110	-	89,783
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	21,000,000	72,188	1,743	-	73,930
Federal Agencies	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	33,000,000	113,438	2,948	-	116,386
Federal Agencies	3133ERT84	FFCB 4.250 01/14/2028	29,750,000	105,365	4,768	-	110,133
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	50,000,000	177,083	701	-	177,784
Federal Agencies	3133ERZ46	FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028	47,000,000	166,458	658	-	167,117
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	41,880,000	148,325	68	-	148,393
Federal Agencies	3133ER2Z3	FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027	5,000,000	17,708	19	-	17,728
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	30,000,000	106,250	1,332	-	107,582
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	25,000,000	88,542	1,058	-	89,600
Federal Agencies	3133ER4A6	FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027	2,000,000	7,083	88	-	7,171
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	12,815,000	48,056	-3,532	-	44,524
Federal Agencies	3133ER4H1	FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030	18,000,000	67,500	-4,937	-	62,563
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	32,260,000	107,533	266	-	107,800
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	46,750,000	155,833	285	-	156,119
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	15,000,000	50,000	104	-	50,104
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	43,020,000	143,400	1,911	-	145,311
Federal Agencies	3133ER7L9	FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030	8,695,000	28,983	389	-	29,373
Federal Agencies	3133ETBF3	FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030	50,000,000	166,667	7,823	-	174,489

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AWC24	FHLB 4.000 06/09/2028	10,000,000	33,333	91	-	33,424
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	45,000,000	150,000	1,306	-	151,306
Federal Agencies	3133ETJF5	FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027	10,000,000	33,333	290	-	33,624
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	15,000,000	50,000	996	-	50,996
Federal Agencies	3133ETJS7	FFCB 4.000 11/10/2026	12,600,000	42,000	1,056	-	43,056
Federal Agencies	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	23,000,000	76,667	1,422	-	78,089
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	25,000,000	80,729	1,170	-	81,899
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	20,000,000	66,667	904	-	67,570
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	10,000,000	33,333	427	-	33,761
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	15,000,000	50,000	355	-	50,355
Federal Agencies	3133ETKN6	FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029	10,000,000	33,333	237	-	33,570
Federal Agencies	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	7,370,000	23,799	755	-	24,554
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	16,500,000	53,281	913	-	54,194
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	10,000,000	32,292	553	-	32,845
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	20,000,000	64,583	1,107	-	65,690
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	13,000,000	41,979	719	-	42,699
Federal Agencies	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	36,000,000	116,250	1,992	-	118,242
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	25,000,000	83,333	967	-	84,301
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	14,450,000	48,167	559	-	48,726
Federal Agencies	3133ETME4	FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030	5,000,000	16,667	187	-	16,854
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	16,000,000	55,000	-1,043	-	53,957
Federal Agencies	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	25,000,000	83,333	579	-	83,912
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	50,000,000	156,250	4,684	-	160,934
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	22,500,000	70,313	2,083	-	72,396
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	41,000,000	136,667	-586	-	136,081
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	15,000,000	50,000	-214	-	49,786
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	10,070,000	33,567	-131	-	33,436
Federal Agencies	3133ETNU7	FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028	25,000,000	78,125	2,640	-	80,765
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	65	-	32,565
Federal Agencies	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	16,944,000	56,480	113	-	56,593
Federal Agencies	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	12,515,000	43,020	-1,074	-	41,947
Federal Agencies	3133ETPF8	FFCB 3.750 07/08/2030	20,000,000	62,500	3,689	-	66,189
Federal Agencies	3130B1BC0	FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029	9,705,000	37,405	-5,079	-	32,326
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	7,000,000	21,146	578	-	21,724
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	413	-	15,517
Federal Agencies	3133ETSX6	FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027	5,000,000	15,104	421	-	15,525
Federal Agencies	3130ATHX8	FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029	17,000,000	58,438	-4,097	-	54,340
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	40,000,000	125,000	2,907	-	127,907

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	25,000,000	78,125	1,776	-	79,901
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	15,000,000	46,875	1,090	-	47,965
Federal Agencies	3133ETUE5	FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027	35,000,000	109,375	2,697	-	112,072
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	3,444	-	123,027
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	50,000,000	145,833	4,200	-	150,033
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	25,000,000	72,917	2,100	-	75,017
Federal Agencies	3130B82L5	FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027	20,000,000	58,333	1,680	-	60,013
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027	9,320,000	26,213	869	-	27,082
Federal Agencies	3133ETM95	FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027	60,000,000	168,750	5,597	-	174,347
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	26	-	84,401
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	26	-	84,401
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	50,000,000	168,750	51	-	168,801
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	26	-	84,401
Federal Agencies	3136GC2P9	FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029	25,000,000	84,375	26	-	84,401
Federal Agencies	3130AWMP2	FHLB 4.375 06/14/2030	31,000,000	113,021	-16,179	-	96,842
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	5,000,000	14,063	631	-	14,693
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	25,000,000	70,313	3,104	-	73,417
Federal Agencies	3133ETL70	FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028	30,000,000	84,375	3,785	-	88,160
Federal Agencies	3133ET2W6	FFCB 3.500 01/20/2028	5,000,000	14,583	318	-	14,902
Federal Agencies	3130AYPN0	FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027	20,000,000	68,750	-7,597	-	61,153
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	7,306	-	105,744
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	1,516	-	132,766
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	37,000,000	107,917	1,247	-	109,163
Federal Agencies	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	15,000,000	43,750	505	-	44,255
Federal Agencies	3133EN5N6	FFCB 4.000 01/06/2028	50,000,000	166,667	-19,440	-	147,227
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	72	-	29,238
Federal Agencies	3133ET4Y0	FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028	20,000,000	58,333	143	-	58,477
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	46,000,000	129,375	3,686	-	133,061
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	30,000,000	84,375	2,404	-	86,779
Federal Agencies	3133ET6R3	FFCB 3.375 10/08/2027	15,000,000	42,188	1,051	-	43,238
Federal Agencies	313385ZG4	FHDN 0.000 07/13/2026	15,000,000	-	43,188	-	43,188
Federal Agencies	313385ZS8	FHDN 0.000 07/23/2026	15,000,000	-	43,125	-	43,125
Federal Agencies	313385ZT6	FHDN 0.000 07/24/2026	50,000,000	-	144,167	-	144,167
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	2,951	-	29,534
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	-	72,396	-	72,396
Federal Agencies	313385B62	FHDN 0.000 08/12/2026	51,000,000	-	147,687	-	147,687
Federal Agencies	313385A97	FHDN 0.000 08/07/2026	10,000,000	-	29,000	-	29,000
Federal Agencies	3133ET6K8	FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028	23,480,000	66,038	3,166	-	69,204
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028	35,000,000	102,083	3,035	-	105,118
Federal Agencies	3133EWAU4	FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028	35,000,000	102,083	3,035	-	105,118
Federal Agencies	313385B88	FHDN 0.000 08/14/2026	22,900,000	-	67,269	-	67,269
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	25,000,000	-	73,646	-	73,646
Federal Agencies	313385D29	FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026	25,000,000	-	73,646	-	73,646

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	-	44,187	-	44,187
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	73,021	-	73,021
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	73,021	-	73,021
Federal Agencies	313385G91	FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026	25,000,000	-	73,021	-	73,021
Federal Agencies	313385D45	FHDN 0.000 08/26/2026	51,000,000	-	150,450	-	150,450
Federal Agencies	3133EWGC8	FFCB 3.500 09/06/2030	36,750,000	107,188	4,021	-	111,209
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	15,000,000	43,750	531	-	44,281
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	50,000,000	145,833	1,770	-	147,603
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	30,000,000	87,500	1,062	-	88,562
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	25,000,000	72,917	885	-	73,801
Federal Agencies	3130B9RC6	FHLB 3.500 03/03/2028	13,000,000	37,917	460	-	38,377
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	50,000,000	-	148,125	-	148,125
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	25,000,000	-	74,063	-	74,063
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	15,585,000	-	46,365	-	46,365
Federal Agencies	313385G67	FHDN 0.000 09/21/2026	40,000,000	-	118,500	-	118,500
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	80,729	882	-	81,612
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	80,729	964	-	81,694
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	25,000,000	80,729	1,005	-	81,735
Federal Agencies	3133EWJZ4	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2028	2,000,000	6,458	80	-	6,539
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	25,000,000	80,729	1,444	-	82,173
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	21,700,000	70,073	1,396	-	71,469
Federal Agencies	3133EWKC3	FFCB 3.875 03/27/2029	50,000,000	161,458	3,216	-	164,675
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	1,807	-	79,932
Federal Agencies	3133EWNE6	FFCB 3.750 05/01/2029	33,950,000	106,094	6,566	-	112,660
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	FFCB 3.875 11/03/2028	11,500,000	37,135	1,137	-	38,273
Federal Agencies	3133EWNL0	FFCB 3.875 11/03/2028	5,000,000	16,146	534	-	16,680
Federal Agencies	313385ZL3	FHDN 0.000 07/17/2026	35,000,000	-	105,292	-	105,292
Federal Agencies	3130AWN30	FHLB 4.375 06/08/2029	13,500,000	42,656	-2,437	-	40,219
Federal Agencies	3133EWRQ5	FFCB 4.125 02/28/2029	11,002,000	28,995	559	-	29,554
Federal Agencies	3133EWTC4	FFCB 4.250 06/12/2031	25,000,000	56,076	96	-	56,173
Federal Agencies	3130BB3J2	FHLB 4.125 06/01/2028	25,000,000	54,427	462	-	54,889
Federal Agencies	3133EWTC4	FFCB 4.250 06/12/2031	24,750,000	37,984	-608	-	37,376
Subtotals			8,349,406,000	24,900,214	1,855,415	-	26,755,629
Negotiable CDs	96130AC22	WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026	-	168,000	-	-	168,000
Negotiable CDs	06418NHV7	BNSHOU 4.270 07/01/2026	100,000,000	355,833	-	-	355,833
Negotiable CDs	06367DRZ0	BMOCHG 4.170 06/01/2026	-	0	-	-	0
Negotiable CDs	78015JL88	RY 4.060 07/01/2026	100,000,000	338,333	-	-	338,333
Negotiable CDs	06367DS97	BMOCHG 4.200 06/15/2026	-	163,333	-	-	163,333
Negotiable CDs	06367DSQ9	BMOCHG 4.000 06/09/2026	-	40,889	-	-	40,889
Negotiable CDs	06367DSR7	BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026	-	84,000	-	-	84,000
Negotiable CDs	06367DSV8	BMOCHG 3.980 06/17/2026	-	97,289	-	-	97,289
Negotiable CDs	89115DK96	TDNY 3.850 06/23/2026	-	117,639	-	-	117,639
Negotiable CDs	89115DKD7	TDNY 3.850 07/01/2026	50,000,000	160,417	-	-	160,417
Negotiable CDs	89115DNV4	TDNY 3.780 06/15/2026	-	147,000	-	-	147,000
Negotiable CDs	78015J4M6	RY 4.000 10/23/2026	100,000,000	333,333	-	-	333,333
Negotiable CDs	13606DUD2	CIBCNY 4.050 10/23/2026	100,000,000	337,500	-	-	337,500
Negotiable CDs	89115MA63	TDNY 4.050 09/23/2026	25,000,000	84,375	-	-	84,375
Negotiable CDs	89115MAA4	TDNY 4.050 09/24/2026	50,000,000	168,750	-	-	168,750
Negotiable CDs	89115MAE6	TDNY 4.060 10/05/2026	25,000,000	84,583	-	-	84,583
Negotiable CDs	89115MAJ5	TDNY 4.070 10/23/2026	100,000,000	339,167	-	-	339,167
Negotiable CDs	06367DUX1	BMOCHG 4.000 11/02/2026	100,000,000	333,333	-	-	333,333
Negotiable CDs	06367DUZ6	BMOCHG 4.010 11/04/2026	60,000,000	200,500	-	-	200,500

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Negotiable CDs	89115M4K9	TDNY 4.010 11/03/2026	50,000,000	167,083	-	-	167,083
Negotiable CDs	13606DUN0	CIBCNY 4.040 01/11/2027	70,000,000	235,667	-	-	235,667
Negotiable CDs	13606DUP5	CIBCNY 4.040 01/13/2027	55,000,000	185,167	-	-	185,167
Negotiable CDs	13606DUU4	CIBCNY 4.000 12/03/2026	60,000,000	200,000	-	-	200,000
Negotiable CDs	13606DUV2	CIBCNY 4.000 12/14/2026	25,000,000	83,333	-	-	83,333
Negotiable CDs	78015J6H5	RY 3.950 12/15/2026	100,000,000	329,167	-	-	329,167
Negotiable CDs	78015J6R3	RY 3.920 12/28/2026	100,000,000	326,667	-	-	326,667
Negotiable CDs	06418NQH8	BNSHOU 3.910 12/16/2026	70,000,000	228,083	-	-	228,083
Negotiable CDs	78015J6V4	RY 3.910 12/30/2026	70,000,000	228,083	-	-	228,083
Negotiable CDs	06418NQJ4	BNSHOU 3.910 12/28/2026	30,000,000	97,750	-	-	97,750
Negotiable CDs	13606DVN9	CIBCNY 3.980 02/08/2027	100,000,000	331,667	-	-	331,667
Negotiable CDs	89115M5L6	TDNY 3.980 02/05/2027	50,000,000	165,833	-	-	165,833
Negotiable CDs	06367DVT9	BMOCHG 4.090 03/22/2027	100,000,000	170,417	-	-	170,417
Negotiable CDs	89115M5D4	TDNY 4.090 03/22/2027	45,000,000	71,575	-	-	71,575
Negotiable CDs	89115M6H4	TDNY 4.210 03/24/2027	100,000,000	105,250	-	-	105,250
Negotiable CDs	78015JC96	RY 4.230 03/24/2027	75,000,000	79,313	-	-	79,313
Subtotals			1,910,000,000	6,559,329	-	-	6,559,329
Commercial Paper	89233HF33	TOYCC 0.000 06/03/2026	-	-	13,000	-	13,000
Commercial Paper	89233HG16	TOYCC 0.000 07/01/2026	70,000,000	-	220,500	-	220,500
Commercial Paper	62479MFP3	MUFGBK 0.000 06/23/2026	-	-	116,722	-	116,722
Commercial Paper	62479MFV0	MUFGBK 0.000 06/29/2026	-	-	74,278	-	74,278
Commercial Paper	62479MF16	MUFGBK 0.000 06/01/2026	-	-	-0	-	(0)
Commercial Paper	62479MFJ7	MUFGBK 0.000 06/18/2026	-	-	27,058	-	27,058
Commercial Paper	89233HGE8	TOYCC 0.000 07/14/2026	75,000,000	-	234,375	-	234,375
Commercial Paper	89233HGQ1	TOYCC 0.000 07/24/2026	75,000,000	-	233,750	-	233,750
Commercial Paper	89233HGV0	TOYCC 0.000 07/29/2026	50,000,000	-	155,417	-	155,417
Commercial Paper	62479MFF5	MUFGBK 0.000 06/15/2026	-	-	94,286	-	94,286
Commercial Paper	62479MJP9	MUFGBK 0.000 09/23/2026	100,000,000	-	331,667	-	331,667
Commercial Paper	62479MK77	MUFGBK 0.000 10/07/2026	51,000,000	-	167,875	-	167,875
Commercial Paper	62479MKF9	MUFGBK 0.000 10/15/2026	11,000,000	-	36,208	-	36,208
Commercial Paper	62479ML27	MUFGBK 0.000 11/02/2026	25,000,000	-	81,667	-	81,667
Commercial Paper	62479ML68	MUFGBK 0.000 11/06/2026	15,000,000	-	49,000	-	49,000
Commercial Paper	62479MLP6	MUFGBK 0.000 11/23/2026	90,000,000	-	294,000	-	294,000
Commercial Paper	02314QFN4	AMZN 0.000 06/22/2026	-	-	73,541	-	73,541
Commercial Paper	89233HNT7	TOYCC 0.000 01/27/2027	100,000,000	-	330,000	-	330,000
Commercial Paper	62479MNR0	MUFGBK 0.000 01/25/2027	15,000,000	-	48,875	-	48,875
Commercial Paper	62479MNU3	MUFGBK 0.000 01/28/2027	25,000,000	-	81,667	-	81,667
Commercial Paper	14912EFN2	CATFIN 0.000 06/22/2026	-	-	48,292	-	48,292

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Description	Par Value	Accrued	(Amort.) / Accre.	Unrealized G/L	Total Earnings
Commercial Paper	14912EFP7	CATFIN 0.000 06/23/2026	-	-	50,833	-	50,833
Commercial Paper	89233HQ15	TOYCC 0.000 03/01/2027	60,000,000	-	177,750	-	177,750
Commercial Paper	14912EFH5	CATFIN 0.000 06/17/2026	-	-	63,440	-	63,440
Commercial Paper	62479MP80	MUFG BK 0.000 02/08/2027	30,000,000	-	49,625	-	49,625
Commercial Paper	62479MPG2	MUFG BK 0.000 02/16/2027	25,000,000	-	41,354	-	41,354
Commercial Paper	62479MPC1	MUFG BK 0.000 02/12/2027	15,000,000	-	24,813	-	24,813
Commercial Paper	24422MGU9	JDCCPP 0.000 07/28/2026	100,000,000	-	144,278	-	144,278
Commercial Paper	14912EG68	CATFIN 0.000 07/06/2026	100,000,000	-	132,528	-	132,528
Commercial Paper	24422MG62	JDCCPP 0.000 07/06/2026	25,000,000	-	33,854	-	33,854
Subtotals			1,057,000,000	-	3,430,652	-	3,430,652
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	6,452,000	18,281	6,806	-	25,087
Medium Term Notes	594918CN2	MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026	13,009,000	36,859	13,650	-	50,509
Medium Term Notes	24422EXV6	DE 4.200 07/15/2027	10,000,000	35,000	40	-	35,040
Medium Term Notes	14913UAN0	CAT 4.450 10/16/2026	18,385,000	68,178	-8,521	-	59,657
Medium Term Notes	037833CJ7	AAPL 3.350 02/09/2027	50,000,000	139,583	14,211	-	153,794
Medium Term Notes	89236TMY8	TOYOTA 4.600 01/08/2027	40,000,000	153,333	905	-	154,239
Medium Term Notes	24422EYD5	DE 4.250 06/05/2028	25,000,000	88,542	609	-	89,151
Subtotals			162,846,000	539,776	27,700	-	567,476
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	114,877,823	52,723	-	-	52,723
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	641,480,639	1,873,286	-	-	1,873,286
Money Market Funds	608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	201,997,718	280,190	-	-	280,190
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	15,468,272	44,633	-	-	44,633
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	331,564,938	314,737	-	-	314,737
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	348,964,979	453,514	-	-	453,514
Subtotals			1,654,354,369	3,019,083	-	-	3,019,083
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	25,000,000	85,938	6,261	-	92,198
Supranationals	459058KJ1	IBRD 3.125 06/15/2027	12,323,000	32,153	10,969	-	43,122
Supranationals	4581X0EN4	IADB 4.125 02/15/2029	50,000,000	171,875	3,100	-	174,975
Supranationals	459058KC6	IBRD 0.700 11/16/2026	55,000,000	103,125	67,305	-	170,430
Subtotals			142,323,000	393,090	87,635	-	480,725
Secured Bank Deposit	0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	167,658,069	494,621	-	-	494,621
Subtotals			167,658,069	494,621	-	-	494,621
Grand Totals			18,602,587,439	51,484,915	5,854,879	-	57,339,794

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
59143	Buy	14912EFN2	CATFIN 0.000 06/22/2026	99.80683	06/03/2026	06/03/2026	25,000,000	24,951,708	-	24,951,708
59144	Buy	14912EFP7	CATFIN 0.000 06/23/2026	99.79667	06/03/2026	06/03/2026	25,000,000	24,949,167	-	24,949,167
59145	Buy	89233HQ15	TOYCC 0.000 03/01/2027	97.03750	06/04/2026	06/04/2026	60,000,000	58,222,500	-	58,222,500
59146	Buy	14912EFH5	CATFIN 0.000 06/17/2026	99.86783	06/04/2026	06/04/2026	48,000,000	47,936,560	-	47,936,560
59147	Buy	3130AWN30	FHLB 4.375 06/08/2029	100.76300	06/05/2026	06/05/2026	13,500,000	13,603,005	290,391	13,893,396
59148	Buy	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	99.66406	06/05/2026	06/05/2026	50,000,000	49,832,031	915,522	50,747,553
59149	Buy	91282CMZ1	T 3.875 04/30/2030	99.02344	06/05/2026	06/05/2026	50,000,000	49,511,719	189,538	49,701,257
59150	Buy	3133EWRQ5	FFCB 4.125 02/28/2029	99.78000	06/08/2026	06/08/2026	11,002,000	10,977,796	12,606	10,990,402
59151	Buy	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	99.68750	06/08/2026	06/08/2026	50,000,000	49,843,750	878,453	50,722,203
59152	Buy	91282CJX0	T 4.000 01/31/2031	98.81641	06/08/2026	06/08/2026	50,000,000	49,408,203	707,182	50,115,385
59153	Buy	3133EWTC4	FFCB 4.250 06/12/2031	99.96300	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	25,000,000	24,990,750	-	24,990,750
59154	Buy	3130BB3J2	FHLB 4.125 06/01/2028	99.93000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	25,000,000	24,982,500	-	24,982,500
59155	Buy	62479MP80	MUFGBK 0.000 02/08/2027	97.38642	06/16/2026	06/16/2026	30,000,000	29,215,925	-	29,215,925
59156	Buy	62479MPG2	MUFGBK 0.000 02/16/2027	97.29819	06/16/2026	06/16/2026	25,000,000	24,324,549	-	24,324,549
59157	Buy	62479MPC1	MUFGBK 0.000 02/12/2027	97.34231	06/16/2026	06/16/2026	15,000,000	14,601,346	-	14,601,346
59158	Buy	06367DVT9	BMOCHG 4.090 03/22/2027	100.00000	06/16/2026	06/16/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59159	Buy	89115M5D4	TDNY 4.090 03/22/2027	100.00000	06/17/2026	06/17/2026	45,000,000	45,000,000	-	45,000,000
59160	Buy	24422MGU9	JDCCPP 0.000 07/28/2026	99.57747	06/17/2026	06/17/2026	100,000,000	99,577,472	-	99,577,472
59161	Buy	14912EG68	CATFIN 0.000 07/06/2026	99.81650	06/18/2026	06/18/2026	100,000,000	99,816,500	-	99,816,500
59162	Buy	3133EWTC4	FFCB 4.250 06/12/2031	100.34400	06/18/2026	06/18/2026	24,750,000	24,835,140	17,531	24,852,671
59163	Buy	91282CKF7	T 4.125 03/31/2031	99.56250	06/18/2026	06/18/2026	50,000,000	49,781,250	445,184	50,226,434
59164	Buy	91282CKF7	T 4.125 03/31/2031	99.56250	06/18/2026	06/18/2026	50,000,000	49,781,250	445,184	50,226,434
59165	Buy	24422MG62	JDCCPP 0.000 07/06/2026	99.81250	06/18/2026	06/18/2026	25,000,000	24,953,125	-	24,953,125
59166	Buy	89115M6H4	TDNY 4.210 03/24/2027	100.00000	06/22/2026	06/22/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
59167	Buy	78015JC96	RY 4.230 03/24/2027	100.00000	06/22/2026	06/22/2026	75,000,000	75,000,000	-	75,000,000
Activity Total							1,172,252,000	1,166,096,245	3,901,593	1,169,997,838

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Price	Settlement Date	Posted Date	Par Value	Principal	Accrued Interest	Total
58761	Maturity	06367DRZ0	BMOCHG 4.170 06/01/2026	100.00000	06/01/2026	06/01/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
58919	Maturity	62479MF16	MUFGKB 0.000 06/01/2026	100.00000	06/01/2026	06/01/2026	30,000,000	30,000,000	-	30,000,000
58811	Maturity	89233HF33	TOYCC 0.000 06/03/2026	100.00000	06/03/2026	06/03/2026	60,000,000	60,000,000	-	60,000,000
58812	Maturity	06367DSQ9	BMOCHG 4.000 06/09/2026	100.00000	06/09/2026	06/09/2026	46,000,000	46,000,000	-	46,000,000
57657	Maturity	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	17,045,000	17,045,000	-	17,045,000
57665	Maturity	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	20,000,000	20,000,000	-	20,000,000
57671	Maturity	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	15,000,000	15,000,000	-	15,000,000
57672	Maturity	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	10,000,000
57701	Maturity	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58022	Maturity	3130B1BT3	FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	13,485,000	13,485,000	-	13,485,000
58023	Maturity	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	32,000,000	32,000,000	-	32,000,000
58024	Maturity	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	100.00000	06/12/2026	06/12/2026	20,000,000	20,000,000	-	20,000,000
58780	Maturity	06367DS97	BMOCHG 4.200 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
58813	Maturity	06367DSR7	BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	54,000,000	54,000,000	-	54,000,000
57679	Maturity	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	30,000,000	30,000,000	-	30,000,000
57680	Maturity	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	20,000,000	20,000,000	-	20,000,000
57683	Maturity	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	24,700,000	24,700,000	-	24,700,000
58951	Maturity	62479MFF5	MUFGKB 0.000 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	65,000,000	65,000,000	-	65,000,000
58946	Maturity	89115DNV4	TDNY 3.780 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
58726	Maturity	96130AC22	WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026	100.00000	06/15/2026	06/15/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
58995	Maturity	912797UA3	B 0.000 06/16/2026	100.00000	06/16/2026	06/16/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
58829	Maturity	06367DSV8	BMOCHG 3.980 06/17/2026	100.00000	06/17/2026	06/17/2026	55,000,000	55,000,000	-	55,000,000
59146	Maturity	14912EFH5	CATFIN 0.000 06/17/2026	100.00000	06/17/2026	06/17/2026	48,000,000	48,000,000	-	48,000,000
58920	Maturity	62479MFJ7	MUFGKB 0.000 06/18/2026	100.00000	06/18/2026	06/18/2026	15,000,000	15,000,000	-	15,000,000
59136	Maturity	02314QFN4	AMZN 0.000 06/22/2026	100.00000	06/22/2026	06/22/2026	34,730,000	34,730,000	-	34,730,000
59143	Maturity	14912EFN2	CATFIN 0.000 06/22/2026	100.00000	06/22/2026	06/22/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
59144	Maturity	14912EFP7	CATFIN 0.000 06/23/2026	100.00000	06/23/2026	06/23/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
57686	Maturity	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	100.00000	06/23/2026	06/23/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
57687	Maturity	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	100.00000	06/23/2026	06/23/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
57688	Maturity	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	100.00000	06/23/2026	06/23/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
58917	Maturity	62479MFP3	MUFGKB 0.000 06/23/2026	100.00000	06/23/2026	06/23/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58921	Maturity	89115DK96	TDNY 3.850 06/23/2026	100.00000	06/23/2026	06/23/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58918	Maturity	62479MFV0	MUFGKB 0.000 06/29/2026	100.00000	06/29/2026	06/29/2026	25,000,000	25,000,000	-	25,000,000
47078	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47096	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47099	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47101	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47113	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47124	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47165	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47175	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
47275	Maturity	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	50,000,000	50,000,000	-	50,000,000
58923	Maturity	91282CKY6	T 4.625 06/30/2026	100.00000	06/30/2026	06/30/2026	100,000,000	100,000,000	-	100,000,000
Activity Total							1,909,960,000	1,909,960,000	-	1,909,960,000

Interest Received Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
58690	Interest Income	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	06/01/2026	300,000.00	0.00	300,000.00
58692	Interest Income	3133ETJV0	FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029	06/01/2026	460,000.00	0.00	460,000.00
58761	Interest Income	06367DRZ0	BMOCHG 4.170 06/01/2026	06/01/2026	3,475,000.00	0.00	3,475,000.00
58901	Interest Income	91282CHF1	T 3.750 05/31/2030	06/01/2026	1,218,750.00	53,571.43	1,165,178.57
47226	Interest Income	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	06/01/2026	312,500.00	0.00	312,500.00
47237	Interest Income	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	06/01/2026	312,500.00	0.00	312,500.00
47333	Interest Income	91282CDK4	T 1.250 11/30/2026	06/01/2026	312,500.00	0.00	312,500.00
58430	Interest Income	91282CKT7	T 4.500 05/31/2029	06/01/2026	1,125,000.00	0.00	1,125,000.00
58715	Interest Income	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	06/04/2026	319,687.50	0.00	319,687.50
58716	Interest Income	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	06/04/2026	193,750.00	0.00	193,750.00
58717	Interest Income	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	06/04/2026	387,500.00	0.00	387,500.00
58718	Interest Income	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	06/04/2026	251,875	0	251,875
58719	Interest Income	3130B6R24	FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027	06/04/2026	697,500	0	697,500
58702	Interest Income	24422EYD5	DE 4.250 06/05/2028	06/05/2026	531,250	0	531,250
58704	Interest Income	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	06/05/2026	484,375	0	484,375
58714	Interest Income	3133ETJZ1	FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028	06/05/2026	142,794	0	142,794
58759	Interest Income	3130B1BC0	FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029	06/08/2026	224,428	0	224,428
59147	Interest Income	3130AWN30	FHLB 4.375 06/08/2029	06/08/2026	295,313	290,391	4,922
58000	Interest Income	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	06/08/2026	337,500	0	337,500
58038	Interest Income	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	06/08/2026	450,000	0	450,000
58040	Interest Income	3133ERGL9	FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028	06/08/2026	336,015	0	336,015
58672	Interest Income	3130AWC24	FHLB 4.000 06/09/2028	06/09/2026	200,000	0	200,000
58812	Interest Income	06367DSQ9	BMOCHG 4.000 06/09/2026	06/09/2026	1,395,333	0	1,395,333
58707	Interest Income	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	06/10/2026	400,000	0	400,000
58708	Interest Income	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	06/10/2026	200,000	0	200,000
58728	Interest Income	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	06/10/2026	500,000	0	500,000
58742	Interest Income	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	06/10/2026	300,000	0	300,000
58743	Interest Income	3133ETKQ9	FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030	06/10/2026	195,000	0	195,000
58495	Interest Income	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	06/10/2026	790,824	0	790,824
58496	Interest Income	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	06/10/2026	526,041	0	526,041
58497	Interest Income	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	06/10/2026	433,125	0	433,125
58500	Interest Income	3133ERJ51	FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027	06/10/2026	680,625	0	680,625
47409	Interest Income	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	06/11/2026	216,563	0	216,563
47410	Interest Income	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	06/11/2026	175,000	0	175,000
47411	Interest Income	3130ASGU7	FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027	06/11/2026	380,188	0	380,188
57937	Interest Income	3130AX4E5	FHLB 4.500 06/11/2027	06/11/2026	247,500	0	247,500
58033	Interest Income	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	06/11/2026	212,500	0	212,500
58034	Interest Income	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	06/11/2026	212,500	0	212,500
58035	Interest Income	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	06/11/2026	425,000	0	425,000
58036	Interest Income	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	06/11/2026	212,500	0	212,500
58037	Interest Income	3133ERGS4	FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029	06/11/2026	616,250	0	616,250
58066	Interest Income	3130B1EF0	FHLB 4.625 06/11/2027	06/11/2026	478,688	0	478,688

Interest Received Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
57657	Interest Income	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	319,594	0	319,594
57665	Interest Income	3130AVWS7	FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	375,000	0	375,000
57671	Interest Income	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	300,000	0	300,000
57672	Interest Income	3130AWAH3	FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	200,000	0	200,000
57701	Interest Income	3130AWLZ1	FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	1,187,500	0	1,187,500
58022	Interest Income	3130B1BT3	FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	328,697	0	328,697
58023	Interest Income	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	780,000	0	780,000
58024	Interest Income	3133ERHD6	FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026	06/12/2026	487,500	0	487,500
58676	Interest Income	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,156,250	0	1,156,250
58726	Interest Income	96130AC22	WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026	06/15/2026	4,320,000	0	4,320,000
58727	Interest Income	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	06/15/2026	330,000	0	330,000
58735	Interest Income	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,156,250	0	1,156,250
58744	Interest Income	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,156,250	0	1,156,250
58746	Interest Income	3130AWGS3	FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030	06/15/2026	258,122	0	258,122
58755	Interest Income	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,156,250	0	1,156,250
58780	Interest Income	06367DS97	BMOCHG 4.200 06/15/2026	06/15/2026	3,511,667	0	3,511,667
58813	Interest Income	06367DSR7	BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026	06/15/2026	1,674,000	0	1,674,000
58893	Interest Income	3130AWMP2	FHLB 4.375 06/14/2030	06/15/2026	678,125	0	678,125
58896	Interest Income	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	06/15/2026	968,750	0	968,750
58903	Interest Income	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,000,000	0	1,000,000
58946	Interest Income	89115DNV4	TDNY 3.780 06/15/2026	06/15/2026	1,690,500	0	1,690,500
58966	Interest Income	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	06/15/2026	968,750	159,684	809,066
59074	Interest Income	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	354,167	0	354,167
59075	Interest Income	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	177,083	0	177,083
59076	Interest Income	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	177,083	0	177,083
59077	Interest Income	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	177,083	0	177,083
59078	Interest Income	3136GD3W1	FNMA 4.250 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	177,083	0	177,083
59103	Interest Income	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	146,094	0	146,094
59104	Interest Income	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	146,094	0	146,094
59105	Interest Income	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	146,094	0	146,094
59106	Interest Income	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	146,094	0	146,094
59107	Interest Income	3136GD5K5	FNMA 4.125 06/15/2029	06/15/2026	292,188	0	292,188
59148	Interest Income	91282CNH0	T 3.875 06/15/2028	06/15/2026	968,750	915,522	53,228
57679	Interest Income	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	06/15/2026	637,500	0	637,500
57680	Interest Income	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	06/15/2026	425,000	0	425,000
57681	Interest Income	3133EPMV4	FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	596,888	0	596,888
57683	Interest Income	3133EPMU6	FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026	06/15/2026	524,875	0	524,875
58039	Interest Income	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,156,250	0	1,156,250
58067	Interest Income	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,156,250	0	1,156,250
58101	Interest Income	459058KJ1	IBRD 3.125 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	192,608	0	192,608
58415	Interest Income	91282CKV2	T 4.625 06/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,156,250	0	1,156,250
58492	Interest Income	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,000,000	0	1,000,000

Interest Received Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
58493	Interest Income	91282CMB4	T 4.000 12/15/2027	06/15/2026	1,000,000	0	1,000,000
58737	Interest Income	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	06/17/2026	820,000	0	820,000
58738	Interest Income	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	06/17/2026	300,000	0	300,000
58739	Interest Income	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	06/17/2026	201,400	0	201,400
58745	Interest Income	3133ETLM7	FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030	06/17/2026	338,880	0	338,880
58829	Interest Income	06367DSV8	BMOCHG 3.980 06/17/2026	06/17/2026	1,617,428	0	1,617,428
58932	Interest Income	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	06/22/2026	787,500	0	787,500
58933	Interest Income	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	06/22/2026	647,500	0	647,500
58934	Interest Income	3133ET5B9	FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026	06/22/2026	262,500	0	262,500
58908	Interest Income	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	06/23/2026	1,043,750	0	1,043,750
58909	Interest Income	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	06/23/2026	521,875	0	521,875
58910	Interest Income	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	06/23/2026	521,875	0	521,875
58911	Interest Income	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	06/23/2026	521,875	0	521,875
58916	Interest Income	3134HCFX2	FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030	06/23/2026	480,125	0	480,125
58921	Interest Income	89115DK96	TDNY 3.850 06/23/2026	06/23/2026	1,037,361	0	1,037,361
57686	Interest Income	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	06/23/2026	1,093,750	0	1,093,750
57687	Interest Income	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	06/23/2026	546,875	0	546,875
57688	Interest Income	3133EPNG6	FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026	06/23/2026	546,875	0	546,875
58937	Interest Income	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	06/24/2026	504,375	0	504,375
58938	Interest Income	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	06/24/2026	504,375	0	504,375
58939	Interest Income	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	06/24/2026	504,375	0	504,375
58940	Interest Income	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	06/24/2026	1,008,750.00	0.00	1,008,750.00
58941	Interest Income	3134HCKN8	FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030	06/24/2026	504,375.00	0.00	504,375.00
47402	Interest Income	3133ENZK9	FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027	06/29/2026	451,413.00	0.00	451,413.00
58041	Interest Income	3133ERJZ5	FFCB 4.500 06/28/2027	06/29/2026	675,000.00	0.00	675,000.00
47099	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
47101	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
47113	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
58756	Interest Income	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	06/30/2026	812,500.00	0.00	812,500.00
47124	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
58886	Interest Income	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	06/30/2026	812,500.00	0.00	812,500.00
47165	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
58923	Interest Income	91282CKY6	T 4.625 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	2,312,500.00	0.00	2,312,500.00
58950	Interest Income	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	06/30/2026	1,087,500.00	42,058.01	1,045,441.99
58971	Interest Income	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	06/30/2026	906,250.00	80,110.50	826,139.50
58974	Interest Income	91282CPR6	T 3.625 12/31/2030	06/30/2026	906,250.00	100,138.12	806,111.88
47175	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
59151	Interest Income	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	06/30/2026	1,000,000.00	878,453.04	121,546.96
47275	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
47330	Interest Income	91282CDQ1	T 1.250 12/31/2026	06/30/2026	312,500.00	0.00	312,500.00
57826	Interest Income	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	06/30/2026	1,000,000.00	0.00	1,000,000.00
57833	Interest Income	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	06/30/2026	1,000,000.00	0.00	1,000,000.00

Interest Received Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Transaction Type	Cusip	Description	Date Posted	Interest Received	Purchased Interest Adjustment	Net Interest
57834	Interest Income	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	06/30/2026	1,000,000.00	0.00	1,000,000.00
57845	Interest Income	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	06/30/2026	1,000,000.00	0.00	1,000,000.00
57861	Interest Income	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	06/30/2026	1,000,000.00	0.00	1,000,000.00
57879	Interest Income	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	06/30/2026	812,500.00	0.00	812,500.00
57892	Interest Income	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	06/30/2026	812,500.00	0.00	812,500.00
57935	Interest Income	91282CHK0	T 4.000 06/30/2028	06/30/2026	1,000,000.00	0.00	1,000,000.00
58391	Interest Income	91282CEW7	T 3.250 06/30/2027	06/30/2026	812,500.00	0.00	812,500.00
47078	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
47096	Interest Income	91282CCJ8	T 0.875 06/30/2026	06/30/2026	218,750.00	0.00	218,750.00
Activity Total					89,720,992	2,519,928	87,201,065

Cash Activity Pooled Fund

Accounting ID	Description	Activity Date	Transaction	Amount
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/01/2026	Withdrawal	-150,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/02/2026	Deposit	65,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/03/2026	Withdrawal	-95,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/04/2026	Withdrawal	-105,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	06/05/2026	Deposit	10,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/05/2026	Withdrawal	-135,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/08/2026	Withdrawal	-125,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/10/2026	Withdrawal	-40,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/11/2026	Withdrawal	-10,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/12/2026	Deposit	100,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/15/2026	Withdrawal	-85,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	06/16/2026	Withdrawal	-115,000,000
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	06/17/2026	Deposit	105,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/17/2026	Deposit	75,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	06/17/2026	Deposit	200,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/17/2026	Deposit	200,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/18/2026	Withdrawal	-135,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/18/2026	Withdrawal	-150,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	06/22/2026	Withdrawal	-100,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/22/2026	Withdrawal	-80,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/24/2026	Deposit	20,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/24/2026	Deposit	80,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/25/2026	Deposit	45,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	06/26/2026	Deposit	50,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/29/2026	Deposit	45,000,000
09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	06/30/2026	Deposit	100,000,000
09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund	06/30/2026	Interest Received	52,723
31607A703	Fidelity Govt Portfolio	06/30/2026	Interest Received	1,873,286
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/30/2026	Deposit	155,000,000
608919718	Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund	06/30/2026	Interest Received	280,190
262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management	06/30/2026	Interest Received	44,633
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	06/30/2026	Deposit	150,000,000
85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF	06/30/2026	Interest Received	314,737
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/30/2026	Deposit	150,000,000
61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund	06/30/2026	Interest Received	453,514
0660P0999	Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct	06/30/2026	Interest Received	494,621
Activity Total				228,513,704

From: [Rivas, Jorge \(ADM\)](#)
To: [Mayor Daniel Lurie \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Souza](#); [Kudrat Dutta Chaudhary](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Zou, Han \(MYR\)](#); [Garcia, Moises \(MYR\)](#); [Yip, Angela \(ADM\)](#); [Johnston, Jennifer \(ADM\)](#); [Shore, Elena \(ADM\)](#); [Engagement, Civic \(ADM\)](#)
Subject: Immigrant Rights Commission - Advancing Protections for Immigrant Communities at SFO
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 5:47:38 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-d3h2zaz4.png](#)
[IRC 2026 Letter on Immigrant Support at SFO_6.24.26.pdf](#)

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to share the San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission's recently issued letter, "Advancing Protections for Immigrant Communities at SFO," which is attached for your review.

As outlined in the letter, the Commission has advanced a resolution opposing discriminatory travel bans and reaffirming San Francisco's commitment to ensuring our immigrant communities experience safety, dignity, and support, especially at San Francisco International Airport (SFO). During the Commission's public hearing, community members shared deeply personal testimony about the urgent need for stronger protections and more accessible services at our airports. Their experiences underscore the importance of ensuring that fear is not the first interaction people have when they arrive in San Francisco.

While recognizing the City's limitations over federally managed spaces at SFO, the letter outlines several key recommendations aimed at strengthening preparedness, coordination, and support for impacted travelers and families.

Please feel free to reach out if you would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Sarah Souza
Chair, Immigrant Rights Commission

Jorge Rivas | Executive Director | He, Him, él

Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs | City & County of San Francisco
(415) 554 -0600 | 1145 Market Street, Suite #100, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: (415) 554-0615

[OCEIA | Immigrant Rights Commission | Follow OCEIA on Instagram](#)

OCEIA SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
& IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IMMIGRANT RIGHTS COMMISSION

Commissioners:

Sarah Souza, Chair
Kudrat Chaudhary, Vice Chair
Soha Abdou Agina
Aseel Fara
Hans How
Celine Kennelly
Yu Pok (Jose) Ng
Lucia Obregon Matzer
Laura Padilla
Mario Paz
Monthanus Ratanapakdee
Jessy Ruiz
Adoubou Traore
Alicia Wang

Executive Director:

Jorge Rivas, Jr.
Office of Civic Engagement
& Immigrant Affairs

July 15, 2026

Honorable Daniel Lurie

Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

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

Re: Advancing Protections for Immigrant Communities at SFO

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission has taken action by advancing a resolution opposing discriminatory travel bans and reaffirming our city's commitment to protecting immigrant communities. We are attaching this resolution for your reference.

At our public hearing, where we heard directly from community members impacted by the proposed travel ban, it became clear that there is an urgent need for stronger protections and accessible support systems, including at our airports.

At a time when we have seen the presence of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at San Francisco International Airport (SFO), it is even more critical that San Francisco ensures that fear is not the first experience people encounter when they arrive here. The Immigrant Rights Commission affirms that SFO must remain a welcoming place, especially for our immigrant communities. Our airport is not just a point of entry; it is a reflection of our values as a city.

In response, we are calling on the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to do the following:

- Assess how resources can be strategically allocated at San Francisco International Airport (SFO) to ensure preparedness, coordination, and protection for impacted travelers and families. This includes exploring dedicated space and infrastructure for legal services, multilingual support, and emergency assistance so that no individual navigating the airport is left without guidance or support.

- Collaborate with the San Francisco Airport Commission to identify funding opportunities, partnerships, and operational strategies that can support immigrant and traveler assistance resources at SFO.
- Partner with the Immigrant Rights Commission, [Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs \(OCEIA\)](#), SFO leadership, and community organizations to develop a pilot program focused on addressing immigrant and traveler needs at the airport through coordinated services, legal support access, language assistance, and rapid response planning.

We remain committed to building a city where dignity, access, and belonging are not conditional—they are guaranteed.

Respectfully,

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah Souza", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Sarah Souza
Commission Chair

San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission

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: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, July 23 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 8:54:35 AM
Attachments: [ISCOTT_1620_Agenda.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see the attached and below communication from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic Street Closures (ISCOTT) agenda for the July 23, 2026, ISCOTT hearing.

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: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2026 8:49 AM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, July 23 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Good morning –

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, July 23.

If you have any questions, please email us.

Nick Chapman

Manager, [ISCOTT](#) and SFMTA Special Events
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Pronouns: he/him, they/them

Please consider the environment before using AI to respond to this email



ISCOTT AGENDA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COUNCIL ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION
FOR TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of July 23, 2026 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1620th Regular Meeting

Online Participation

Please join Microsoft Teams Meeting at
SFMTA.com/ISCOTTHearing

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

Phone Participation

Please dial +1 415-523-2709,,397937701# [Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 397 937 701#

Dial *5 to be placed in the queue for public comment. When prompted dial *6 to unmute yourself.

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

Written Participation

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

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



MINUTES OF THE JULY 9, 2026, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)

The Council to adopt the Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

NONE

REGULAR CALENDAR

- A.** Union Street between Columbus Avenue and Stockton Street
 Sunday, October 11, 2026, 8 am to 5 pm
 Italian Heritage Parade Car Show
- B.** Balboa Street between 35th and 39th avenues; 37th Avenue between 100-
 feet northerly and 100-feet southerly of Balboa Street
 Intersections closed: Balboa Street at 36th, 37th, and 38th avenues
 Saturday, September 12, 2026, 6 am to 7:30 pm
 Art Walk SF / Far Out Fest
- C.** Cole Street between Carl and Grattan streets; Cole Street between Frederick
 and Carl streets; Parnassus Avenue between Shrader and Belvedere streets
 Intersection closed: Cole Street at Parnassus Avenue
 (Intersection of Cole and Carl to remain unobstructed at all times)
 Sunday, September 27, 2026, 6 am to 7 pm
 Cole Valley Fair
- D.** Howard Street between 3rd and 4th streets
 and
 Howard Street (southernmost travel lane and parking lane) between
 Hawthorne and 3rd streets; 3rd Street (two most westerly lanes) between
 Folsom and Howard streets; 3rd Street (westernmost travel/parking lane)



between Howard and Mission streets; Folsom Street (northernmost travel and parking lane) between 3rd and 5th streets; 4th street (easternmost travel lane) between Howard and Folsom streets

Saturday, September 5, 2026, 6 am to

Sunday, September 20, 2026, 10 pm

and

4th Street (two easternmost lanes) between Minna and Folsom streets;

Sunday September 13, 2026, 10 pm to

Thursday, September 17, 2026, 9 pm

and

Minna Street between 4th and 5th streets

Monday, September 14, 2026, to

Thursday, September 17, 2026

6 am to 8 pm daily

and

4th Street between Mission and Howard streets

(restricted to shuttles and shuttles only)

Monday, September 14, 2026,

Thursday, September 17, 2026

6 am to 8 pm daily

Dreamforce Core Campus

Howard Street (parking lane and most northerly travel lane) between 4th Street and 50 feet past Moscone West loading dock to the west

Tuesday, September 15, 2026, 6 am to 10:30 am

Tuesday, September 15, 2026, 4 pm to 8 pm

Wednesday, September 16, 2026, 6 am to 9:30 am

Wednesday, September 16, 2026, 5 pm to 9 pm

Thursday, September 17, 2026, 6 am to 10 am

Dreamforce Hotel Shuttle Service

4th Street (westernmost travel lane) between Minna and Howard streets;

4th Street (easternmost travel lane) between Mission and Folsom streets;

3rd Street (westernmost travel lane) between Mission and Folsom streets

(At least two traffic lanes of 3rd Street to remain unobstructed at all times.)

Friday, September 4, 2026, 10 pm to

Saturday, September 5, 2026, 3:30 am

and

Thursday, September 17, 2026, 10 pm to

Friday, September 18, 2026, 3:30 am

K-Rail Installation/Removal



Dreamforce 2026

Berry Street (southerly lane) between 3rd and 4th streets

Wednesday September 16, 2026, 12:00 am to 11:59 pm

Dreamfest at Oracle closure

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

Forrest Chamberlain
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Date

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

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

NONE

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)

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

NONE



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

Sound Producing Devices

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

Disability Access

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

Know Your Rights under the Sunshine Ordinance

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

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

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

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

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Resolution 26-41
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:15:06 AM
Attachments: [Res 26-41 Approval urging BOS to auth accept and expend \\$3,000,000 for RTIC.pdf](#)
[Outlook-ixid4rx5.png](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting Police Commission Resolution No. 26-41: Approval to Adopt a Resolution Urging the Board of Supervisors to Authorize the Police Department to Accept and Expend a Gift of \$3,000,000 from the San Francisco Police Community Foundation to Support the Real Time Investigation Center for Technology, Software and Infrastructure Needs.

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: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:07 AM
To: Lew, Derrick (POL) <Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Wu, Kimmie (POL) <Kimmie.Wu@sfgov.org>; Wu, Li (POL) <li.y.wu@sfgov.org>; Yeung, Fannie (POL) <fannie.w.yeung@sfgov.org>; Ashpole, Robert (POL) <robert.ashpole@sfgov.org>; Nicita, Carl (POL) <carl.nicita@sfgov.org>; Reynolds, Sondra (POL) <sondra.reynolds@sfgov.org>
Subject: Resolution 26-41

Honorable Board of Supervisors and Chief Lew,

Attached is Police Commission Resolution 26-41 authorizing the Department to accept a gift of \$3,000,000 from the Police Community Foundation.

Thank you,

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Secretary
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and 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 the communication.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

July 16, 2026

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

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

C. DON CLAY
President

PRATIBHA TEKKEY
Vice President

CINDY ELIAS
Commissioner

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

W.S. WILSON LEUNG
Commissioner

MATTIE SCOTT
Commissioner

LARRY LOW
Commissioner

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, July 15, 2026, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION 26-41

APPROVAL TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION URGING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AUTHORIZE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TO ACCEPT AND EXPEND A GIFT OF \$3,000,000 FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION TO SUPPORT THE REAL TIME INVESTIGATION CENTER FOR TECHNOLOGY, SOFTWARE AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS.

RESOLVED, that the Police Commission hereby urges the Board of Supervisors to authorize the Police Department to accept and expend a gift in the amount of \$3,000,000 from the San Francisco Police Community Foundation to support the Real Time Investigation Center for technology, software and infrastructure.

AYES: Commissioners Low, Leung, Benedicto, Elias and Vice Pres. Tekkey and President Clay
EXCUSED: Commissioner Scott

Very truly yours,

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission

1211/SR

cc: Manager Li Wu/Fiscal
CFO Kimmie Wu/Fiscal
Grants Manager Fannie Yeung/Fiscal
Grants Analyst Robert Ashpole/Fiscal

FILE NO.

RESOLUTION NO.

1 [Accept and Expend Gift - San Francisco Police Community Foundation - \$3,000,000 to
2 Support the Real Time Investigation Center]

3 **Resolution authorizing the Police Department to accept and expend a cash gift in the**
4 **amount of \$3,000,000 from the San Francisco Police Community Foundation to support**
5 **the Real Time Investigation Center for technology, software, and infrastructure needs.**
6

7 WHEREAS, In March 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition E, which
8 facilitated the ability of the Police Department to use technology to fulfill its mission to
9 enhance public safety, protect life and property, and prevent crime; among other things,
10 Proposition E established that the Police Department shall use technology to the maximum
11 extent possible to improve efficiency and effectiveness in combatting crime, and reduce
12 dangers to the public, subject to the City's policies to protect privacy and civil liberties.
13 (Admin. Code § 96I.2(e)); subject to these principles and limitations, Administrative Code
14 Section 96I.2(d) authorizes police officers to use uncrewed aerial vehicles ("UAVs," also
15 known as "drones") along with or in lieu of vehicle pursuits; Proposition E also authorizes the
16 use of drones to assist in criminal investigations and exempts the Police Department's use of
17 drones under Administrative Code Section 96I.2(e) from the requirements of the City's
18 Surveillance Technology Ordinance (Administrative Code Chapter 19B); and

19 WHEREAS, With the passage of Proposition E, the Police Department has sought to
20 expand its use of technology to enhance community safety, combat crime, and more
21 efficiently utilize personnel during an ongoing staffing shortage; in March 2024, the Police
22 Department launched the Real Time Investigation Center (RTIC), a real-time intelligence hub
23 where officers simultaneously use technology including drones, Automated License Plate
24 Readers, public safety cameras and other crime-fighting tools to help protect the community;
25 the RTIC allows the Police Department to leverage technology, data, and collaboration to

1 provide real-time intelligence to law enforcement officers in the field, enabling them to more
2 effectively respond to incidents, prevent crimes, and apprehend suspects; using technology
3 like drones, the Police Department can rapidly respond to crimes in progress, with officers in
4 the community directly communicating with teams at the RTIC; and

5 WHEREAS, The Police Department is continuing to expand its use of technology
6 through programs such as Drone as First Responder, which operates citywide and is being
7 expanded to support operations at Southern Station, and the implementation of counter-drone
8 capabilities to address emerging public safety needs; and

9 WHEREAS, The RTIC is currently located at 315 Montgomery Street, pursuant to a
10 sublease on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 250722; and

11 WHEREAS, 315 Montgomery Street provides the infrastructure necessary to support a
12 modern, technology-enabled investigation center, including sufficient electrical capacity, high-
13 speed and reliable internet connectivity, and improved communication capabilities; this
14 location allows the Police Department to effectively operate and continue developing the RTIC
15 as a centralized hub for real-time intelligence and coordinated public safety response; and

16 WHEREAS, The San Francisco Police Community Foundation (SFPCF) is a 501(c)(3)
17 non-profit corporation that is dedicated to supporting the Police Department; the SFPCF's
18 vision is to provide the Police Department resources to create a best-in-class RTIC; SFPCF's
19 gifts are intended to help the Police Department procure state-of-the-art equipment and
20 technology to enhance the capabilities of the RTIC; and

21 WHEREAS, Through a prior Accept and Expend Resolution (File No. 250723), the
22 Board of Supervisors authorized the Police Department to accept and expend gifts of
23 equipment, services, and funds from the SFPCF totaling approximately \$7,250,028 to support
24 the RTIC, including technology, infrastructure, and related services; and

25

1 WHEREAS, SFPCF has proposed to make an additional cash gift totaling \$3,000,000
2 in support of the RTIC, to fund the following: approximately \$540,000 for two drone docking
3 stations; approximately \$375,000 for counter-drone technology; and approximately
4 \$2,085,000 for additional RTIC technology, software, infrastructure, and operational needs in
5 future years, including hardware purchases, upgrades, maintenance, and replacements;
6 software licenses, subscriptions, upgrades, and maintenance; facility-related technological
7 enhancements necessary to support RTIC operations; and other public safety and
8 investigative equipment and related services; and

9 WHEREAS, The proposed gift will be provided through the SFPCF in installments of
10 approximately \$1,000,000 per year over a three-year period; and

11 WHEREAS, Use of the gifted funds will support time-sensitive investigations,
12 coordinated responses to incidents, and officer and public safety, including support for Drone
13 as First Responder operations, and will be conducted consistent with Proposition E and all
14 applicable federal, state, and local laws and policies, including Administrative Code Chapter
15 19B and Assembly Bill 481, as applicable; and


16 WHEREAS, The Police Commission authorized the acceptance of the gifts from
17 SFPCF at its meeting on _____; the Police Commission's approval is on file with the
18 Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____; and

19 WHEREAS, Under Administrative Code, Section 10.100.305, the Police Department
20 must obtain the Board of Supervisors' approval to accept a donation with a market value of
21 more than \$10,000; now, therefore, be it

22 RESOLVED, That the Police Department is authorized to accept and expend a gift of
23 funds from the SFPCF of up to \$3,000,000 to support the RTIC, including for drone
24 equipment, drone docking infrastructure, counter-drone technology, and other technology and
25 equipment associated with RTIC operations, consistent with all applicable federal, state, and


1 local laws and policies, including Administrative Code Chapter 19B and Assembly Bill 481, as
2 applicable.

3
4
5 Recommended:

6
7 
8 _____
9 Chief Derrick J. Lew

Approved: _____

Mayor

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
DocuSigned by:
Approved: 
500E65870BF147A
Controller

File Number: _____
(Provided by Clerk of Board of Supervisors)

Gift Resolution Information Form
(Effective July 2011)

Purpose: Accompanies proposed Board of Supervisors resolutions authorizing a Department to accept and expend grant funds.

The following describes the grant referred to in the accompanying resolution:

1. Gift Title: San Francisco Police Community Foundation - Real Time Investigation Center Donation

2. Department: San Francisco Police Department

3. Contact Person: Fannie Yeung Telephone: 415-837-7212

4. Grant Approval Status (check one):

☒ [X] Approved by funding agency

☐ [] Not yet approved

5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: \$3,000,000

6a. Matching Funds Required: \$0

b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable):

7a. Grant Source Agency: San Francisco Police Community Foundation (SFPCF)

b. Grant Pass-Through Agency (if applicable):

8. Proposed Grant Project Summary: The purpose of the gift is to support enforcement activities to expand drone docking stations; counter-drone technology; software, infrastructure, and operational needs including hardware purchases, upgrades, maintenance, and replacements, software licenses, subscriptions, upgrades, and maintenance, facility-related technological enhancements necessary to support RTIC operations, and other public safety and investigative equipment and related services.

9. Grant Project Schedule, as allowed in approval documents, or as proposed:

\$1 million dollars per year over three years.

10a. Amount budgeted for contractual services: N/A

b. Will contractual services be put out to bid? N/A

c. If so, will contract services help to further the goals of the Department's Local Business Enterprise (LBE) requirements? N/A

d. Is this likely to be a one-time or ongoing request for contracting out? N/A

11a. Does the budget include indirect costs? ☐ [] Yes ☒ [X] No

b1. If yes, how much? N/A

b2. How was the amount calculated? N/A

c1. If no, why are indirect costs not included?

☒ [X] Not allowed by granting agency
☐ [] Other (please explain):

☐ [] To maximize use of grant funds on direct services

c2. If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs? None

12. Any other significant grant requirements or comments: No

****Disability Access Checklist***(Department must forward a copy of all completed Grant Information Forms to the Mayor's Office of Disability)**

13. This Grant is intended for activities at (check all that apply):

☒ [x] Existing Site(s)	☐ [] Existing Structure(s)	☐ [] Existing Program(s) or Service(s)
☐ [] Rehabilitated Site(s)	☐ [] Rehabilitated Structure(s)	☐ [] New Program(s) or Service(s)
☐ [] New Site(s)	☐ [] New Structure(s)	

14. The Departmental ADA Coordinator or the Mayor's Office on Disability have reviewed the proposal and concluded that the project as proposed will be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and all other Federal, State and local disability rights laws and regulations and will allow the full inclusion of persons with disabilities. These requirements include, but are not limited to:

1. Having staff trained in how to provide reasonable modifications in policies, practices and procedures;
2. Having auxiliary aids and services available in a timely manner in order to ensure communication access;
3. Ensuring that any service areas and related facilities open to the public are architecturally accessible and have been inspected and approved by the DPW Access Compliance Officer or the Mayor's Office on Disability Compliance Officers.

If such access would be technically infeasible, this is described in the comments section below:


Comments:

Departmental ADA Coordinator or Mayor's Office of Disability Reviewer:

Penny Si
(Name)

Departmental ADA Coordinator
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 6/9/2026



(Signature Required)

Department Head or Designee Approval of Grant Information Form:

Derrick J. Lew
(Name)

Chief of Police
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 6/9/24


(Signature Required)

April 22, 2026

Delivered via E-Mail (Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org, carl.nicita@sfgov.org)

Chief Derrick Lew
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

Dear Chief Derrick Lew,

On behalf of our Board of Directors, I am pleased to inform you that the San Francisco Police Community Foundation ("SFPCF") has agreed to provide funding to support the San Francisco Police Department's Real Time Investigation Center ("RTIC") for expenses incurred up to \$3,000,000, conditioned on SFPCF's receipt of anticipated donations. Funds donated through SFPCF may be used for the following purposes related to the RTIC facility at 315 Montgomery:

1. Technology and equipment

- Unmanned aerial systems (drones) and related equipment
- Drone docking infrastructure
- Drone detection and counter-drone technologies
- Other public safety and investigative technologies
- Hardware purchases, upgrades, maintenance, and replacements

2. Software and systems


- Software licenses and subscriptions
- Software upgrades and maintenance
- System integration tools

3. Infrastructure and operational support

- Technology infrastructure improvements
- Facility-related technological enhancements necessary to support RTIC operations

The donation remains subject to final documentation with the SFPD and the vendors, which we expect to occur in the near future. Thank you for the opportunity to support the San Francisco Police Department. We look forward to the coming years!

Best regards,



Ixchel Acosta, Executive Director
ixchel@sfpolicycommunity.org

DONOR DISCLOSURE/GIFT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM

Thank you for your generous contribution to the San Francisco Police Department.

In order to help the San Francisco Police Department comply with San Francisco's Sunshine Ordinance,* we ask that you please complete this form and return it as soon as possible to: San Francisco Police Department **Attention: Donor Disclosure.**

Thank you again for contributing to the San Francisco Police Department.

Donor: San Francisco Police Community Foundation

Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2026

Gift: \$3,000,000 to support SFPD's Real Time Investigation Center

Estimated Value:

(For Gifts other than cash gifts)

Contact Information:

Name: Ixchel Acosta

Address: 700 Montgomery St
Street Suite #100 Apt

Telephone: 415-316-9516

City, State, Zip Code

The above contact information is:

San Francisco Ca, 94111



Business



Residence

Financial Interest: The sunshine Ordinance requires that a department that receives a gift of money, goods or services worth \$100 or more report any financial interest that the donor has involving the San Francisco City government. Please check the appropriate box or boxes below that describe your financial interest(s) in the City.



Contract with City

(Please describe):



Grant from the City

(Please describe):



Lease of Space to or from the City

(Please describe):



City License, Permit or Entitlement for Use

(Please describe):



Pending request for a City Contract, Grant, Lease, License,,
Permit or Other Entitlement for Use.

(Please describe):



Other Financial Interest

(Please describe):



No Financial Interest

*The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 67), as approved by the San Francisco voters in 1999, provides that:

SEC. 67.29-6. Sources of Outside Funding

No official or employee or agent of the city shall accept, allow to be collected, or direct or influence the spending of, any money, or any goods or services worth more than one hundred dollars in aggregate, for the purpose of carrying out or assisting any City function unless the amount and source of all such funds is disclosed as public record and made available on the website for the department to which the funds are directed. When such funds are provided or managed by an entity, and not an individual, that entity must agree in writing to abide by this ordinance. The disclosure shall include the names of all individuals or organizations contributing such money and a statement as to any financial interest the contributor has involving the City

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Proposed Allocation of SFPCF RTIC Gift Funds

Category	Estimated Amount
Drone Docking Stations (2)	\$540,000
Counter-Drone Technology	\$375,000
Future RTIC Technology, Software, Infrastructure, and Operational Needs*	\$2,085,000
Total	\$3,000,000

***Note:** The drone docking station and counter-drone technology amounts reflect year one anticipated expenditures. The remaining \$2,085,000 is intended to support RTIC technology, software, infrastructure, and operational needs in years two and three. Because technology, operational requirements, and available solutions are expected to evolve over that period, the remaining funds may be allocated among eligible RTIC-related expenditures, including hardware purchases, upgrades, maintenance and replacements; software licenses, subscriptions, upgrades and maintenance; technology infrastructure improvements; facility-related technological enhancements necessary to support RTIC operations; and other public safety and investigative technologies and equipment.

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: Notice of Findings of Candidacy - Southern Resident Killer Whale
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:53:36 AM
Attachments: [Notice of Candidacy_062426.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a Notice of Findings of Candidacy to list southern resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) as an endangered species under the California Endangered Species 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: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2026 11:40 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; cob@countyofmonterey.gov
Cc: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>
Subject: Notice of Findings of Candidacy - Southern Resident Killer Whale

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

[View as a webpage / share](#)

Redwoods



California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Findings of Candidacy of CESA Petition

Greetings,

A notice of findings of candidacy regarding the petition to list southern resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) has been posted to the Commission's website and is available at <https://fgc.ca.gov/CESA> under "Active Petitions".

Please refer to the notice for additional information.

Sincerely,

Jenn Bacon
California Fish and Game Commission

[Click Here to visit our CESA page](#)

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

[Sign Up](#)

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

[California Fish and Game Commission](#)

715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:

[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Help](#)

This email was sent to fgc@fgc.ca.gov from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery.
California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Commissioners

Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena

Darius W. Anderson, Vice President
Kenwood

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville

Samantha Murray, Member
La Jolla

Erika Zavaleta, Member
Santa Cruz

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870*

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

Notice of Findings of Candidacy

Southern Resident Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2074.2 of the California Fish and Game Code, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), at its June 17-18, 2026 meeting, accepted for consideration the petition submitted to list southern resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) as an endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act.

Pursuant to subdivision (e)(2) of Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission determined that the amount of information contained in the petition, when considered in light of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife written evaluation report, the comments received, and the remainder of the administrative record, would lead a reasonable person to conclude there is a substantial possibility the requested listing could occur.

Based on its determination and acceptance of the petition, the Commission is also providing notice that southern resident killer whale is a candidate species as defined by Section 2068 of the Fish and Game Code.

Within one year of the date of publication of this notice of findings, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall submit a written report, pursuant to Section 2074.6 of the Fish and Game Code, indicating whether the petitioned actions are warranted. Copies of the petition and minutes of the June 17-18, 2026 Commission meeting are on file and available for public review on the Commission's website at fgc.ca.gov. If you would prefer to view the documents at the Commission's office, please make an appointment by sending an email to fgc@fgc.ca.gov or by calling (916) 653-4899.

Written comments or data related to the petitioned actions should be directed to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Marine Region, Attn: Senior Environmental Scientist Dylan Stompe, via email at OceanSalmon@wildlife.ca.gov with "Southern Resident Killer Whale" in the subject line. Alternatively, comments or data may be submitted by mail to P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090. Submitting information via email is preferred.

June 24, 2026

California Fish and Game Commission
Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director

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: AT&T
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 2:51:18 PM
Attachments: [Unsent PC Linda Bazan.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached regarding AT&T plan to end landline phone service in California.

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.*

1937 BUGATTI ATALANTE COUPE

Type 57SC, 8 cylinder (D.O.H.C. supercharged),
200 horsepower.
Price when new—\$10,275.

SAN FRANCISCO



*# Save the Post Office
Save UNION JOBS*



7/7/26,

Linda Bazan

2345 28th Ave

San Francisco, CA 94116-2330

Dear Supervisors:

Please

oppose plan to end
tel. Landlines. I much
prefer my landline to the
cell tel. 184,000 in CA would
lose Landlines.
* Save The Post Office
* Save UNION JOBS *

S.F. City Hall
1 Carlton Woodlett Plc
Bd. of Supervisors / Rm. 244
San Francisco, California
94102-4634

Thanks! - Linda Bazan

HARRAH'S AUTOMOBILE COLLECTION • Over 1,000 vehicles on display.
An attraction of Harrah's Hotel & Casino, Reno & Lake Tahoe, Nevada

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM08:43

Boo - 11

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: AT&T
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 8:36:45 AM
Attachments: [AT&T - Linda Bazan.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached regarding AT&T plan to end landline phone service in California.

Sincerely,

Justice Alcantar

Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
justice.alcantar@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

2345-28th Ave,
S.F. CA 94116-2330,
Tel. (415) 564-2076
7/11/26,

Dear Bd. of Supv.:

Please stop
ATT plan to end
LANDLINE tel's.
If satellites fail,
no cell tel. svc.

I do not want to
have to use cell tel.
Thank you, Linda

Thinking of selling?

Please call me for a FREE and NO obligation
comparative market analysis of what
your property is worth!



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 16 AM08:26
JKP

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: concern about recent vote
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 2:58:26 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding [File No. 250630](#): Various Codes - Streamlining Reporting Requirements and Procedures, Removing Obsolete Programs and Requirements, and Other Code Cleanup.

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: Anna Gracia <Anna.C.Gracia@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 8:31 PM
To: SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: concern about recent vote

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

Dear Supervisor Sauter (and the rest of the Board),

I am alarmed by some of the changes in the recently passed Ordinance 250630, particularly the reduction of audits required on surveillance technology from yearly to every 5 years. It is irresponsible at its best, and flat out dangerous at its worst. We are already bombarded by self-driving cars filming everything and everyone despite *never* being asked to weigh in on whether or not we wanted to be used as a test ground. SFPD is constantly being caught breaking its own rules regarding surveillance tech, including inadvertently live-streamed footage of overhead police drones TODAY, showing their tech surveilling far more people than allowed *or* disclosed. We need **more** oversight, not less.

Signed,
Anna Gracia
District 3 resident

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: An Open Letter to the Leaders of San Francisco and California
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 3:01:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding housing.

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: Robb Fleischer <rfleischer@amsiemail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2026 10:39 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Wiener, Scott <scott.wiener@sen.ca.gov>; Matt Haney <assemblymember.haney@outreach.assembly.ca.gov>; assemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: An Open Letter to the Leaders of San Francisco and California

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

A Call to Reexamine Housing Policy, Property Rights, and the Future of San Francisco

The Honorable Daniel Lurie

Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

The Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Scott Wiener

California State Senator, District 11

The Honorable Matt Haney

California State Assemblymember, District 17

The Honorable Catherine Stefani

California State Assemblymember, District 19

Dear Mayor Lurie, Members of the Board of Supervisors, Senator Wiener, Assemblymember Haney, and Assemblymember Stefani:

I write with great respect for the difficult responsibilities you carry in addressing the housing challenges facing San Francisco and California.

I recognize that reasonable people can disagree about housing policy. Many of the policies adopted over the past several decades were enacted with sincere intentions and in response to legitimate concerns about affordability, displacement, and neighborhood stability. My purpose is not to criticize those intentions or diminish the importance of protecting tenants. Rather, after more than 45 years of living and working in San Francisco, I believe it is time to reexamine whether some of the assumptions underlying our housing policies continue to produce the outcomes originally intended and whether the burdens created by those policies remain appropriately balanced.

I have been a San Francisco resident for more than 45 years. During that same period, I have devoted my professional life to the property management industry, working with both tenants and housing providers throughout the city.

I am not writing as an advocate for the real estate industry or on behalf of a trade association. I am writing from the perspective of a longtime San Francisco resident and a property management professional who has spent more than four decades observing how housing policy operates in practice.

Throughout my career, I have witnessed the financial hardship experienced by tenants struggling to remain in the city they call home. I have also witnessed the growing financial hardship experienced by housing providers struggling to preserve and maintain the housing they already provide.

Good public policy should recognize both realities. Protecting tenants and preserving the long-term viability of rental housing should not be treated as opposing objectives. They are mutually dependent.

The Growing Financial Strain on Housing Providers

During my first three decades in property management, I observed recessions, inflation, changing interest rates, shifting demographics, and numerous housing-market cycles. The past decade,

however, has been markedly different.

I have never witnessed so many landlords and housing providers experiencing such sustained financial strain.

This strain is not attributable to a single law, regulation, or economic event. It results from the cumulative effect of rapidly increasing insurance premiums, escalating contractor and construction costs, higher labor expenses, expanding building and life-safety requirements, seismic mandates, environmental obligations, growing code-compliance costs, property taxes and assessments, professional fees, litigation exposure, and an increasingly complex body of local and state regulations governing rental housing.

Many of these expenses have increased at rates bearing little relationship to the general Consumer Price Index.

Nevertheless, annual allowable rent adjustments under San Francisco's rent stabilization system are based on only a fraction of the Consumer Price Index. In practice, that formula does not adequately reflect the operating costs landlords actually experience.

The cost of a contractor does not necessarily increase at the general rate of consumer inflation. Neither do insurance premiums, building materials, major repairs, code-mandated improvements, legal services, or regulatory compliance expenses. In many cases, these costs have risen substantially faster than the allowable adjustments in rental income.

The result is a widening gap between the cost of responsibly owning, operating, repairing, and improving rental housing and the revenue legally available to support those obligations.

Over time, that gap has consequences. It places smaller housing providers under increasing pressure. It discourages reinvestment in existing buildings. It reduces the attractiveness of providing rental housing. It encourages some owners to withdraw their properties from the rental market whenever legally possible. It also discourages future investment in San Francisco.

Housing Is Not Free

Every housing policy carries a cost.

The question is not whether affordable housing should exist. Affordable housing is unquestionably an important public objective.

The question is who should bear the cost of providing it.

Our society ordinarily finances public priorities broadly. Roads, schools, public transportation, parks, emergency services, and other public benefits are supported through taxation and public investment because society has determined that both their benefits and their costs should be shared.

Affordable housing is also a public priority. Yet our present system increasingly places the financial burden of that priority on a relatively limited class of private property owners by restricting the income their properties may generate while requiring them to absorb continually increasing ownership and operating expenses.

If affordable housing provides a benefit to society as a whole, then it is reasonable to ask whether its cost should also be shared by society as a whole.

Supply, Demand, and the Incentives Created by Rent Regulation

Throughout my career, I have observed that supply and demand provide the healthiest long-term means of establishing pricing, encouraging investment, and bringing additional housing into the market.

In my experience, many landlords traditionally did not raise rents automatically each year. They often adjusted rents only when operating costs or market conditions made an increase necessary.

Rent control changed those incentives.

When landlords know that their ability to adjust rents in the future will be severely restricted, they are encouraged to raise rents whenever a lawful opportunity arises. An owner who might otherwise postpone or forgo an increase may conclude that failing to impose one today could permanently impair the property's ability to meet future expenses.

As a result, a system intended to restrain rent increases may unintentionally encourage housing providers to make every permissible increase because they cannot predict whether future income will keep pace with future costs.

This does not mean that every landlord behaves in the same manner or that rent regulation is the only factor affecting rents. It does mean that public policy should examine the incentives it creates, not merely the intentions behind it.

San Francisco's Fundamental Supply Problem

In my observation, San Francisco's most persistent housing problem has not been a lack of demand. It has been an inadequate supply of housing.

For decades, the city has made housing production unusually lengthy, costly, complex, and uncertain. The permitting process can be slow and expensive. Construction and financing costs are high. Approval timelines are difficult to predict. Projects face extensive procedural, regulatory, neighborhood, and political obstacles.

At the same time, San Francisco's complex rent ordinances and broader regulatory environment make the city less attractive to those considering long-term investment in rental housing.

Capital is mobile. Investors and housing providers compare San Francisco with other markets offering clearer regulations, shorter approval periods, lower development costs, and greater certainty regarding future operations.

When San Francisco becomes less predictable and more bureaucratic than competing markets, investment moves elsewhere.

When investment moves elsewhere, fewer homes are constructed.

When housing production fails to keep pace with demand, housing becomes more expensive.

Regulating the price of an inadequate supply does not, by itself, create additional housing. In some circumstances, it may further discourage the very investment required to expand that

supply.

For this reason, I respectfully suggest that increasing housing production, simplifying permitting, reducing unnecessary regulatory delay, and creating a predictable environment for responsible investment deserve at least as much attention as regulating the price of existing housing.

The Constitutional Question

My concerns extend beyond economics and housing policy. They also raise a constitutional question.

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

I recognize that courts have historically upheld rent control as a permissible exercise of governmental police power. I also recognize that existing legal precedent does not generally treat conventional rent control as a compensable taking merely because regulated rent is lower than market rent.

Nevertheless, I believe the cumulative effect of modern rent regulation deserves renewed constitutional examination.

One frequently hears that a landlord continues to receive “some compensation” because rent is still being collected.

Respectfully, that does not fully answer the concern.

The Constitution does not refer to “some compensation.”

It requires just compensation when private property is taken for public use.

When government restricts the price an owner may charge for the use of private property, while simultaneously imposing increasing financial, maintenance, safety, and regulatory obligations upon that owner, it is fair to ask whether the government is merely regulating property or compelling the owner to provide an ongoing private subsidy in support of a public objective.

A landlord may continue receiving rent while still suffering a substantial loss in the economic value of the property interest being regulated. Reduced income can reduce net operating income. Reduced net operating income can reduce market value. Restrictions can also impair an owner's ability to fund repairs, improvements, reserves, and long-term preservation of the building.

Receiving something is not necessarily the same as receiving the value that would exist in a competitive market.

That distinction deserves serious legal, economic, and legislative consideration.

Public Benefits and Private Burdens

Affordable housing serves an important public purpose. Tenant stability benefits families, neighborhoods, employers, schools, and the broader community.

But when a policy benefits the public, we must still ask how its cost should be allocated.

Should the cost be supported broadly through public funding, rental assistance, tax credits, housing vouchers, development incentives, public-private partnerships, and other programs financed by society as a whole?

Or should the cost be imposed primarily on individual property owners through limitations on the economic use and value of their private property?

This is not an argument against tenants. It is not an argument against affordable housing. It is not an argument against reasonable regulation.

It is an argument that an important public responsibility should not be financed disproportionately through compelled private subsidization without a candid examination of the fairness, economic sustainability, and constitutional implications of doing so.

The Need for Reexamination

San Francisco's current rental housing system does not operate in the environment that existed when rent control was first adopted.

Housing providers now face substantially more extensive code requirements, disclosure obligations, eviction restrictions, registration requirements, relocation obligations, safety mandates, environmental rules, administrative procedures, legal risks, and compliance costs.

Insurance markets have also changed. Construction and contractor expenses have changed. The permitting system has become more complex. The cumulative regulatory burden has expanded significantly.

A policy that may once have been evaluated as one limited form of price regulation must now be considered within this much broader system of financial and operational restrictions.

The question is not whether each individual regulation can be justified in isolation. The question is whether their cumulative effect remains economically sustainable, appropriately balanced, and consistent with the constitutional principle that a limited group of citizens should not be required to bear public burdens that, in fairness, should be shared by the public as a whole.

A Request for Constructive Dialogue

I respectfully ask the City and the State to undertake a serious reexamination of these issues.

That examination should include:

- Whether allowable rent adjustments bear a meaningful relationship to the actual operating costs experienced by housing providers.
- Whether insurance, contractor, capital-improvement, and code-compliance costs should receive greater consideration.
- Whether the cumulative impact of housing regulations is discouraging responsible investment and reducing rental supply.
- Whether existing permitting and approval processes unnecessarily restrict new housing production.
- Whether affordable housing obligations should be financed more broadly through public resources rather than imposed primarily on individual property owners.

- Whether long-term rent regulation has produced economic and behavioral consequences that were not originally intended.
- Whether modern rent-control systems deserve renewed constitutional scrutiny in light of their cumulative effects on income, value, investment, and the practical use of private property.

I am currently preparing a more comprehensive paper examining the historical, economic, ethical, and constitutional dimensions of modern rent regulation. My purpose is not to declare that all rent control is unconstitutional or to advocate the wholesale elimination of tenant protections.

My purpose is to ask whether our present system has evolved to the point that its assumptions, incentives, burdens, and results deserve a fresh and intellectually honest examination.

For more than 45 years, I have watched San Francisco evolve into one of the world's most extraordinary cities. I have also watched many individuals and families who invested their savings, labor, and lives in providing housing become increasingly discouraged by an environment they experience as financially unsustainable, bureaucratically overwhelming, and legally uncertain.

I believe we are capable of protecting tenants while also respecting private property, encouraging investment, increasing housing supply, and preserving the economic viability of those who provide rental housing.

I respectfully ask that we begin this conversation not as adversaries divided between landlords and tenants, but as citizens sharing a commitment to the future of San Francisco.

Thank you for your public service and your thoughtful consideration of these concerns.

Respectfully,

Robb Fleischer

San Francisco Resident for More Than 45 Years
Property Management Professional



Robb Fleischer

Broker/Officer

CA DRE: 01403882

AMSI

2800 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA. 94109

Phone: 415-447-2009

Additional Phone: 415-447-2000

Email: rfleischer@amsiemail.com

Website: www.amsires.com



Let Us Show You The Way Home



[Make an appointment](#)





From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Drug Free Housing File 251003
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:08:05 PM
Attachments: [DrugFreeHousingltr7.14.26.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding **File No. 251003**:

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing (“PSH”) that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents (“Drug-Free PSH”) to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone (“Drug-Tolerant PSH”), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH’s strategies to meet PSH residents’ demands.

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: Jennifer Friedenbach <jfriedenbach@cohsf.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 9:01 AM
To: Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Drug Free Housing File 251003

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

Dear Supervisor,

Attached is a short letter detailing our continued need for amendments to the Drug Free Housing [File 251003](#).

Thank you for your consideration.

Jennifer Friedenbach (she,her)

jfriedenbach@cohsf.org

Coalition on Homelessness

280 Turk Street

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415)346-3740

https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/____http://www.cohsf.org/____.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyOGIzYzQ5MWY2MjZmNjZjMTRhZjk4OTlmNjQyYTU0ZD03OjlkYmM6ZGZhYjllYzA0MTc3MzUwZDc0NWEiMGNjOWlyYTA2ZjhYzZkMTk0OWUyZDhhZGFiNTRhMTc3YzQyNjE5YjNiODp0OIQ6Tg

Twitter @TheCoalitionSF

Instagram coalitiononhomelessness

[Facebook](#)

[Donate now](#) to the Coalition on Homelessness!

"When ignorance allies with power, it becomes the most formidable adversary of justice"

James Baldwin



COALITION ON HOMELESSNESS

July 13, 2026

Supervisor Matt Dorsey
City Hall
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

We appreciate the City and County of San Francisco's continued focus on addressing homelessness and expanding housing options that meet the diverse needs of San Franciscans. We share the goal of ensuring people have access to housing models that support drug-free, stability, and long-term well-being. We support the expansion of drug-free housing and agree that a continuum of housing options, including drug-free-oriented environments, are essential. At the same time, we want to ensure that one housing type is not moved forward at the expense of another housing type.

Accordingly, we respectfully request amendments to the Expanding Drug-Free Housing ordinance to ensure that residents of permanent supportive housing are afforded meaningful tenant protections, strong eviction safeguards, and a clear pathway to maintain housing if tenants return to use. Recovery should never come at the cost of losing permanent housing, as the experience of homelessness can drive addiction rates up.

Our amendments are as follows:

Give people a choice, not an eviction. If someone returns to use, let them choose: get treatment, transfer to a comparable housing option, or stay and work on their sobriety with support. Having an eviction on your record can complicate getting future housing and employment.

1. Please add on Page 8, line 13 ...confirming from HSH that the resident has been offered **comparable** housing ~~and shelter~~. This is to ensure that tenants are not evicted into homelessness.

Guarantee housing, not shelter. If drug free housing is no longer appropriate, no one should be put out until they can move into comparable housing. The language in the ordinance should be stronger to ensure these protections - not just a commitment

2. Please add on Page 8, line 24 goal of **avoiding evictions** and returns to homelessness. This amendment would allow people to access treatment after the second return to use instead of losing their homes.

Other amendments

- **Make it a pilot program.** Rather than prohibiting the use of funds for current models of PSH, the ordinance should be amended to create a pilot program for recovery housing. This would encourage exploration and evaluation of the model without restricting funding or creating more barriers for PSH.
- **Do not use stigmatizing language to describe Permanent Supportive Housing under the Housing First model.** Calling it “drug tolerant” housing slows creation of new housing.

We sincerely appreciate your consideration of these requests for the Expanding Drug-Free Housing ordinance. We believe these amendments will allow San Francisco to expand drug-free-oriented housing while protecting the housing stability and tenant rights of people living in permanent supportive housing. By ensuring strong eviction protections and a pathway for tenants to maintain current housing, the city can support drug-free housing without increasing the risk of homelessness. Together, we can continue increasing and improving our housing system where drug-free-housing is expanded in San Francisco.

In community,



Jennifer Friedenbach
Executive Director

Cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
President Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor Connie Chan
Supervisor Chyanne Chen
Supervisor Jackie Fielder
Supervisor Bilal Mahmood
Supervisor Myrna Melgar
Supervisor Danny Sauter
Supervisor Stephen Sherrill
Supervisor Shamann Walton
Supervisor Alan Wong

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: URGING CONTINUANCE Otherwise OPPOSING UNLESS AMENDED Board of Supervisors Meeting July 7, 2026 Agenda Item #9 [Charter Amendment - Department, Board, Commission, and Advisory Body Updates] File #260536
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 9:57:00 AM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication regarding Item #9 on today's agenda.

File 260536 - Charter Amendment - Department, Board, Commission, and Advisory Body Updates

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: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 6:21 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: URGING CONTINUANCE Otherwise OPPOSING UNLESS AMENDED Board of Supervisors Meeting July 7, 2026 Agenda Item #9 [Charter Amendment - Department, Board, Commission, and Advisory Body Updates] File #260536

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

FR: Eileen Boken,

State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

RE: Board of Supervisors Meeting July 7, 2026 Agenda Item #9 [Charter Amendment - Department, Board, Commission, and Advisory Body Updates] File #260536

Position: URGING CONTINUANCE Otherwise OPPOSING UNLESS AMENDED

In leg version 1, item #10 in the Title and Summary states "expanding".

In leg version 2, item #10 in the Title and Summary states "updating".

For leg version 2, there is no indication in the legislation or in the BLA Legislative Digest 2 that this has been amended.

The "Expanding" exclusive charge wording would be more accurate.

No other City department has exclusive charge.

No other water utility in the U.S. or internationally seems to have an exclusive charge.

Exclusive charge was implemented as a result of Prop E in November 2002.

Although the intent was to avoid SFPUC funds being diverted to the General Fund, there have been unintended consequences.

The SFPUC has become largely autonomous with limited oversight by the Board of Supervisors.

That being said, this charter amendment should significantly curtail exclusive charge not expand it.

Section 8B.121 subsection a should delete the exclusive charge text.

Section 8B.122 subsection a should also delete the exclusive charge text.

Besides exclusive charge, the charter amendment should expand the SFPUC Commission from five to seven members to avoid quorum issues.

SFPUC Commissioners should still be required to have specific expertise rather than it be desirable.

The SFPUC Commission should have split appointments between the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

The SFPUC General Manager should be required to have direct utility industry expertise of no less than fifteen years.

In terms of Joint Powers in Section 8B.121 subsection b, as well as, Section 8B.122 subsection b, the scope of Joint Powers should be clarified.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

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: FW: Strongly CONCURRING with Board of Supervisors Meeting July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #46 [Supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 1448 (Hart) - California Coastal Sanctuary] File #260803
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:47:33 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 260803:**

Resolution supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 1448, authored by Assembly Member Gregg Hart, Coastal Resources: California Coastal Sanctuary: Tidelands and Submerged Lands: Oil and Gas Development, to preserve the state's coastline, safeguard the economy, protect marine environments and public health, and advance California's climate resilience goals.

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: Adkins, Joe (BOS) <joe.adkins@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 10:50 AM
To: BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: Strongly CONCURRING with Board of Supervisors Meeting July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #46 [Supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 1448 (Hart) - California Coastal Sanctuary] File

#260803

For C-pages

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 273

San Francisco, CA 94102

Office: 415-554-6516, Direct: 415-554-6519

www.sf.gov/sfbos/melgar

[Sign up](#) to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 8:31 PM

To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>

Subject: Strongly CONCURRING with Board of Supervisors Meeting July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #46
[Supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 1448 (Hart) - California Coastal Sanctuary] File
#260803

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

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors members

FR: Eileen Boken,
State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

RE: Board of Supervisors Meeting July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #46 [Supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 1448 (Hart) - California Coastal Sanctuary] File #260803

Position: Strongly CONCURRING.

Strongly urging the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to join with the Marin County Board of Supervisors in supporting AB1448 (Hart).

A link to the Marin County Board of Supervisors letter re AB1448 (Hart) is below.

In response to the US Bureau of Ocean Energy Management's decision to open the entire coast of California to new oil leases in federal waters, AB1488 (Hart) would delete outdated provisions to authorize new oil leases in state waters, as well as, prohibit the use of existing oil infrastructure in state waters to support new offshore oil drilling in federal waters.

AB1448 (Hart) would protect our coastal resources and our coastal communities.

https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://www.marincounty.gov/departments/executive/budget-and-priority-setting/legislative-support-and-advocacy/legislative-letters/june-23-support-ab-1448-hart-coastal-resources-california-coastal-sanctuary-tidelines-and-submerged-lands-oil-and-gas-development___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4NzQxMjM1NjM1YzNiYWRmYjZmNWRhMTJiNzZhY2ZlMzo3OjA5NDQ6ZjRjZmIxOTk3MmMzMzMzA5NDU0NDg0YTk5MzYyMDQ5YzQ2NmY3NDU3YTlmMzk4YjQxZjZmZTgyMDIzODk0MGE2Yzpw0OKY6Tg

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

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: FW: BOS 7/14 item 1 - Mission St Bart
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 9:27:27 AM
Attachments: [image1.png](#)

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 260805:**

Pursuant to Charter, Sections 2.103 and 3.100(7), and Administrative Code, Section 2.11, the Mayor shall discuss eligible topics submitted from the Supervisors. The Mayor may address the Board initially for up to five minutes. Discussion shall not exceed two minutes per question or answer.

The following topic was noticed on the agenda representing District 9:

1. Strategies and metrics of success at the Mission Street BART Plazas.

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: A R <rotbergalexia@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 10:53 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS)

<Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>

Subject: BOS 7/14 item 1 - Mission St Bart

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

Hi BOS and Mayor,

Alexia Rotberg, 1600 15th Street. I'd like to offer comment on item 1 of the agenda - the mayors presentation portion - specifically the topic of the BART plazas.

Below is an image of the northeast 16th street station at 9 pm on 7/13 - a Monday night. At 10:40 pm there was a stabbing at the convenience store two store fronts down. It's no wonder when these are the street conditions allowed to occur.

I thought the mayor was tough on crime? What about open drug sales?


I thought the mayor wanted clean streets? What about after dark?

I thought the city promoted transit and walkability? What about these street conditions?

Would you feel safe walking through that side of the street?

The mission deserves better and the city / Muni / BART all have a vested interest in keeping the plaza and adjacent streets inviting.

Thanks for your ear,
Alexia Rotberg



LIVE 925 86
0.2 mi · 16th St & Mission St

Report of Person Stabbed at Liquor Store

sanfranciscoUser1546907015

sanfranciscoUser22...
Lemme pay you a visit leon

2

Share 4

CITIZEN.COM

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Oppose File #260281 – Protect San Francisco Smoke-Free Workplace Protections
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 2:24:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[San Francisco BOS Letter of Opposition 7.13.26.docx](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication regarding File No. 260281 - Various Codes - Cannabis Cafés.

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: Kesa Bruce <Kesa.Bruce@lung.org>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 2:18 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Oppose File #260281 – Protect San Francisco Smoke-Free Workplace Protections

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



July 13, 2026

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

bos-supervisors@sfgov.org

bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org

John.Carroll@sfgov.org

RE: Oppose File #260281 – Protect San Francisco Smoke-Free Workplace Protections

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the American Lung Association, we respectfully urge you to oppose File #260281, which would permit cannabis retailers to operate cannabis cafés where smoking and the use of electronic smoking devices would be allowed indoors.

For more than 120 years, the American Lung Association has worked to save lives by improving lung health and preventing lung disease. We strongly support policies that protect workers and the public from exposure to secondhand smoke and particulate matter. This ordinance would move San Francisco in the wrong direction by weakening longstanding smokefree workplace protections that have made the city a national leader in public health. Permitting cannabis lounges normalizes deleterious effects of smoking cannabis and exposes the adjacent properties to secondhand cannabis smoke.

Secondhand smoke is toxic and dangerous. We have long known that secondhand smoke causes lung disease, heart disease and cancer. California responded to this public health crisis in 1995 by implementing a statewide smokefree law in restaurants; then extended those protections to bars in 1998.

Secondhand cannabis smoke is not harmless. Research has found that cannabis smoke contains many of the same toxic chemicals, carcinogens, and fine particulate matter found in tobacco smoke. Exposure to these pollutants can contribute to respiratory and cardiovascular disease, trigger asthma attacks, and negatively affect overall lung health. Employees working in cannabis cafés would be required to spend hours each day in an environment where they are repeatedly exposed to harmful airborne pollutants simply to do their jobs.

Scientific evidence also demonstrates that ventilation and air filtration systems cannot eliminate the health risks associated with secondhand smoke. It has long been the clear position of ventilation and engineering experts that engineering solutions do not adequately protect workers from smoke activity of any kind and that all smoking activity inside or near buildings should be eliminated.^[1]


San Francisco has spent decades strengthening smokefree laws to ensure everyone can breathe clean air in workplaces, restaurants, bars, and other public spaces. Creating an exception for cannabis cafés would reverse years of public health progress and establish a troubling precedent for weakening smokefree protections.

No worker should have to choose between earning a paycheck and protecting their health. Every employee deserves a safe workplace free from exposure to harmful secondhand smoke.

The American Lung Association respectfully urges you to oppose File #260281 and preserve San Francisco's smoke-free workplace protections.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Kesa Bruce
Director of Advocacy
American Lung Association
916-585-7665

Kesa Bruce
Director | Advocacy
American Lung Association
1531 I Street, Suite 200 | Sacramento, CA 95814
Ph: 916.585.7665
Lung HelpLine: 1-800-LUNGUSA
[Lung.org](https://www.lung.org) | Kesa.Bruce@lung.org
Pronouns: She/Her/Hers

^[1] American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers. ASHRAE Position Document on Environmental Tobacco Smoke. July 1, 2020. Atlanta, Georgia. 2020.



July 13, 2026

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

bos-supervisors@sfgov.org

bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org

John.Carroll@sfgov.org

RE: Oppose File #260281 – Protect San Francisco's Smoke-Free Workplace Protections

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the American Lung Association, we respectfully urge you to oppose File #260281, which would permit cannabis retailers to operate cannabis cafés where smoking and the use of electronic smoking devices would be allowed indoors.

For more than 120 years, the American Lung Association has worked to save lives by improving lung health and preventing lung disease. We strongly support policies that protect workers and the public from exposure to secondhand smoke and particulate matter. This ordinance would move San Francisco in the wrong direction by weakening longstanding smokefree workplace protections that have made the city a national leader in public health. Permitting cannabis lounges normalizes deleterious effects of smoking cannabis and exposes the adjacent properties to secondhand cannabis smoke.

Secondhand smoke is toxic and dangerous. We have long known that secondhand smoke causes lung disease, heart disease and cancer. California responded to this public health crisis in 1995 by implementing a statewide smoke-free law in restaurants; then extended those protections to bars in 1998.

Secondhand cannabis smoke is not harmless. Research has found that cannabis smoke contains many of the same toxic chemicals, carcinogens, and fine particulate matter found in tobacco smoke. Exposure to these pollutants can contribute to respiratory and cardiovascular disease, trigger asthma attacks, and negatively affect overall lung health. Employees working in cannabis cafés would be required to spend hours each day in an environment where they are repeatedly exposed to harmful airborne pollutants simply to do their jobs.

Scientific evidence also demonstrates that ventilation and air filtration systems cannot eliminate the health risks associated with secondhand smoke. It has long been the clear position of ventilation and engineering experts that engineering solutions do not adequately protect workers from smoke activity of any kind and that all smoking activity inside or near buildings should be eliminated.¹

San Francisco has spent decades strengthening smokefree laws to ensure everyone can breathe clean air in workplaces, restaurants, bars, and other public spaces. Creating an exception for cannabis cafés would reverse years of public health progress and establish a troubling precedent for weakening smokefree protections.

No worker should have to choose between earning a paycheck and protecting their health. Every employee deserves a safe workplace free from exposure to harmful secondhand smoke.

The American Lung Association respectfully urges you to oppose File #260281 and preserve San Francisco's smoke-free workplace protections.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kesa Bruce

Kesa Bruce
Director of Advocacy
American Lung Association
916-585-7665

¹ American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers. ASHRAE Position Document on Environmental Tobacco Smoke. July 1, 2020. Atlanta, Georgia. 2020.

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: 4 Letters Regarding File No. 260281
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:24:25 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding File No. 260281.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters regarding [File No. 260281](#): Various Codes - Cannabis Cafés

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: [Gabbi Duhl](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support File No. 260281 / Item 8: Cannabis Cafés
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 3:18:34 PM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

Please support File No. 260281, the Cannabis Cafés ordinance, on first reading.

I support creating a legal, regulated cannabis café permit in San Francisco so adults can gather safely, licensed operators can compete, and the city can support small businesses, tourism, cannabis equity, and real local culture instead of pushing cannabis use into gray areas.

Having access to food and beverages with cannabis will improve safety as well as business and i hope you give the cannabis community a chance to expand in a safe and creative way!

Please vote yes and keep implementation practical for equity operators and existing licensed cannabis retailers.

Name: Gabbi Duhl

Neighborhood / ZIP: (currently living out of sf but grew up there and still visit many times a year)

Connection to San Francisco: family grew up in San Francisco, i grew up in oakland/sf. used to work in medicinal and rec cannabis many years ago.

From: [Samantha Clements](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support File No. 260281 / Item 8: Cannabis Cafés
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 4:08:33 PM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

Please support File No. 260281, the Cannabis Cafés ordinance, on first reading.

I support creating a legal, regulated cannabis café permit in San Francisco so adults can gather safely, licensed operators can compete, and the city can support small businesses, tourism, cannabis equity, and real local culture instead of pushing cannabis use into gray areas.

Please vote yes and keep implementation practical for equity operators and existing licensed cannabis retailers.

Name: Samantha Clements
Neighborhood / ZIP: 94122
Connection to San Francisco: Resident

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Francis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support File No. 260281 / Item 8: Cannabis Cafés
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 7:48:28 PM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

Please support File No. 260281, the Cannabis Cafés ordinance, on first reading.

I support creating a legal, regulated cannabis café permit in San Francisco so adults can gather safely, licensed operators can compete, and the city can support small businesses, tourism, cannabis equity, and real local culture instead of pushing cannabis use into gray areas.

Please vote yes and keep implementation practical for equity operators and existing licensed cannabis retailers.

Name: Francis Sells
Neighborhood / ZIP: Noe Valley, 94114
Connection to San Francisco: SF Homeowner

From: [Leigh Klotz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support File No. 260281 / Item 8: Cannabis Cafés
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 10:34:55 AM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

Please support File No. 260281, the Cannabis Cafés ordinance, on first reading.

I support creating a legal, regulated cannabis café permit in San Francisco so adults can gather safely, licensed operators can compete, and the city can support small businesses, tourism, cannabis equity, and real local culture instead of pushing cannabis use into gray areas.

Please vote yes and keep implementation practical for equity operators and existing licensed cannabis retailers.

Name: Leigh Klotz

Neighborhood / ZIP: 9430e

Connection to San Francisco: Less than 1h with the new Caltrain!

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 4 Letters Regarding File No. 260499
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:26:06 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding File No. 260499.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters regarding **File No. 260499:**

Resolution affirming San Francisco's support for the Speed Safety System Pilot Program and urging the exploration of changes to strengthen the program, including increasing the number of allowable speed camera locations, with priority given to corridors on the High Injury Network and other locations with demonstrated safety need.

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: [SBRMB NA](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DPH-jodie](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Bruce Agid](#); [Gary Pegueros](#); [Sarah Davis](#); [Sarah Bertram](#); [Mike Linksvayer](#)
Subject: July 14 hearing, item 42/Resolution 260499--please support
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 6:48:31 PM

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

July 12 2026

RE: July 14 BOS Hearing, Agenda Item 42: Resolution 260499/Supervisor Dorsey

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

We are grateful that our D6 Supervisor, Matt Dorsey, has brought forward Resolution 260499 to expand the pilot speed camera program across the City so more—many more—dangerous intersections may experience the same reduction in speeding that has been demonstrated at the 33 intersections currently equipped with these cameras. And we thank you, President Mandelman, and Supervisors Sauter, Sherrill, Wong, Mahmoud, and Melgar for co-sponsoring the resolution.

We, the South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay NA, are writing to ask the board to pass this resolution, and to implore Supervisors Walton, Chan, Chen and Felder to add their votes of support for unanimous passage. San Francisco needs this level of proven enforcement to stem the rising tide of fatalities and serious injuries on our streets. Our neighborhoods have lost two toddlers in the recent two years, and sadly our neighborhoods are not alone in grieving such losses.

Our NA has advocated for pedestrian safety measures since we were established in 2008 and we actively engaged with Walk SF, the City, and members of the Vision Zero Coalition for over 8 years to get this pilot program passed. The program has needed privacy and equity safeguards built in and it is working; please now cast a wider net of safety across our City.

Respectfully,

The South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay Neighborhood Association Board

Alice Rogers, President
Gary Pegueros, Vice President/Secretary
Bruce Agid, Director
Sarah Bertram, Director
Sarah Davis, Director
Mike Linksvayer, Director

.....
[South Beach|Rincon|Mission Bay NA](#)
sbrmbna@gmail.com

From: [Gary Pegueros](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DPH-jodie](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution to expand the successful Speed Camera Program
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 7:09:08 PM

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

To: Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, chanstaff@sfgov.org

CC: matt.dorsey@sfgov.org, mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org, melgarstaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, sherrillstaff@sfgov.org, wongstaff@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, Jodie@walksf.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

RE: July 14 BOS Hearing, Agenda Item 42: Resolution 260499/Supervisor Dorsey

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

I am grateful that our D6 Supervisor, Matt Dorsey, has brought forward Resolution 260499 to expand the pilot speed camera program across the City so more—many more—dangerous intersections may experience the same reduction in speeding that has been demonstrated at the 33 intersections currently equipped with these cameras. And thank you to President Mandelman, and Supervisors Sauter, Sherrill, Wong, Mahmoud, and Melgar for co-sponsoring the resolution.

As a resident of San Francisco for 30+ years, as well as an original board member of the South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay Neighborhood Association since 2008, I am writing to ask the board to pass this resolution, and to implore Supervisors Walton, Chan, Chen and Felder to add their votes of support for unanimous passage. San Francisco needs this level of proven enforcement to stem the rising tide of fatalities and serious injuries on our streets. Our neighborhoods have lost two toddlers in the recent two years, and sadly our neighborhoods are not alone in grieving such losses.

Our NA has advocated for pedestrian safety measures since we were established in 2008 and we actively engaged with Walk SF, the City, and members of the Vision Zero Coalition for over 8 years to get this pilot program passed. The program has needed privacy and equity safeguards built in and it is working; please now cast a wider net of safety across our City.

Respectfully,

Gary Pegueros
1 Federal Street #21
San Francisco, CA 94107

GaryPegueros@sbcglobal.net

South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay Neighborhood Association, Vice President/Secretary
SFFD NERT Advisory Board, Chair
South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay NERT Neighborhood Coordinator
Eastern Neighborhood Democratic Club, Social Events Director
SFPD Police Chief's LGBTQ+ Community Forum, Member

From: [Ilene Lederman](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DPH-jodie](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#)
Subject: July 14 hearing, item 42/Resolution 260499--please support
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 8:53:29 PM

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

July 13 2026

RE: July 14 BOS Hearing, Agenda Item 42: Resolution 260499/Supervisor Dorsey

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

We are grateful that our D6 Supervisor, Matt Dorsey, has brought forward Resolution 260499 to expand the pilot speed camera program across the City so more—many more—dangerous intersections may experience the same reduction in speeding that has been demonstrated at the 33 intersections currently equipped with these cameras. And we thank you, President Mandelman, and Supervisors Sauter, Sherrill, Wong, Mahmoud, and Melgar for co-sponsoring the resolution.

I am writing to ask the board to pass this resolution, and to implore Supervisors Walton, Chan, Chen and Felder to add their votes of support for unanimous passage. San Francisco needs this level of proven enforcement to stem the rising tide of fatalities and serious injuries on our streets. Our neighborhoods have lost two toddlers in the recent two years, and sadly our neighborhoods are not alone in grieving such losses.

Our NA has advocated for pedestrian safety measures since we were established in 2008 and we actively engaged with Walk SF, the City, and members of the Vision Zero Coalition for over 8 years to get this pilot program passed. The program has needed privacy and equity safeguards built in and it is working; please now cast a wider net of safety across our City.

Respectfully,
Ilene Lederman
207 King St

Ilene Lederman

From: [Patricia Ash](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Google Group SBRMBNA](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DPH-jodie](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: SBRMBNA Group Resolution to expand the successful speed camera program--BOS vote Tuesday 7/14
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 2:57:10 PM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

We are grateful that our D6 Supervisor, Matt Dorsey, has brought forward Resolution 260499 to expand the pilot speed camera program across the City so more—many more—dangerous intersections may experience the same reduction in speeding that has been demonstrated at the 33 intersections currently equipped with these cameras. And we thank you, President Mandelman, and Supervisors Sauter, Sherrill, Wong, Mahmoud, and Melgar for co-sponsoring the resolution.

We as members of the South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay NA are writing to ask the board to pass this resolution, and to implore Supervisors Walton, Chan, Chen and Felder to add their votes of support for unanimous passage. San Francisco needs this level of proven enforcement to stem the rising tide of fatalities and serious injuries on our streets. Our neighborhoods have lost two toddlers in the recent two years, and sadly our neighborhoods are not alone in grieving such losses.

Our NA has advocated for pedestrian safety measures since we were established in 2008 and we actively engaged with Walk SF, the City, and members of the Vision Zero Coalition for over 8 years to get this pilot program passed. The program has needed privacy and equity safeguards built in and it is working; please now cast a wider net of safety across our City.

Respectfully,

Patricia and Richard Ash
Long Time Residents and Property Owners in the South Beach Neighborhood

Sent from my iPad
Pat Ash

On Jul 12, 2026, at 6:46 PM, SBRMB NA <sbrmbna@gmail.com> wrote:

Happy Sunday neighbors,

For those of you concerned with unsafe traffic conditions on our streets, an **important vote is up this Tuesday, [July 14, at the Board of Supervisors Meeting](#): Supervisor Dorsey has introduced Resolution 260499 to expand the current speed camera program, now a pilot project involving 33 intersections, across the City.** Per Walk SF, a [note on the program effectiveness](#):

"According to data from the SFMTA, the share of drivers speeding 10 MPH or more is down nearly 80% across the 33 speed camera locations. And drivers are changing their behavior: about two-thirds of drivers who have received a warning or citation did not get another one."

We have actively advocated—along with the City, WalkSF and the Vision Zero Coalition—for this program for 8 years prior to its passage, and we support this resolution to expand the program. Pasted below is a letter we have sent to our Board of Supervisors. **If you share our perspective, we encourage you to write too**; supervisors' email addresses are given. Feel free to copy all or parts of our letter (substituting YOUR name, of course!) and email it by tomorrow (Monday) noon. Or just forward the letter in whole and note that you support the request.

Separately, the [agenda](#) also has three items related to the Mission Bay Ferry Landing slated to be built at Bayside Park: Item 11 Regents of the University of California grant; Item 12 Professional Service contract extension; Item 13 SFMTA grant. All seem administrative, so more an FYI than a call to action.

Thanks for your engagement, and thanks to all you participated in One City Day at Bayside Park, the NERT program at UCSF, the Mission Bay Clean Up, and the activities around the pavilion,
Alice

.....
[Alice Rogers](#)
President, South Beach|Rincon|Mission Bay NA
sbrmbna@gmail.com

[Follow us on Instagram for neighborhood updates, events, and alerts: @SBRMBNA](#)

.....
To: Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, ChenStaff@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org, chanstaff@sfgov.org

CC: matt.dorsey@sfgov.org, mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org, melgarstaff@sfgov.org, SauterStaff@sfgov.org, sherrillstaff@sfgov.org, wongstaff@sfgov.org, MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org, Jodie@walksf.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

July 14 hearing, item 42/Resolution 260499--please support

July 12 2026

RE: July 14 BOS Hearing, Agenda Item 42: Resolution 260499/Supervisor Dorsey

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

We are grateful that our D6 Supervisor, Matt Dorsey, has brought forward Resolution 260499 to expand the pilot speed camera program across the City so more—many more—dangerous intersections may experience the same reduction in speeding that has been demonstrated at the 33 intersections currently equipped with these cameras. And we thank you, President Mandelman, and Supervisors Sauter, Sherrill, Wong, Mahmoud, and Melgar for co-sponsoring the resolution.

We, the South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay NA, are writing to ask the board to pass this resolution, and to implore Supervisors Walton, Chan, Chen and Felder to add their votes of support for unanimous passage. San Francisco needs this level of proven enforcement to stem the rising tide of fatalities and serious injuries on our streets. Our neighborhoods have lost two toddlers in the recent two years, and sadly our neighborhoods are not alone in grieving such losses.

Our NA has advocated for pedestrian safety measures since we were established in 2008 and we actively engaged with Walk SF, the City, and members of the Vision Zero Coalition for over 8 years to get this pilot program passed. The program has needed privacy and equity safeguards built in and it is working; please now cast a wider net of safety across our City.

Respectfully,

The South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay Neighborhood Association Board

Alice Rogers, President
Gary Pegueros, Vice President/Secretary
Bruce Agid, Director
Sarah Bertram, Director
Sarah Davis, Director
Mike Linksvayer, Director

.....
[South Beach|Rincon|Mission Bay NA
sbrmbna@gmail.com](mailto:sbrmbna@gmail.com)


.....


Begin forwarded message:

Subject: More speed ? | Defending Sunset Dunes | New hike!
Date: July 10, 2026 at 9:58:07 AM PDT
To: <sbrmbna@gmail.com>
Reply-To: <us16-9b3f2cba80-a2e7f9f58b@inbound.mailchimpapp.net>

[Take action](#) | [DONATE](#) | [Volunteer](#)

[View in your browser](#)





Speed camera resolution heads to full vote by the Board of Supervisors

Yesterday, we went to City Hall to show strong support for District 6 Supervisor Matt Dorsey's resolution urging San Francisco to pursue expanding the program. Thank you to Walk SF and Families for Safe Streets members for joining us at the hearing for the resolution!

The resolution will likely go to the full Board of Supervisors for a vote on Tuesday, July 14. Supervisors Sauter, Sherrill, Wong, Mahmood, Melgar, and Mandelman are co-sponsoring the resolution, but we want nothing less than unanimous support.



2601 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94110
415.431.WALK (9255)

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "SBRMBNA" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sbrmbna+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sbrmbna/794A758F-1826-4E99-885F-8EEB993644EB%40gmail.com>.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Speed cameras support
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 11:58:33 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 260499**:

Resolution affirming San Francisco's support for the Speed Safety System Pilot Program and urging the exploration of changes to strengthen the program, including increasing the number of allowable speed camera locations, with priority given to corridors on the High Injury Network and other locations with demonstrated safety need.

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: Jonathan Ayres <malcolmbeckwithayres@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 7:18 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Speed cameras support

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

Dear SF supervisors,

I am writing you to express complete support for the expansion of the speed camera program in San Francisco.

I have lived in San Francisco for 13 years, and in that time, especially most recently, I've been beyond shocked at the way the drivers conduct themselves in the city.

They speed recklessly throughout the city, routinely drive-through red lights, and appear to completely disregard the rights and safety of pedestrians—and even of the other drivers who choose to respect the speed limit.

I found it fascinating in the recent article that I came across that spurred me to write this email, that there are privacy concerns regarding the program.

We're talking about human life here, and the constant news reports of people who have died or been injured due to reckless driving should be evidence enough that this program must be expanded.

Thank you for your time and for your efforts in this area.

Jonathan Ayres

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 7 Letters Regarding File No. 260538
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:30:05 PM
Attachments: [7 Letters Regarding File No. 260538.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 7 letters regarding [File No. 260538](#): Planning, Administrative, Building Codes - Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions; Development Impact Fee Reductions.

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: [Adkins, Joe \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: Fw: Strongly OPPOSING Board of Supervisors Meeting July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #39 [Planning, Administrative, Building Codes - Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions; Development Impact Fee Reductions] File #260538
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 10:50:17 AM

For C-pages

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins

Office of Supervisor Myrna Melgar, District 7

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 273

San Francisco, CA 94102

Office: 415-554-6516, Direct: 415-554-6519

www.sf.gov/sfbos/melgar

[Sign up](#) to receive Supervisor Melgar's Newsletter

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 8:50 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Strongly OPPOSING Board of Supervisors Meeting July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #39 [Planning, Administrative, Building Codes - Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions; Development Impact Fee Reductions] File #260538

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

FR: Eileen Boken,
State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

RE: Board of Supervisors Meeting July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #39 [Planning, Administrative, Building Codes - Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions; Development Impact Fee Reductions] File #260538

Position: Strongly OPPOSING.

Even though it's increasingly challenging to build affordable housing, this legislation would make it even more challenging.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Thomas Schuttish](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Sciammas, Charlie \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Marie, Sophie \(BOS\)](#); [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [FelderStaff](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Skelly, Maeve \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
Subject: Board File No. 260538 on July 14, 2026 Item No. 39
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 9:49:41 PM
Attachments: [Letter on Inclusionary.pdf](#)
[Sample from BLA study.pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am a realist and I don't doubt that this Ordinance will pass the Board.

This Ordinance is one of the end results of over a decade of action.

With all the changes imposed by Sacramento and the decimation of local control it is obvious that they have succeeded and are victorious.

Whether this victory will solve the housing crisis...and the affordable housing crisis through a supply side philosophy of real estate development...remains to be seen.

However.

Given this victory, I think it would be reasonable for the Board to make a gesture to attempt to get Sacramento to eliminate the Ellis Act in order to preserve existing rental housing.

Please add a sentence or two in this Ordinance acknowledging the idea of using this victory to get rid of the Ellis Act to potentially balance out the loss of Inclusionary housing, by encouraging the City and County of San Francisco to lobby Sacramento to get rid of the Ellis Act.

This would not be a constraint on the production of housing, but would potentially preserve existing housing for tenants now and in the future.

My previous email and letter to the Government Audit and Oversight Committee is in the packet, but I have added it here for your convenience.

Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish

Begin forwarded message:

From: <schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: Inclusionary Housing Board File No.260538 Hearing July 2,

2026

Date: June 29, 2026 at 3:32:13 PM PDT

To: monique.crayton@sfgov.org

Cc: "myrna.melgar@sfgov.org" <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>, "Bintliff, Jacob (ECN)" <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>, "sheila.nickolopoulos@sfgov.org" <sheila.nickolopoulos@sfgov.org>, "carly.grob@sfgov.org, ada.tan@sfgov.org", "Low, Jen (BOS)" <jen.low@sfgov.org>, Jennifer Fieber <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>

Dear Ms. Crayton:

Good afternoon. Please add this email and the two pdf attachments to **File No.260583**.

Attached below is a copy of the letter I submitted to the Planning Commission when they heard this item on June 18th.

I want to add a few comments here to supplement the attached letter.

Comment #1: I reference a project on 18th Street in my letter. I mis-typed the address.

The correct address is 3832 18th Street, not 3882.

As I stated in the letter, this project has been stalled at DBI since 2024, due to inaction by the project sponsor. But now according to the SFYIMBY website and the SFPIM, the project has been revised but as just a large single family home with a JADU!

See the link to the SFYIMBY article:

<https://sfyimby.com/2026/06/preliminary-plans-for-3832-18th-street-in-mission-dolores-san-francisco.html>

This illustrates that the market has improved...for luxury homes. Market improvement gets me to comment #2.

Comment #2: In my June 18th letter to the Planning Commission I cite the **Financial Feasibility Study** from June 2025 for the Rezoning and the more recent **Financial Feasibility Study** from the Controller for this legislation on the Inclusionary.

Both studies were completed by the same Consultant.

The June 2025 Study says the only lot size with positive outcome or RLV *when the market improves* would be lots of 2500 square feet, which is basically the most common lot size in our residential neighborhoods.

The current 2026 Study done for the Inclusionary *did not factor in the lot size*, but did cite one example of market rate housing that would be “feasible” when the market improves.

The lot size seems like an important factor to omit from this current Study, when it was an important factor in the June 2025 Study just one year ago.

Please see pages 4 and 5 in my June 18th letter in the pdf below comparing these two Feasibility Studies.

One additional point on this lot size issue: The recent Study done for Supervisor Chen by the Budget and Legislative Analyst on Affordable Housing did use a lot size of 10,000 square feet for a type of project similar to the one cited by the Controller in that Study. *Please see the second pdf below.*

But I think we can all agree that we are in new round of high-end frenzy that is improving the market...and lowering the Inclusionary even further would mean the loss of funds for the affordable housing that is needed per the Housing Element and the Rezoning.

Comment #3: Given all the streamlining in legislation from both the City and the State, it is apparent that the proponents of “build, baby, build” have won and the City has a lot of political capital, both in Room 200 and Room 250.

If the Inclusionary is going to be reduced per this legislation, it would be really nice if some effort could now be put into repealing the Ellis Act to better protect tenants.

And to keep rental housing on the market.

And here is an extreme example from over 25 years ago as to why the Ellis Act should be repealed. But there are many sad stories in our City due to the Ellis Act.

See this link also from SFYIMBY.

<https://sfyimby.com/2026/06/renovation-plans-filed-for-storied-2100-jackson-street-san-francisco.html>

Finally, please make sure you note John King’s comments that are highlighted on page 2 in my June 18th letter to the Planning Commission. His comments get to the real heart of this issue.

Here below are the pdfs with my letter and info on the Financial Feasibility Studies.

Thank you.
Georgia Schuttish

June 18, 2026

To: Planning Commission

From: Georgia Schuttish

Re: Inclusionary Housing Issues and Affordability Issues

At the Informational Hearing on May 28th it was very clear that everyone is trying very hard to create a climate that boosts housing production. Hopefully the expansion of the Housing Trust Fund and the proposed bonds will pass in November which will deal with the pressing need of affordable housing.

Market rate housing is challenging. Based on previous reports under the Family Zoning the only financially feasible development would be on a 2,500 square foot lot, which is the typical lot size (25' x 100') in most residential neighborhoods. And this will happen when the market improves. (see page 4 below).

Generally speaking it is difficult to imagine 10 units on a lot this size, but I suppose it is possible.

(Even the notorious group housing project at 3882 18th Street on a larger lot measuring 27.5' x 114.854 has not moved out of DBI since January 2024. This project was intended to be units affordable by design).

However, I think it is apparent that the market is improving, at least in my neighborhood of Noe Valley, where the over asking price of a sample of eight sales since April averaged \$1.314 million.

With the IPOs and newly minted millionaires, there will be even more of a frenzy.

What seems probable in this current housing market under programs like SB 423 and the HC-SF (Code Section 206.10) will be ministerial approval of projects with

two high-end luxury units in order to meet the densification mandated by the State and by the Local Program. Some projects may have a third unit or an ADU.

Obviously this won't solve the affordable housing crisis. (*Or even solve the "missing middle" crisis*). It is no different than the major Alterations that should have been reviewed as Demolitions in the years since the 2014 Housing Element.

The Policy in the previous Housing Element to preserve "starter homes" was never acted on and instead there was a tidal wave of high-end, very large single family homes, including pairs of Flats turned into de facto SFHs.



Hopefully Residential Flats will now be better preserved and there will be solid tenant protection.

Slightly larger lots that are wider than 25' may have projects with more than two units, but this is likely to still be high-end, luxury housing.

Hopefully this type of development will not proliferate in the Priority Equity Geography neighborhoods which should be protected and preserved.

Here above is a pertinent excerpt from John King's article that appeared in the Chronicle upon his retirement in September 2024. See marked passage with the sentence that begins, "*More ominously....*" and ends with "*...that, some say, threatened its soul.*"

John King was right to put the issue in terms of San Francisco's "soul".

The HC-SF and SB 423 are both major loopholes. Two units is all that is required to use these two programs. These are programs that allow for Ministerial approval. There is no oversight from the public or the Commission. And of course no affordability. Or even relative affordability.

So given the past history in the previous booms with their speculative frenzy and the new boom the City is about to experience, it would seem prudent to close loopholes that would allow for only two (luxury) units.

The City would need to get Sacramento to amend SB 423. But for developers/ project sponsors seeking to use the HC-SF, they should be required to do four units (not just two or three) on those lots that are zoned 40/40 4-R. These are lots that are 25' x 100' (or similar dimensions close to 2,500 square feet) which have been determined to be the most financially feasible lots to develop.

And with the upcoming IPOs the market is going to improve even more than it has already. The City does not need to incentivize more speculative luxury housing.

If you haven't seen it, here is a link to the Mission Local article about the boom.

<https://missionlocal.org/2026/06/san-francisco-anthropic-openai-chatgpt-ipo/>

cc: Planning Staff; Kristen Jensen; Austin Yang; Commissions Secretary

Attachments: Excerpt from pages 24-25 of Executive Summary for Hearing on Rezoning June 26, 2025; Emails June 2-3, 2026 between G. Schuttish and Staff on methodology used by Controller for Inclusionary Feasibility Analysis.

- **Additional development types start to become more financially feasible under the “improved case” assumptions.** Under the “improved case,” which includes more favorable assumptions for return on costs, interest rates, and rental and sales price growth, the results show one out of 98 projects showing positive residual land values in the medium submarket, and 48 out of 98 demonstrate positive RLV in the high submarket, indicating a higher likelihood of feasibility (see Figure 9 below). It is important to note that while these have more feasibility relative to other prototypes in other some markets, some of these positive RLV results are likely to still fall below values that would reflect feasible land costs.

In particular, some of the development types that will be enabled by the rezoning, including low- and **mid-rise multifamily buildings, show positive RLVs under these improved economic assumptions**, particularly under the “high” submarket assumptions. These are the most common development sites in the rezoned areas, including the mid-rise commercial corridors zoned for 65’, and the residential areas off the corridors.

Overall, 12 of 98 prototypes resulted in an RLV greater than \$75k/unit under improved conditions in the high submarket. Of those, there are a few anomalies with substantially high RLV that were established for illustrative purposes only and do not reflect realistic development prototypes that would be constructed. The smallest site prototype measuring **2,500 square feet was the only prototype with every single iteration across both residential tenures that demonstrated a positive RLV under the**

improved market conditions.

- **Flexibility on specific code standards as contemplated in the Local Program can support greater feasibility.** In particular, the prototypes tested three different assumptions on a subset of prototypes that would be available through the local program: 1) reduced rear yard (down to 18% or 15 feet, whichever is greater), 2) flexibility on inclusionary housing including rent control for small projects (10-24 dwelling units) and 3) form-based zoning (also known as density decontrol). While the impact of these changes varied for specific prototypes, they cumulatively did result in some development types showing more positive (or less negative) RLV results, indicating these could be meaningful policy interventions for some development types.

Hi Georgia,

The feasibility analysis for the market rate midrise condominium prototype was not based on lot size. Instead, it was based on the following factors:

Case	Case B
Building Type	Midrise
Construction Type	Type III
Building Height	85 Feet
Building Stories	8 Stories
Building Units	107 Units
Average Unit Size	1,000 NSF
Parking Ratio	0.50:1

Ada Tan, Senior Planner

Housing Implementation, Current Planning Division

San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7403 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Thomas Schuttish <schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 10:16 AM
To: Tan, Ada (CPC) <ada.tan@sfgov.org>; Grob, Carly (CPC) <carly.grob@sfgov.org>
Subject: Power Point Presentation on Inclusionary

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

Dear Ada and Carly,

Good morning and Happy June to you both.

I have a question about the one category that was deemed feasible on page 11 of the power point.

That would be the hypothetical 100% market rate mid-rise project for condos.

Was the size of the lot a factor in this determination of feasibility?

And if the lot size was a factor, what sized lots would be feasible?

I guess mid-rise is up to 8 stories?

I couldn't find anything about lot size in the memo and if I missed it I apologize.

Thanks and have a good day.

Sincerely,
Georgia

NOTE: It was puzzling to me why the lot size (2,500 square feet) was a factor in the Feasibility Analysis for the Rezoning in June 2025 as written in the excerpt shown on page 4 above, but lot size was not a factor in the Feasibility Analysis for the Inclusionary one year later as stated in the email above.

Exhibit K: Development Impact Fee Modifications Adopted in 2023 Legislation

Ordinance	Area	Impact
Ord. 187-23 (230769)	Fee Reduction	33% discount on all fees (with restrictions) for eligible projects
Ord. 193-23 (230769)	Fee Deferral	For eligible projects, deferred 80–85% of development impact fee payments from building permit issuance to no later than the first certificate of occupancy
Ord. 193-23 (230764)	Fee Indexing	Replaced the existing method of annual fee escalation based on Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimate (AICCE) with a flat 2% escalation rate per year
Ord. 193-23 (230764)	Fee Assessment	Froze the rates and applicability of development impact fees to the time of project approval for eligible projects

- BLA estimated lost total development impact fee collections, FY 2024-25: \$1,902,077 is based on a 33 percent reduction in revenues collected. The loss in development impact fee revenue dedicated to affordable housing was only \$211,030, a fairly insignificant amount relative to annual affordable housing spending in San Francisco, but a reflection of reduced housing production.

Impact on Housing Production

- Exhibit G above shows that housing production in San Francisco fell overall from a peak of 4,972 new units in 2017 to a low of just 1,457 units in 2024. Because the City's policy interventions were introduced while the market was already in retreat and facing pressures like high interest rates and slow-growing rents, isolating the specific impact of fee reductions from broader macroeconomic trends is challenging. However, even if some project developers made the decision to proceed with a development project, housing production was still well below pre-pandemic levels after the reductions were adopted.
- To estimate the potential impact of the reductions in development impact fees on development projects, we applied the 2023 fee discounts to a hypothetical project. Our hypothetical new construction project has an assumed 98 units total, is 100 percent residential, and is 80,000 gross square feet (average of 612 sq. ft. per unit plus 20,000 sq. ft for lobby, elevators and stairs, utilities, and common space)³ on a 10,000 square foot lot.
- Exhibit L below shows what the relevant per-unit development impact fees would be for this hypothetical project across the different Planning Areas, given the relevant Special Area Fees in each location. We then add the fees to the applicable Citywide fees.

³ On average, 20-25% of a building's square footage is needed for non-residential uses.

From: [lgpetty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: NO on Inclusionary Housing Program Cuts and Development Impact Fee Reductions Item # 39 on Agenda 7-14-26
File 260538
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 10:01:37 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to reject this proposed, unnecessary, **194-page deconstruction** of the Inclusionary Housing Program and Development Impact Fees.

If no outright rejection can be accomplished, then I urge you to continue this legislation until well after the November election, with a concurrent extension of existing terms and requirements to at least mid-January. That would allow sufficient time to examine the complexities and propose a thoughtful way forward in light of election results.

To drastically lower Inclusionary Requirements and Development Impact fees NOW, would be like throwing Humpty Dumpty off the wall. In the current political climate, these massive proposed changes, like Humpty Dumpty after the fall, would be extremely difficult to put back together as they once were. The suggestion that it would be easy to restore all these Inclusionary Program and Development Impact Fee changes with a simple increase to 10 per cent is disingenuous. Because of the accompanying complex of detailed changes that would be necessary to reverse, restoring the Inclusionary Program & Development Fees would be a difficult and uncertain task, particularly in light of a new composition on the Board.

There might be ways to make this legislation better, such as keeping the Inclusionary exemption at below 10 units, or not changing requirements for special use districts, or offering a changed effective date.

But it will still be a bad, policy-altering bill – both because of a large number unwise changes, and because it **breaks faith with the public** in two ways:

First, it drastically **reduces intended inclusion of economic and social diversity among residents in market rate housing.**

Second, the Inclusionary Program and Development Impact Fees were instituted in recognition of developers' obligations to mitigate the harms of construction upheaval and displacement. If this legislative package is passed, it will go a long way to **absolving developers of their responsibilities – shifting them entirely onto the public.**

Reject this legislation, or, at very least, adjust it using slow caution, to avoid destroying the very values our city vowed to uphold.

Thank you.

Lorraine Petty
Affordable Housing Advocate
D2

From: [Gordon Mar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Sinn, Andrew \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Gaona, Sasha \(BOS\)](#); [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Chin, Linshao \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File #260538, Inclusionary Housing Reduction - Westside Forward comments
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 9:00:26 AM

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



July 13, 2026

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

RE: File #260538 - Ordinance Reducing Inclusionary Affordable Housing Requirements

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors,

We are writing on behalf of Westside Forward to express serious concerns about the proposed ordinance to reduce the inclusionary affordable housing requirements for market-rate developments.

Westside Forward is a neighborhood-based group organizing for social justice and a resilient, vibrant westside where every resident has the opportunity to thrive. Our organization represents hundreds of diverse community members—including both renters and homeowners—across Districts 1, 4, and 7. As residents of the neighborhoods directly

impacted by recent zoning changes, we believe that efforts to unlock housing development must also preserve meaningful opportunities to expand affordable housing in historically underserved westside neighborhoods.

We appreciate the careful work of the Controller, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and City staff in evaluating the economic challenges facing residential development. The Controller's report makes clear that today's market conditions have made many projects financially infeasible and that thoughtful policy changes are warranted.

However, we do not believe the ordinance, as drafted, maintains the balanced framework reflected in the TAC's recommendations. Instead, it asks the City to permanently reduce affordable housing obligations today based largely on the hope that replacement affordable housing resources will be secured in the future. We believe San Francisco can—and should—restore housing feasibility without weakening its long-term commitment to affordable housing and equitable development

Accordingly, we respectfully urge the Board to adopt the following amendments.

1. Make Reduced Inclusionary Requirements Contingent on Securing Replacement Affordable Housing Funding

The Controller's feasibility study concluded that current market conditions cannot support San Francisco's existing inclusionary housing requirements. The TAC therefore recommended lower inclusionary percentages as a policy response. At the same time, the TAC repeatedly emphasized that reducing developer obligations should be paired with a stable, recurring source of funding for affordable housing.

Westside Forward appreciates the TAC's effort to balance the need for housing feasibility with the equally important goal of preserving affordable housing production. The ordinance, however, secures an immediate reduction in developers' affordable housing obligations while providing no legally enforceable assurance that replacement affordable housing funding will ever be realized.

In effect, the ordinance asks the public to trust that future legislative action and a future election will replace affordable housing resources that are being reduced today. We do not believe that is sound public policy.

If voters ultimately reject a Housing Trust Fund measure—or if such a measure never reaches the ballot—San Francisco will have permanently weakened one of its most important affordable housing tools without securing the long-term funding intended to replace it.

Requested Amendment: Amend the ordinance so that the reduced inclusionary housing requirements become operative only upon voter approval of the proposed Housing Trust Fund Charter amendment or the enactment of another dedicated, long-term funding source providing comparable support for affordable housing production.

2. Preserve Inclusionary Housing Requirements for Projects Containing 10 to 24 Units

We are also deeply concerned by the proposal to eliminate inclusionary housing requirements for residential projects containing between 10 and 24 units.

The TAC recommended this change as part of its broader package of recommendations. However, unlike many other parts of San Francisco, much of the future residential growth expected under the Family Zoning Plan in westside neighborhoods is likely to occur through projects of exactly this scale because of existing parcel sizes and neighborhood development patterns.

Eliminating inclusionary housing requirements for these projects would mean that most of the developments made possible by recent upzoning would produce no permanently affordable homes whatsoever. That outcome would further widen longstanding geographic disparities in the distribution of affordable housing opportunities across San Francisco.

Westside Forward supports expanding housing opportunities in westside neighborhoods. But new housing should also expand access to those neighborhoods for working families,

educators, healthcare workers, service workers, seniors, and young people—not exclusively for households able to afford market-rate housing.

Requested Amendment: Amend the ordinance to retain an inclusionary affordable housing requirement for residential projects containing between 10 and 24 units.

Conclusion

The Controller's report demonstrates that restoring housing production requires difficult policy choices. It also demonstrates that economic feasibility cannot be the City's only objective. Although the consultants' analysis found that current market conditions could support no inclusionary requirement at all, the TAC deliberately recommended maintaining inclusionary housing requirements because affordable housing production remains an essential public objective.

Westside Forward agrees with that balanced principle. The challenge before the Board is not simply to make development easier. It is to make it possible to build more housing while preserving meaningful opportunities for households of all incomes to live in every neighborhood of our city.

As drafted, this ordinance places too much of the burden of solving today's housing feasibility challenges on future affordable housing production. We believe San Francisco can do better.

Sincerely,

Natalie Gee, Leslie Hu, Ralph Lane and Gordon Mar

From: [A.R](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [ChenStaff](#); [WaltonStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment 7/14/26 2PM - Item 39.
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 3:10:05 PM

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

Hi Supervisors, my name is Alexia Rotberg, 1600 15th Street, Mission District. I'm an Urban Planning/economic development professional and urge you to push back **and amend and/or oppose Item 39** the proposal to reduce the city's affordable housing inclusionary requirement.

I can understand, if due to economies of scale, projects less than 25 units cannot make their development proformas work with inclusionary requirements. This reduction in requirements may even help encourage more "missing middle housing".

HOWEVER I cannot understand or support any reduction of inclusionary requirements for 25+ unit developments.

- It is incumbent on developers to do their due diligence when designing projects. This includes accounting for local impact fees which can affect developments.
- If these fees "kill" a 25+ unit project, it doesn't seem the project's proforma / development budget was very well thought out to begin with.

Nor do I think developers should be able to dedicate land in lieu of a fee/ unit provision.

- Inclusionary requirements are meant to INTEGRATE units of various incomes into projects, so we do not segregate affordable units from market rate properties like we did in the 1940s-1980s in American Urban History. (See Bayview Hunters Point public housing)
- Integrating affordable units into market rate projects has been federal housing policy for decades (before HUD was gutted by our President) for the above reason.
- It encourages income integration and combats historical patterns of discrimination across the city (see the Marina vs. Mission).

Additionally, with the rental market being as inflated as it is right now, it is unbelievable that the Board would even consider such a proposal to reduce affordable requirements - when people are actively being priced out of the city. **Is anyone on the Board a renter?**

- The reality is, inclusionary requirements are a KEY land value capture (LVC) strategy for local governments in competitive real estate markets. It's a way to ensure the growth and prosperity gained in the city is shared amongst economic classes - including renters of all income levels. <https://www.lincolnst.edu/publications/policy-focus-reports/land-value-capture-in-united-states/>
- The theory that fee reductions would incentivize more housing production in general which would then lower market rents IGNORES THE FACT that housing markets take

time to adjust, and such rent reductions would take YEARS to materialize. In the short term, the number of affordable units requires to be entitled and built would immediately be slashed, only exacerbating the existing inflated rental market.

Please do not believe the Mayor's one-sided, bias economic views. The supply side, Regan era proposals should be left in the 1980's.

Respectfully,
Alexia Rotberg

From: [T.Flandrich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Item#39 File #260538 Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions MUST BE AMENDED
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 5:04:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

As a North Beach resident engaged in pushing for more affordable housing, especially following so much displacement of long-time neighbors, I know that the many luxury unit projects currently in the pipeline for North Beach will do far too little to re-house the working families today and in the future. Too many developers have opted out of building inclusionary housing on site, and as such too many residents are no longer able to remain in our community and near to their jobs. In-lieu fees currently are not designated to be used in the same neighborhood, as such we will never reach the number of affordable housing units needed for majority income levels. There are several neighborhoods facing similar challenges. This legislation as written, needs clear safeguards, clarifications, and I urge you to do the following:

- Keep the Inclusionary exemption at below 10 units
- Do not change the requirements for special districts
- All neighborhoods are NOT the same
- Inclusionary units play a vital role in achieving neighborhoods affordable housing goals and meeting the needs of its residents
- On site inclusionary means those units are getting

built in that community, at the same time market rate units are being built-DO NOT REDUCE

- In-lieu fees are historically but a pittance of cost compared to actually building a number of units on site-not a fair, equitable exchange

Lastly, I write in support of the letters sent by United to Save the Mission and CCHO and ask you to vote no unless amended.

Thank you for your consideration,

Theresa Flandrich

From: [SF Latino Task Force](#)
To: [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [Chung Hagen, Sheila \(BOS\)](#); [Bejoy, Renil \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Samantha \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Sinn, Andrew \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [Sciammas, Charlie \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 260538 — Preserve Equity-Based Inclusionary Housing Requirements
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 12:29:05 PM
Attachments: [TAC INCLUSIONARY - LTF 2026.pdf](#)

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

Re: File No. 260538 — Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions

On behalf of the Latino Task Force, we ask that you honor San Francisco's historic equity commitments by retaining a higher level of inclusionary housing for the Mission District, which has lost approximately 12,000 Latino residents since 2000, along with many low-income families, workers, small businesses, and cultural institutions.

The needs of every neighborhood are not the same. Their displacement risks are not the same, and neither is their ability to absorb additional market-rate development.

The Mission is one of three neighborhoods, along with the Tenderloin and SoMa, that has historically maintained higher inclusionary requirements in recognition of its significant community losses and affordable-housing needs. These requirements have not stopped development. Market-rate projects continued to move forward under higher requirements than those now proposed, including during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We believe the Mission, Tenderloin, and SoMa should retain enhanced inclusionary protections. This is especially important because the proposed reductions are not fully tied to guaranteed replacement of the lost affordable units through the Housing Trust Fund. There is also no clear City commitment to restore inclusionary requirements if the fund does not pass or fails to generate sufficient resources.

The current proposal preserves higher offsite, fee-out, and land-dedication requirements for these neighborhoods, but does not extend the same equity framework to onsite inclusionary housing. This creates the appearance of equity while allowing most developers to choose the lower citywide onsite rate of 5%.

Retaining an **8% onsite inclusionary requirement** for the Mission and other designated equity geographies would recognize current economic conditions while preserving the City's longstanding equity framework.

Years of community organizing and City planning went into establishing these

protections. They should be honored in order to meet San Francisco's responsibility to affirmatively further fair housing and prevent additional displacement.

These commitments are reflected in the City's core planning documents, including:

- - The **San Francisco Housing Element**, which calls for increased production of housing for extremely low- and very low-income households and targeted investment to prevent displacement through permanently affordable housing
 - Action 1.5.1 - Where the city committed to "Increase production of housing affordable to extremely low and very low-income households."
 - Action 4.1.7 - Where the city committed to "target levels of investments that prevent community displacement through increased permanentlyaffordable housing production.";
- The **Eastern Neighborhoods Plan**, which allowed the conversion of industrial land in exchange for stronger community benefits, including higher inclusionary housing requirements; and
- The **Mission Action Plans 2020 and 2030**, which recognize inclusionary housing as an essential tool for meeting the neighborhood's affordable-housing goals.

Weakening these requirements would allow the continued loss of blue-collar jobs, affordable homes, and community-serving spaces without delivering the benefits promised to impacted neighborhoods.

This concern is reinforced by Karen Chapple's 2024 study, [*Can New Housing Supply Mitigate Displacement and Exclusion?*](#), which found that without substantial accompanying affordable housing, market-rate development in San Francisco may contribute to displacement of low-income residents by approximately 11% to 14%.

For the Mission, this is not a theoretical risk. It is a continuation of a displacement crisis that has already reshaped the neighborhood.

Without a stronger onsite inclusionary requirement that more closely aligns with the offsite, fee-out, and land-dedication rates, the Mission can expect further loss of working-class residents, blue-collar jobs, small businesses, and cultural institutions.

We respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to retain an **8% onsite inclusionary housing requirement** for the Mission and other equity geographies and to preserve

the City's historic commitments to racial equity, affordable housing, and community stability.

Thank you for your commitment to housing justice,

The San Francisco Latino Task Force





» *Community Led* » *Community Driven* » *Community Implemented*

July 10, 2026

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

Re: File No. 260538 — Inclusionary Housing Program Updates and Reductions

On behalf of the Latino Task Force, we ask that you honor San Francisco's historic equity commitments by retaining a higher level of inclusionary housing for the Mission District, which has lost approximately 12,000 Latino residents since 2000, along with many low-income families, workers, small businesses, and cultural institutions.

The needs of every neighborhood are not the same. Their displacement risks are not the same, and neither is their ability to absorb additional market-rate development.

The Mission is one of three neighborhoods, along with the Tenderloin and SoMa, that has historically maintained higher inclusionary requirements in recognition of its significant community losses and affordable-housing needs. These requirements have not stopped development. Market-rate projects continued to move forward under higher requirements than those now proposed, including during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We believe the Mission, Tenderloin, and SoMa should retain enhanced inclusionary protections. This is especially important because the proposed reductions are not fully tied to guaranteed replacement of the lost affordable units through the Housing Trust Fund. There is also no clear City commitment to restore inclusionary requirements if the fund does not pass or fails to generate sufficient resources.

The current proposal preserves higher offsite, fee-out, and land-dedication requirements for these neighborhoods, but does not extend the same equity framework to onsite inclusionary housing. This creates the appearance of equity while allowing most developers to choose the lower citywide onsite rate of 5%.

Retaining an **8% onsite inclusionary requirement** for the Mission and other designated equity geographies would recognize current economic conditions while preserving the City's longstanding equity framework.

Years of community organizing and City planning went into establishing these protections. They should be honored in order to meet San Francisco's responsibility to affirmatively further fair housing and prevent additional displacement.

These commitments are reflected in the City's core planning documents, including:

- The **San Francisco Housing Element**, which calls for increased production of housing for extremely low- and very low-income households and targeted investment to prevent displacement through permanently affordable housing
 - Action 1.5.1 - Where the city committed to "Increase production of housing affordable to extremely low and very low-income households."
 - Action 4.1.7 - Where the city committed to "target levels of investments that prevent community displacement through increased permanentlyaffordable housing production.";
- The **Eastern Neighborhoods Plan**, which allowed the conversion of industrial land in exchange for stronger community benefits, including higher inclusionary housing requirements; and
- The **Mission Action Plans 2020 and 2030**, which recognize inclusionary housing as an essential tool for meeting the neighborhood's affordable-housing goals.

Weakening these requirements would allow the continued loss of blue-collar jobs, affordable homes, and community-serving spaces without delivering the benefits promised to impacted neighborhoods.


This concern is reinforced by Karen Chapple's 2024 study, [*Can New Housing Supply Mitigate Displacement and Exclusion?*](#), which found that without substantial accompanying affordable housing, market-rate development in San Francisco may contribute to displacement of low-income residents by approximately 11% to 14%.

For the Mission, this is not a theoretical risk. It is a continuation of a displacement crisis that has already reshaped the neighborhood.

Without a stronger onsite inclusionary requirement that more closely aligns with the offsite, fee-out, and land-dedication rates, the Mission can expect further loss of working-class residents, blue-collar jobs, small businesses, and cultural institutions.

We respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to retain an **8% onsite inclusionary housing requirement** for the Mission and other equity geographies and to preserve the City's historic commitments to racial equity, affordable housing, and community stability.

Thank you for your commitment to housing justice,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'S' or 'L' shape with a horizontal line through it, followed by a small 'x' and a flourish.

The San Francisco Latino Task Force

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: 2 Letters Regarding File No. 260614
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:21:14 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding File No. 260614.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding **File No. 260614:**

-

Resolution authorizing the Recreation and Park Department to issue an amended permit allowing Another Planet Entertainment to hold ticketed concerts at the Golden Gate Park Polo Field, to take place on the Friday, Saturday, and Sunday either following or preceding the Outside Lands Festival in 2027, 2028 and 2029, in exchange for a minimum permit fee of \$1,530,000 per year for two-day events and \$2,295,000 per year for three-day events through 2029, and with options to extend the permit until 2035 and with increased minimum permit fees during any such extensions; affirming a categorical exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act; and authorizing the Recreation and Park Department General Manager to enter into amendments or modifications to the permit that do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities to the City and are necessary to effectuate the purposes of the permit or this Resolution.

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: [David Romano](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Commission, Recpark \(REC\)](#)
Subject: Please don't approve the current terms of the contract with Another Planet Entertainment
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 2:03:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The contracts proposed, between the San Francisco Recreation and Park Dept. and Another Planet Entertainment, LLC (APE), fall short of the industry standard. The APE contracts are not typical for a venue this size, potentially costing the City millions of dollars in lost revenue.

"The resolution (approved by the Budget and Appropriations Committee in June) authorizes the department to issue a permit allowing Another Planet Entertainment, LLC to hold concerts at the polo field "on the Friday, Saturday and Sunday either following or preceding the Outside Lands Festivals ... in exchange for a minimum permit fee of \$1,530,000 per year for two-day events and \$2,295,000 per year for three-day events through 2029, with options to extend the permit until 2035." (Another Planet Entertainment Contract Extension Before Board of Supes, by Thomas K. Pendergast, Richmond Review, 7/8/26)

How much money is APE making on the newly proposed post/pre Outside Lands (OSL) concerts? Not to mention OSL itself. APE won't share that information. The City is not getting a share of the profits so we don't know.

Tickets to OSL cost a minimum of \$200 a day, with premium tickets going for \$1,000 or more. Assuming the same prices and level of attendance for the proposed concerts (sold out) and 1,000 premium tickets sold each day out of the 65,000 tickets: 1,000 tickets x \$1,000 = \$1,000,000. 64,000 tickets x \$200 = \$12,800,000. That's \$13,800,000 per day. For two days, that's \$27,600,000.

APE is offering the City \$1.53 million for two days: that is not a good deal for San Francisco.

When the post-Outside Lands concert was first being voted on by the SF Rec and Parks Commission, Jenny Sue, a local resident, called in to comment on the proposed post-Outside Lands contract terms, "Currently Golden Gate Park plans to charge Another Planet a fixed permit fee...

However when you take a look at local arenas like Oracle Arena, Chase Center, and SAP Center, ShoreLine Amphitheater and Concord Pavilion, they typically employ a percentage based revenue sharing model ranging from 15 to 20 percent of ticket sales."

Supervisors, please don't approve this giveaway contract.

Thank you for your attention to the above.

David Romano
San Francisco CA 94121

From: [Harry S. Pariser](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Please oppose Legislation # 260614 Nine Year extension for Another Planet Entertainment!
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 11:09:22 AM
Importance: High

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

Dear Supervisors:

Neighbors were promised only one weekend of concerts.

This area is closed for weeks because of this anti-environmental event. A horrific concrete boomerang was created at the Polo Fields without any discussion.

Please oppose Legislation # 260614 Nine Year extension for Another Planet Entertainment!

Harry S. Pariser

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: 5 Letters Regarding File No. 260804
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:27:32 PM
Attachments: [5 Letters Regarding File No. 260804.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 5 letters regarding **File No. 260804:**

Resolution urging the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to halt the closure of the National Archives at San Francisco and the relocation of the facility's records and artifacts to ensure that local communities continue to have direct access to evidence of their history and stories in the United States.

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: [Adkins, Joe \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: Fw: SUPPORTING Board of Supervisors July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #47 [Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco] File #260804
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 5:58:05 PM

Hi Ops team,

For C-pages

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 5:18 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: SUPPORTING Board of Supervisors July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #47 [Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco] File #260804

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

FR: Eileen Boken,
State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

RE: Board of Supervisors July 14, 2026 Agenda Item #47 [Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco] File #260804

Position: SUPPORTING

Bay Area families with records in the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) facility near San Francisco in San Bruno need to continue to have local access to those records.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Dennis Hong](#)
To: [Dennis James](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Senator Scott Wiener](#)
Subject: SF BoS mth 7.14.203 meeting
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 10:11:11 PM

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

Good evening Everyone, its July 13, 2023 @10:01PMpst. I trust everyone's doing great. I would be remiss if I did not reach out and share my opinion ref to Item #47 on your agenda here and offer my undivided attention and support with the Honorable Miss Connie Chan's item number 47. I regret I will be unable to be at your July 14, meeting. Trust this makes the cut off for the meeting.

Ok, my name is DennisH+, a San Francisco native, living in District 7, formally District 3, after 23 year, retired from the Federal Government in 2012.

So, here are my draft rambling thoughts and opinion. No AI used...and in no order, just want to vent a little and get this approved....passed approved/passed, because its very dear to a lot of us. Sorry for any duplications here, its late and need to get this out.

We cannot stop here. We need you now to help deliver more policy victories for the American people. Policies that:

- This NARA is used by many many agencies to many to list..and use in research their work.
- Our community / residents use this to research family roots / when developing their Family Tree / I have used it several times both personal and at work.
- Should this agency be abolished, pooofed, there needs to be set in place a back up plan so that these vital, history, archived records, files, etc.. don't get lost.
- Sadly it would be a great loss if this fails.
- After this gets approved or not we need to do a follow up; time is too perfect, its election time to get this in to our candidates running for office and agenda as a to do.

- More as you all review this item at tomorrow meeting, a recap of item #47:

47. 260804 [Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco] Sponsor: Chan Resolution urging the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to halt the closure of the National Archives at San Francisco and the relocation of the facility's records and artifacts to ensure that local communities continue to have direct access to evidence of their history and stories in the United States.

Finally, good or bad, I too would like to hear from you, for some of new to the board, I'm back. We cannot stop here. We need you now to help deliver more policy victories for the American people. Please share as needed was unable to find a complete list here.

Thanks for all that you do down there, the very best to you all.

From: [Dennis Hong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Dennis James](#)
Subject: Fw: SF BoS mth 7.14.203 meeting
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 9:57:58 AM

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

Good morning TEAM its July 14, 9:56AMpst, hope this will get thru looks like I missed this send. Sincerely, DennisH+

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Dennis Hong <dennisjames888@yahoo.com>
To: Dennis James <dennisjames888@yahoo.com>; bos@sfgov.org <bos@sfgov.org>
Cc: Daniel.Lurie@sfgov.org <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Senator Scott Wiener <info@scottwiener.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 at 10:10:49 PM PDT
Subject: SF BoS mth 7.14.203 meeting

Good evening Everyone, its July 13, 2023 @10:01PMpst. I trust everyone's doing great. I would be remiss if I did not reach out and share my opinion ref to Item #47 on your agenda here and offer my undivided attention and support with the Honorable Miss Connie Chan's item number 47. I regret I will be unable to be at your July 14, meeting. Trust this makes the cut off for the meeting.

Ok, my name is DennisH+, a San Francisco native, living in District 7, formally District 3, after 23 year, retired from the Federal Government in 2012.

So, here are my draft rambling thoughts and opinion. No AI used...and in no order, just want to vent a little and get this approved....passed approved/passed, because its very dear to a lot of us. Sorry for any duplications here, its late and need to get this out.

We cannot stop here. We need you now to help deliver more policy victories for the American people. Policies that:

- This NARA is used by many many agencies to many to list..and use in research their work.
- Our community / residents use this to research family roots / when developing their Family Tree / I have used it several times both personal and at work.
- Should this agency be abolished, pooofed, there needs to be set in

place a back up plan so that these vital, history, archived records, files, etc.. don't get lost.

- Sadly it would be a great loss if this fails.
- After this gets approved or not we need to do a follow up; time is too perfect, its election time to get this in to our candidates running for office and agenda as a to do.
- More as you all review this item at tomorrow meeting, a recap of item #47:

47. 260804 [Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco] Sponsor: Chan Resolution urging the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to halt the closure of the National Archives at San Francisco and the relocation of the facility's records and artifacts to ensure that local communities continue to have direct access to evidence of their history and stories in the United States.

Finally, good or bad, I too would like to hear from you, for some of new to the board, I'm back. We cannot stop here. We need you now to help deliver more policy victories for the American people. Please share as needed was unable to find a complete list here.

Thanks for all that you do down there, the very best to you all.

From: [Anisha Hingorani](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CAA Support Letter - FILE NO. 260804 Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 1:25:28 PM
Attachments: [2026.07.13 - National Archives Resolution_CAA SUPPORT.pdf](#)

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

Greetings,

Please see attached our letter of support for **FILE NO. 260804** Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco.

Thank you,
Anisha

--



Anisha Hingorani
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Policy Manager
she/her | (415) 651-2563
ahingorani@caasf.org



July 13, 2026

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Emailed: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: FILE NO. 260804 Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco - SUPPORT

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of Chinese for Affirmative Action, I am writing to express our support for FILE NO. 260804 Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives in San Francisco. We would like to express our appreciation to Supervisor Chan for sponsoring this resolution.

Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA) was founded in 1969 to protect the civil and political rights of Chinese Americans and to advance multiracial democracy in the United States. Today, CAA is a progressive voice in and on behalf of the broader Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) community and provides direct services to residents in San Francisco's Chinatown. We fight for immigrant rights, language diversity, economic justice, and education and digital equity.

The National Archives at San Francisco is home to the world's largest collection of AAPI archival records, including files documenting AAPI experiences during pivotal moments in our history including the Chinese Exclusion Act, World War II incarceration of Japanese and Japanese Americans, and arrival records from the Angel Island Immigration Station. These facilities are vital to evidence-based historical scholarship, as they hold irreplaceable records. For instance, the archive at San Bruno holds the original case file from *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, the 1898 decision that established birthright citizenship, which the United States Supreme Court upheld last month. The closure represents a significant blow for local communities' access to their histories and removes priceless primary sources from their places and communities of relevance.

These attacks on AAPI histories are part of a larger effort to erase vital AAPI contributions to the United States. Fiscal efficiency should not come at the cost of community identity and historical preservation. The effective loss of access to these artifacts – and the history they

contain – would be devastating to historians, researchers, families, and students, and ultimately be detrimental to our communities and overall American history. We strongly urge you to support this resolution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anisha Hingorani', with a large, stylized initial 'A'.

Anisha Hingorani
Policy Manager
Chinese for Affirmative Action

From: [Gabriella Ruiz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Support for Resolution Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives at San Francisco
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 4:54:30 PM
Attachments: [Support of Resolution urging the NARA to halt closure.pdf](#)

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

Hello,

Please see the attached letter of support for the resolution urging the national archives and records administration to halt closure of the San Francisco location.

Thank you,

Gabriella (Gabby) Ruiz

Policy Manager
Community Building & Engagement Department
Pronouns: *she/her/hers*

Chinatown Community Development Center
615 Grant Avenue | San Francisco, CA | 94108

I often work outside traditional business hours to accommodate family responsibilities. Please do not feel obligated to read, respond to, or act on this email outside of your normal working hours.



615 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94108
TEL 415.984.1450
FAX 415.362.7992
TTY 415.984.9910
www.chinatowncdc.org

July 9, 2026

The Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors

RE: Support for Resolution Urging the National Archives and Records Administration to Halt the Closure of the National Archives at San Francisco

Dear Members of the Board,

On behalf of Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC), I write in strong support of the resolution urging the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to halt the planned closure of the National Archives at San Francisco and preserve public access to its invaluable collections.

For nearly five decades, CCDC has worked alongside low-income residents, immigrants, seniors, and families to preserve San Francisco's Chinatown as a thriving neighborhood where people can remain rooted in their community. Preserving our communities also means preserving the history that tells their stories.

The National Archives at San Francisco houses one of the nation's most significant collections documenting the Asian American experience, including Chinese Exclusion Act case files, Angel Island immigration records, World War II incarceration records, and landmark civil rights cases such as *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*. These records are indispensable resources for researchers, students, historians, community organizations, and families seeking to understand their own histories and the policies that shaped our communities. For immigrant communities like Chinatown, these archives represent more than historical documents, they are evidence of resilience, struggle, and the ongoing pursuit of justice. They provide an essential record of the experiences that continue to inform public policy discussions around immigration, civil rights, housing, and equity today.

Relocating these collections outside the Bay Area would create significant barriers for residents, scholars, educators, and community organizations who rely on direct access to these materials. The loss of a regional archive would weaken our collective ability to preserve, teach, and learn from the histories of communities that have too often been excluded from mainstream narratives.

CCDC appreciates the Board of Supervisors' leadership in advocating for the preservation of these vital public resources. We respectfully urge the Board to adopt this resolution and call upon NARA and Congress to maintain the National Archives at San Francisco and ensure that these irreplaceable records remain accessible to the communities whose histories they document.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Rosa Chen
Director of Planning and Policy
Chinatown Community Development Center

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sunshine Task Force.
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 4:12:00 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication.

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Douglas L Comstock <dougcomz@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 12:59 PM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Angela Alioto <angelaav@aol.com>; maxine anderson <chicagomax2003@yahoo.com>; Dennis Antenore <antenored@earthlink.net>; Phillip Babcock <phillip_babcock@hotmail.com>; Deetje Boler <Deetje@aol.com>; Margaret Brodtkin <mbrodtkin@colemanadvocates.org>; h. brown <hbrown41744@gmail.com>; Bruce Brugmann <brucebbrugmann@gmail.com>; Tab Buckner <tabb@skwsf.com>; Keith & Margaret Consoer <kconsoer@cs.com>; Arthur Evans <AEvans604@aol.com>; Ed Evans <tlwheels@earthlink.net>; Gabriel Haaland <gabriel.haaland@gmail.com>; Lee Heller <eisenberg.info@gmail.com>; Christian Holmer <xian@csrsf.com>; Dan Kelly <dkelly@muse.sfusd.k12.ca.us>; Daniella Kirshenbaum <kbaum88@yahoo.com>; Brad Kopp <starkraving17@yahoo.com>; Douglas Lam <lamcadcd@yahoo.com>; Ed Liu <eliu@pacbell.net>; Henry Louie <henrylouie@hotmail.com>; Clayton Mansfield <cmansfi007@aol.com>; Richard Marquez <magenda@energy-net.org>; Quintin Mecke <quintin3@earthlink.net>; Bruce Mirken <sftroubl@hooked.net>; David Pilpel <david.pilpel@sierraclub.org>; Vince Quackenbush <vquack@hotmail.com>; Jon Rainwater <jrainwater@ecovote.org>; Jim Rhoads <jimbob@igc.org>; Norm Rolfe <normrolfe@juno.com>; Criss Romero <elzpeedy@aol.com>; Marc Soloman <marc@cybre.net>; David Spero <blockhead@energy-net.org>; Starchild <dreamer@ziplink.net>; Howard Strassner <ruthow1@gmail.com>; Sean Sullivan <seangsullivan@yahoo.com>; Betty Traynor <btraynor@energy-net.org>; Kay Tsenin <rassors@sbcglobal.net>; Debra Walker <debrawalker@debrawalker.com>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Lopez-Weaver, Lindsey (BOS) <Lindsey.Lopez@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Patrick Monette Monette Shaw <pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>
Subject: Sunshine Task Force.

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

As someone who sat in on the creation of Prop G (in Angela Alioto's Law Office), which went to the voters in November 1999, and as someone who stood on street corners and collected over 1400 signatures to get it on the ballot, I object to interference from the Board or the Streamlining Task Force with the intent and implementation of the law as voters approved it.

Voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition G, a citizen-backed ballot measure that overhauled the original ordinance to give it "teeth," expanding public access to records and reinforcing the role of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force as an independent open-government watchdog.

Please restore the Task Force.

.....

Doug Comstock
415 845-5778
Westside Observer
westsideobserver.net

"There is no democracy without journalism. It can't be done."
... Scott Pelley

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: Ms. Somera, Ms. Calvillo? — Fwd: Urgent Action Needed by Rules Chair Shamann Walton: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and Holdover Appointments — Rules Committee Must Re-Instate SOTF Members Immediately
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 8:04:09 AM
Attachments: [Testimony_Rules_Committee_SOTF_and_Holdover_Appointments_26-07-13.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

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: pmonette-shaw <pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 7:31 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: Ms. Somera, Ms. Calvillo? — Fwd: Urgent Action Needed by Rules Chair Shamann Walton: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and Holdover Appointments — Rules Committee Must Re-Instate SOTF Members Immediately

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

Ms. Calvillo and Ms. Somera,

Since there was no specific agenda item number on the Rules Committee's Monday, July 13 meeting agenda to have posted this in a Rules Committee "public correspondence" file attached to an actual agenda item,, can you please post this testimony to the next full Board of Supervisors meeting agenda for July 21 as correspondence received by the Board of Supervisors on the meeting agenda section titled "Petitions and Communications" received this week.

Yopu would need to post only the PDF file, not the body of th e-mail, which is essentially a duplicate.

Please advise whether ypu can accommodate this request.

Thanks,
Patrick Monette-Shaw

----- Forwarded Message -----

Urgent Action Needed by Rules Chair Shamann Walton: Sunshine Ordinance
Subject: Task Force and Holdover Appointments — Rules Committee Must Re-Instate
SOTF Members Immediately

Date: Sun, 12 Jul 2026 21:52:34 -0700

From: pmonette-shaw <pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>

Reply-To: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

To: Connie.Chan@sfgov.org, Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org,
Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org, Alan.Wong@sfgov.org, Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org,
Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org, Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org,
Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org, Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org,
Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org

'Angela Calvillo' <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, Somera, Alisa (BOS)
CC: alisa.somera@sfgov.org, victor.young@sfgov.org, Percy.Burch@sfgov.org,
Tracy.Gallardo@sfgov.org, Natalie.Gee@sfgov.org, Lindsey.Lopez@sfgov.org,
waltonstaff@sfgov.org

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-

mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

July 13, 2026

Since the SOTF is **NOT** an 'Advisory Body,' but is a 'Regulatory Body' instead, it appears Ordinance #99-26 §5.1-5 on holdover service does **NOT** apply to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. *Period!*

End of story. The Streamlining Task Force knew this.

Rules Committee

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Shamann Walton, Chair

The Honorable Stephen Sherrill, Member

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Member

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

**Urgent: Sunshine
Ordinance Task Force and Holdover
Appointments — Rules Committee Must Re-
Instate SOTF Members Immediately**

Dear Chair Walton and Rules Committee Members,

It's totally unacceptable that San Francisco's Sunshine Ordinance Task Force — which ensures open meetings and improved access to public records, and adjudicates potential violations of San Francisco's Sunshine Ordinance or the California Brown Act — has been wrongly shut down due to an unforced error over its quorum.

The Rules Committee must take **urgent action** to return the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to its previous status before Ordinance #99-26 took effect on June 27, when the SOTF was improperly deemed in violation of not having a valid quorum in order to meet.

The holdover provisions in the just-passed Ordinance #99-26 was wrongly applied to the SOTF, for a number of reasons:

1. Board of Supervisors Lack Authority to Change Previous Voter-Approved Ordinances

On November 8, 2011, San Francisco voters rejected the then **Proposition E** that was on the ballot that proposed allowing the Board of Supervisors authority to amend or repeal voter initiatives and voter-initiated Ordinances that voters had previously passed. Because the Sunshine Ordinance is a voter-approved initiative Ordinance, the Board of Supervisors have **NO** authority to amend functionality of the SOTF by Ordinance and **without** approval by the voters.

Ordinance #99-26 — that became effective on June 29, 2026 fully 31 days after the Mayor signed the Ordinance into law on May 29 — can **NOT** simply change the SOTF holdover requirements via Ordinance. That would substantially change the SOTF, which can only be done by approval of the voters at the ballot box. And of note, the companion Commission Streamlining Charter Amendment just placed on the November 2026 ballot has not yet passed, so voters have **NOT** ceded authority to the Board of Supervisors or Mayor to change holdover rules for the SOTF via Ordinance.

2. **No Authority for “Retroactive” Application**

There is no language in Ordinance #99-26 that allows the change in holdover provisions to be applied **retroactively** to members of Boards and Commission who were appointed to governance or policy bodies **before** Ordinance #99-26 became effective. There are no provisions in Ordinance #99-26 that applies the new rules retroactively to SOTF members who had been appointed to the SOTF before passage of Ordinance #99-26, and who may have been serving in a holdover capacity. The word “*retroactive*” is nowhere to be found in Ordinance #99-26, and nowhere is “*retroactively*” applied to current members previously appointed who may be serving in a holdover capacity.

3. **The SOTF Is NOT An “Advisory Body” Subject to the Holdover Determination — It’s a “Regulatory Body”**

The SOTF was deemed by the Commission Streamlining Task Force to be a “*Regulatory Body*,” not an “*Advisory Body*,” as shown in the Streamlining Task Force’s internal assessment shown in Exhibit 1 on page 5 in this testimony.

As well, the Streamlining Task Force’s “[Commission Workbook](#)” list of the City’s 152 boards, commission’s, and advisory bodies (maintained in Microsoft Excel at Row #138, Column “M”, **Type Commission**) also states that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force is a “*Regulatory Body*,” not an “*Advisory Body*.”

Of note, page 7 of the 308-page Ordinance submitted by the Streamlining Task Force and passed as **Ordinance #99-26** by the Board of Supervisors explicitly states in §5.1-5, **Hold-Over Service**, that the “tenure of **a member of any Commission or Advisory Body** shall terminate no later than 60 days after the expiration of the member’s term.”

Since the SOTF is **NOT** an “*Advisory Body*,” but is a “*Regulatory Body*” instead, it appears Ordinance #99-26, §5.1-5 on holdover service does **NOT** apply to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, precisely because the SOTF is not an “*Advisory Body*” or a “*Commission*” created by the City Charter. *Period!* End of story. And nowhere in Ordinance #99-26 does it state that the holdover prohibition also applies to “*Regulatory Bodies*.”

“Since the SOTF is a Legislative Branch body created by a voter-initiative Ordinance, it makes no sense that the holdover standard developed for Charter bodies is being extended to non-Charter bodies.”

As well, the City’s Current Charter — since proposed Charter Amendments haven’t been put before voters yet proposed for November 2026 — clearly states in Charter §4.101.5, **Holdover Service by Board and Commission Members**, that the holdover restriction in the Charter applies **only** to members of Board Commissions, other bodies in the **executive branch**, or otherwise created in the Charter.

Since the SOTF is a **Legislative Branch** body, and since the SOTF was **NOT** created by the Charter, but was created by a voter-initiative Ordinance, it makes no sense that the holdover standard developed for Charter Commissions, but excludes Regulatory Bodies created by a Voter-Initiative Ordinance, is now being extended to non-Charter bodies.

4. **California Elections Code §9217 Supersedes and Precludes Ordinance #99-26:**

State Elections Code disallows any local or municipal agency from making amendments to any voter-approved ordinance. Elections Code §9217 states:

*“If a majority of the voters voting on a proposed ordinance vote in its favor, the ordinance shall become a valid and **binding** ordinance of the City. The ordinance shall be considered as adopted upon the date that the vote is declared by the legislative body, and shall go into effect 10 days after that date. **No ordinance ... adopted by the voters, shall be repealed or amended, except by a vote of the people, unless provision is otherwise made in the original ordinance.**”*

Therefore, the Board of Supervisors, and in particular, the Rules Committee, must overturn imposition of Ordinance #99-26 §5.1-5, **Hold-Over Service**, and restore the holdover provisions to the SOTF members who were wrongly removed from the Sunshine Task Force, and allow the SOTF to resume meeting with its full quorum, immediately!

5. **Sunshine Ordinance §67.36 Supersedes and Precludes Ordinance #99-26**

It is indisputable that Sunshine Ordinance §67.36, *Supersedes Other Local Laws* — which has been continuously in effect for just shy of three decades — clearly supersedes the newly enacted Ordinance #99-26. The Sunshine Ordinance — as a voter-initiated Ordinance that can **only be changed by voters**, not by an Ordinance enacted by the Board of Supervisors — clearly states in §67.36:

“The provisions of this Sunshine Ordinance supersede other local laws. Whenever a conflict in local law is identified, the requirement which would result in greater or more expedited public access to public information shall apply.”
(Added by Proposition G, 11/2/99)

Ms. Kittler, and the full the Streamlining Task Force’s should all have known that the Ordinance they submitted to the Board of Supervisors on March 2, 2026 could not simply change the holdover provisions for the SOTF via an Ordinance!

Indeed, as recently as May 20, 2014, during a Board of Supervisors meeting discussing appointments to the SOTF, Supervisor Jane Kim asked about quorum regarding holdovers. Then Deputy City Attorney Jon Givner who was advising the Board of Supervisors — and who is now the City Attorney’s Chief Assistant City Attorney, and the principal author of Ordinance #99-26 — replied to Supervisor Kim that the SOTF is not governed under the Charter. The [audiotape](#) of that meeting indicates Givner replied (at 2:46:00 on tape counter):

*“I believe there are several [Sunshine Ordinance Task Force] members whose, whose terms have, have ended who are holding over, which is **allowed under the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force**, but not under certain charter created committees ... commissions.”*

6. **Ordinance #99-26 Wrongly Altered Streamlining Task Force’s Decision on Holdover Provision**

As the meeting Commission Streamlining Task Force’s November 19, 2025 its [meeting minutes](#) document that during an agenda item discussing “**Applying Certain Charter Provisions to Additional Bodies**,” Streamlining Task Force member Sophia Kittler introduced a motion to:

“For Kittler’s motion, there was no mention of why Charter §4.101.5 was being applied to non-Charter bodies created by Ordinance in the Administrative Code or other codes.”

“Apply a standard 60-day holdover provision (Charter Section 4.101.5) to all bodies for which the Task Force has defined member terms.”

Kittler’s motion was seconded and it passed unanimously. However, there was no mention of why Charter §4.101.5 was being applied to non-Charter bodies created by Ordinance in the Administrative Code or other codes.

Separately, the Streamlining Task Force’s “[Decision Log](#)” — a document created to record the decisions made by the Commission Streamlining Task Force, and created in part to assist writing subsequent legislation — specifically includes an entry dated November 19, 2025 that states “*Apply the 60-day holdover provision to apply to all **decision-making and advisory bodies.***”

So, the “*Decision Log*” did not accurately and faithfully record the motion Kittler had introduced, and instead the “*Decision Log*” entry specifically states it does not apply to “**all bodies**” the Task Force had defined member terms for, but applied only to “**decision-making and advisory bodies.**”

And of more interest, §5.1-5, **Hold-Over Service** further deviated from the motion Kittler had introduced and passed because the Ordinance does not state “*all bodies the Task Force had defined member terms*” for, or mirror the language of the “*Decision Log*” that the holdover restriction applies to “*decision-making bodies,*” but because the actual language in Ordinance #99-26 used “*the tenure of a member of any **Commission or Advisory Body** shall terminate no later than 60 days after the expiration of the member’s term.*”

7. **Exception for One Body Not Applied Equitably to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force**

Finally, the Streamlining Task Force’s December 12, 2025 [meeting minutes](#) carved out an exception to the holdover rule, but only for the Refuse Rate Board (RRB). Streamlining Task Force Vice Chair Bruss stated that for the RRB it made sense to add “*an exception to the holdover provision to **prevent gaps in service.** She explained that the holdover exception is important given the timing of [refuse] rate cycles.*”

Given the variable timing involved when San Franciscans may file Sunshine Ordinance complaints regarding potential violations of San Francisco’s Sunshine Ordinance or the California Brown Act to the SOTF for adjudication, the Streamlining Task Force could have — and should have — created a similar exception for holdover service on the SOTF as it had for the RRB!

The Rules Committee must take **urgent action** to return the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to its previous status before Ordinance #99-26 took effect on June 27, when the SOTF was improperly deemed in violation of not having a valid quorum in order to meet.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Patrick Monette-Shaw

Columnist/Reporter

Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee

The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1

The Honorable Danny Sauter, Supervisor, District 3

The Honorable Alan Wong, Supervisor, District 4

The Honorable Bilal Mahmood, District 5

The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6

The Honorable Myrna Melgar, District 7

The Honorable Jackie Fielder, Supervisor, District 9

The Honorable Chyanne Chen, District 11

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6

San Francisco, CA 94109

Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

July 13, 2026

Rules Committee

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Shamann Walton, Chair

The Honorable Stephen Sherrill, Member

The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Member

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

“ Since the SOTF is **NOT** an ‘*Advisory Body*,’ but is a ‘*Regulatory Body*’ instead, it appears Ordinance #99-26 §5.1-5 on holdover service does NOT apply to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. *Period!*

End of story. The Streamlining Task Force knew this.”

Urgent: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and Holdover Appointments — Rules Committee Must Re-Instate SOTF Members Immediately

Dear Chair Walton and Rules Committee Members,

It’s totally unacceptable that San Francisco’s Sunshine Ordinance Task Force — which ensures open meetings and improved access to public records, and adjudicates potential violations of San Francisco’s Sunshine Ordinance or the California Brown Act — has been wrongly shut down due to an unforced error over its quorum.

The Rules Committee must take **urgent action** to return the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to its previous status before Ordinance #99-26 took effect on June 27, when the SOTF was improperly deemed in violation of not having a valid quorum in order to meet.

The holdover provisions in the just-passed Ordinance #99-26 was wrongly applied to the SOTF, for a number of reasons:

1. Board of Supervisors Lack Authority to Change Previous Voter-Approved Ordinances

On November 8, 2011, San Francisco voters rejected the then **Proposition E** that was on the ballot that proposed allowing the Board of Supervisors authority to amend or repeal voter initiatives and voter-initiated Ordinances that voters had previously passed. Because the Sunshine Ordinance is a voter-approved initiative Ordinance, the Board of Supervisors have **NO** authority to amend functionality of the SOTF by Ordinance and **without** approval by the voters.

Ordinance #99-26 — that became effective on June 29, 2026 fully 31 days after the Mayor signed the Ordinance into law on May 29 — can **NOT** simply change the SOTF holdover requirements via Ordinance. That would substantially change the SOTF, which can only be done by approval of the voters at the ballot box. And of note, the companion Commission Streamlining Charter Amendment just placed on the November 2026 ballot has not yet passed, so voters have **NOT** ceded authority to the Board of Supervisors or Mayor to change holdover rules for the SOTF via Ordinance.

2. No Authority for “Retroactive” Application

There is no language in Ordinance #99-26 that allows the change in holdover provisions to be applied **retroactively** to members of Boards and Commission who were appointed to governance or policy bodies **before** Ordinance #99-26 became effective. There are no provisions in Ordinance #99-26 that applies the new rules retroactively to SOTF members who had been appointed to the SOTF before passage of Ordinance #99-26, and who may have been serving in a holdover capacity. The word “*retroactive*” is nowhere to be found in Ordinance #99-26, and nowhere is “*retroactively*” applied to current members previously appointed who may be serving in a holdover capacity.

3. The SOTF Is NOT An “Advisory Body” Subject to the Holdover Determination — It’s a “Regulatory Body”

The SOTF was deemed by the Commission Streamlining Task Force to be a “*Regulatory Body*,” not an “*Advisory Body*,” as shown in the Streamlining Task Force’s internal assessment shown in Exhibit 1 on page 5 in this testimony.

As well, the Streamlining Task Force’s “[Commission Workbook](#)” list of the City’s 152 boards, commission’s, and advisory bodies (maintained in Microsoft Excel at Row #138, Column “M”, **Type Commission**) also states that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force is a “*Regulatory Body*,” not an “*Advisory Body*.”

Of note, page 7 of the 308-page Ordinance submitted by the Streamlining Task Force and passed as [Ordinance #99-26](#)

by the Board of Supervisors explicitly states in §5.1-5, **Hold-Over Service**, that the “tenure of **a member of any Commission or Advisory Body** shall terminate no later than 60 days after the expiration of the member’s term.”

Since the SOTF is **NOT** an “Advisory Body, but is a “Regulatory Body” instead, it appears Ordinance #99-26, §5.1-5 on holdover service does **NOT** apply to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, precisely because the SOTF is not an “Advisory Body” or a “Commission” created by the City Charter. *Period!* End of story. And nowhere in Ordinance #99-26 does it state that the holdover prohibition also applies to “Regulatory Bodies.”

As well, the City’s Current Charter — since proposed Charter Amendments haven’t been put before voters yet proposed for November 2026 — clearly states in Charter §4.101.5, **Holdover Service by Board and Commission Members**, that the holdover restriction in the Charter applies **only** to members of Board Commissions, other bodies in the **executive branch**, or otherwise created in the Charter.

Since the SOTF is a **Legislative Branch** body, and since the SOTF was **NOT** created by the Charter, but was created by a voter-initiative Ordinance, it makes no sense that the holdover standard developed for Charter Commissions, but excludes Regulatory Bodies created by a Voter-Initiative Ordinance, is now being extended to non-Charter bodies.

“ Since the SOTF is a Legislative Branch body created by a voter-initiative Ordinance, it makes no sense that the holdover standard developed for Charter bodies is being extended to non-Charter bodies.”

4. California Elections Code §9217 Supersedes and Precludes Ordinance #99-26:

State Elections Code disallows any local or municipal agency from making amendments to any voter-approved ordinance. Elections Code §9217 states:

*“If a majority of the voters voting on a proposed ordinance vote in its favor, the ordinance shall become a valid and **binding** ordinance of the City. The ordinance shall be considered as adopted upon the date that the vote is declared by the legislative body, and shall go into effect 10 days after that date. **No ordinance ... adopted by the voters, shall be repealed or amended, except by a vote of the people, unless provision is otherwise made in the original ordinance.**”*

Therefore, the Board of Supervisors, and in particular, the Rules Committee, must overturn imposition of Ordinance #99-26 §5.1-5, **Hold-Over Service**, and restore the holdover provisions to the SOTF members who were wrongly removed from the Sunshine Task Force, and allow the SOTF to resume meeting with its full quorum, immediately!

5. Sunshine Ordinance §67.36 Supersedes and Precludes Ordinance #99-26

It is indisputable that Sunshine Ordinance §67.36, *Supersedes Other Local Laws* — which has been continuously in effect for just shy of three decades — clearly supersedes the newly enacted Ordinance #99-26. The Sunshine Ordinance — as a voter-initiated Ordinance that can **only be changed by voters**, not by an Ordinance enacted by the Board of Supervisors — clearly states in §67.36:

“The provisions of this Sunshine Ordinance supersede other local laws. Whenever a conflict in local law is identified, the requirement which would result in greater or more expedited public access to public information shall apply.” (Added by Proposition G, 11/2/99)

Ms. Kittler, and the full the Streamlining Task Force’s should all have known that the Ordinance they submitted to the Board of Supervisors on March 2, 2026 could not simply change the holdover provisions for the SOTF via an Ordinance!

Indeed, as recently as May 20, 2014, during a Board of Supervisors meeting discussing appointments to the SOTF, Supervisor Jane Kim asked about quorum regarding holdovers. Then Deputy City Attorney Jon Givner who was advising the Board of Supervisors — and who is now the City Attorney’s Chief Assistant City Attorney, and the principal author of Ordinance #99-26 — replied to Supervisor Kim that the SOTF is not governed under the Charter. The [audiotape](#) of that meeting indicates Givner replied (at 2:46:00 on tape counter):

*“I believe there are several [Sunshine Ordinance Task Force] members whose, whose terms have, have ended who are holding over, which is **allowed under the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force**, but not under certain charter created committees ... commissions.”*

6. **Ordinance #99-26 Wrongly Altered Streamlining Task Force’s Decision on Holdover Provision**

As the meeting Commission Streamlining Task Force’s November 19, 2025 its [meeting minutes](#) document that during an agenda item discussing “**Applying Certain Charter Provisions to Additional Bodies**,” Streamlining Task Force member Sophia Kittler introduced a motion to:

“Apply a standard 60-day holdover provision (Charter Section 4.101.5) to all bodies for which the Task Force has defined member terms.”

Kittler’s motion was seconded and it passed unanimously. However, there was no mention of why Charter §4.101.5 was being applied to non-Charter bodies created by Ordinance in the Administrative Code or other codes.

“ For Kittler’s **motion**, there was no mention of why Charter §4.101.5 was being applied to non-Charter bodies created by Ordinance in the Administrative Code or other codes. ”

Separately, the Streamlining Task Force’s “[Decision Log](#)” — a document created to record the decisions made by the Commission Streamlining Task Force, and created in part to assist writing subsequent legislation — specifically includes an entry dated November 19, 2025 that states “*Apply the 60-day holdover provision to apply to all **decision-making and advisory bodies**.*”

So, the “*Decision Log*” did not accurately and faithfully record the motion Kittler had introduced, and instead the “*Decision Log*” entry specifically states it does not apply to “**all bodies**” the Task Force had defined member terms for, but applied only to “**decision-making and advisory bodies**.”

And of more interest, §5.1-5, **Hold-Over Service** further deviated from the motion Kittler had introduced and passed because the Ordinance does not state “*all bodies the Task Force had defined member terms*” for, or mirror the language of the “*Decision Log*” that the holdover restriction applies to “*decision-making bodies*,” but because the actual language in Ordinance #99-26 used “*the tenure of a member of any **Commission or Advisory Body** shall terminate no later than 60 days after the expiration of the member’s term.*”

7. **Exception for One Body Not Applied Equitably to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force**

Finally, the Streamlining Task Force’s December 12, 2025 [meeting minutes](#) carved out an exception to the holdover rule, but only for the Refuse Rate Board (RRB). Streamlining Task Force Vice Chair Bruss stated that for the RRB it made sense to add “*an exception to the holdover provision to **prevent gaps in service**. She explained that the holdover exception is important given the timing of [refuse] rate cycles.*”

Given the variable timing involved when San Franciscans may file Sunshine Ordinance complaints regarding potential violations of San Francisco’s Sunshine Ordinance or the California Brown Act to the SOTF for adjudication, the Streamlining Task Force could have — and should have — created a similar exception for holdover service on the SOTF as it had for the RRB!

The Rules Committee must take **urgent action** to return the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to its previous status before Ordinance #99-26 took effect on June 27, when the SOTF was improperly deemed in violation of not having a valid quorum in order to meet.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Patrick Monette-Shaw

Columnist/Reporter

Westside Observer Newspaper

July 13 2026

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and Holdover Appointments

Page 4

cc: Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1
The Honorable Danny Sauter, Supervisor, District 3
The Honorable Alan Wong, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Bilal Mahmood, District 5
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, District 7
The Honorable Jackie Fielder, Supervisor, District 9
The Honorable Chyanne Chen, District 11

Exhibit 1: Commission Streamlining Task Force:
Criteria-Based Outcomes and Associated Analysis for General Administration and Finance Bodies
Page 94

94 | Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (Board of Supervisors) | Policy Area: Public Integrity

23. Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (Board of Supervisors)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep

Notes:

- Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	BOS	Established	1993
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	22
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 1 vacancy (9%)
Annual Cost	\$300k ¹⁹⁴		

Hears violations of the Sunshine Ordinance. Advises the Board of Supervisors and provides information to City departments on appropriate ways in which to implement the Sunshine Ordinance to ensure that deliberations of commissions and other agencies of the City and County are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review ([Administrative Code § 67.3](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁹⁵	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁹⁷	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ¹⁹⁸	Consider combining or eliminating

¹⁹⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁹⁵ Ethics Commission

¹⁹⁷ Sunshine Ordinance

¹⁹⁸ Ethics Commission

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: SF Department of Emergency Management: Why has Mary Ellen Carroll Created a new Job for her friend Adrienne Bechelli at DEM in the midst of so many layoffs
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 10:46:56 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the Department of Emergency Management (DEM).

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: sunnydisposition <sunnydispositionLT@pm.me>
 Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 10:18 AM
 To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; union21@ifpte21.org; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>
 Subject: SF Department of Emergency Management: Why has Mary Ellen Carroll Created a new Job for her friend Adrienne Bechelli at DEM in the midst of so many layoffs

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

Why has Mary Ellen Carroll created a brand new deputy director position for Adrienne Bechelli? After all the people that she laid off from DEM and UASI? In the light of the layoffs, MEC has the audacity to create a new, unnecessary position for her friend Adrienne Bechelli? Why?

In light of all the people laid off. In light of the families they are destroying, these two have the gall to create a new job out of thin air for Adrienne?!?! This new position would have Adrienne overseeing other deputy directors and a general manager. These people do not need a manager -- that is MEC's job. Mary Ellen created this job out of thin air just to keep Adrienne employed. This is absolutely unacceptable behavior. What an insult and slap in the face it is to all the employees MEC let go.

Why have these two been allowed to abuse and manipulate the system for their own gains for so long?!?
I don't know what hold Adrienne has over Mary Ellen, but their cronyism has gone on for far too long.

What is this "new" position costing the residents of San Francisco during the supposed budget crisis where we are trying to find savings through cutbacks to social programs and jobs? \$200, 000? \$300,000?

This is what I know so far:

Players:

Adrienne Bechelli: AB

Mary Ellen Carroll: MEC

Phil Arnold

Monique Zmuda

(How are they all related, outside of work?)

AB's father is Phil Arnold who was Rec Park assistant general manager, acting director of the SF Zoo, financial planner at PUC, and CFO for HSA.

AB's mother is Monique Z'muda, a former deputy city controller.

MEC came from PUC, where she may have worked for/alongside AB's dad. It is also said that Monique Zmuda was MEC's mentor for some time. I don't have proof of this, it is what I have heard from others who have known MEC for a long time.

Look at MEC's meteoric rise in classifications on transparent California. In 2011 she jumped from case manager technician to a manager iv.

AB has been "promoted" ever since her first administrative analyst job in 2017. Since then, she has been appointed to positions in DEM and UASI that we all believe she has had zero experience for.

Again, look at transparent California to see her unprecedented, rapid rise through city jobs and compensation. In 2017 (earliest record) she went from an admin analyst (1822(?)) to, in 2018, Planner III (5291) to, in 2019, a manager II (0923) to, in 2020, when she became a deputy director IV (0954) and essentially doubled her salary in three years. Im not saying that this cant be done, in the private world for sure, but it is so unlikely for this to happen in the SF government that i am shocked that no one else has said anything. A deputy director iv (0954 classification) has responsibility for the direction of a major division or bureau in a large city department (800-2000 employees). This is not the type of position that someone in their 20's would ever get (AB was born in 1991).

How is this possible? Where is the experience? Transparent California has her latest entry at a total of \$371,000 (salary plus benefits) -- which is more than triple her salary in 7 years.

The latest fraud was AB's appointment to be the general Manger of UASI. She has minimal experience with federal contracts, funding, or grants. The rumor is that MEC saw that future cuts to DEM were coming, and MEC fired the past UASI general manager without notice and AB was quickly appointed to lead the UASI division in September 2024. In May 2025, AB was removed from a sinking UASI "ship" to appoint her to a mayor's street assessment group. MEC said that the mayor specifically asked for AB and that AB couldn't stay to continue leading UASI, bc according to MEC, "what the mayor wants, the mayor gets." It is doubtful to me that the mayor even knew who AB was.

In addition, there are much more qualified people to take on this position, specifically Sam Dodge, who has been doing this job for years. The rumor is that AB will be making more than she is now (\$371,000). How is this saving

the city money? Absolute corruption and backroom dealing. I am not by any means saying that the Mayor is aware of this. But he is being used by MEC to protect her closest allies.

About one month before AB left, they “promoted” Mikyung (MKM) to the number two position. Now MKM is the interim general manager. The group of MEC, AB, and MKM are very close. MKM apparently worked for AB’s father. This group of people are not only close within work, but they are also very close outside of the work space (MEC attended MKM's wedding).

This past September, MEC told all UASI staff that they should look out for themselves and start looking for new jobs bc the federal government was pulling their funding. I believe that MEC had seen this coming and pulled out AB before it all went south, thus leaving the UASI division rudderless.

Its worth noting that in AB’s time at UASI, nothing was accomplished. It was juist a placeholder for her to hide from the possibility that the incoming mayor was going to include her in his cutbacks at DEM.

I am reporting this because I am tired of seeing greed, corruption and cronyism run rampant through the city. Not only that, but they are destroying people's lives as they go -- specifically the entire staff of UASI. These people (MEC and AB) are not civil servants. They are parasites who look out only for themselves and remove themselves from any accountability of the lives they ruin as they proceed. They are an embarrassment and disappointment to those who struggle daily to serve their divisions/departments and the citizens of San Francisco.

In November MEC lied to the city attorney that the UASI approval authority could not meet because they did not have a quorum, when in truth she wanted the meeting rescheduled so that she could go on vacation. These meetings are supposed to occur regardless if MEC can be there or not. If she cannot make it then she is to send her deputy director (MKM) in her place.

The latest abuse is that apparently AB did not approve of the physical location of the office she received from the Mayor, as a member his new streets team, on the bottom floor of City Hall. AB complains to MEC about her new office not living up to her standards, and MEC kicks the current DEM deputy director out of her office and forces her to move to another office so that AB can have her old DEM office back.

AB then had the audacity to ask DEM staff (no longer a department she works for) to write justifications for why her Streets Team staff should all have managerial positions. Again, another blatant abuse of her position and an unjustified request to increase her staff's compensation in a time where the Mayor's office is looking to create cutbacks and save taxpayer dollars.

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: Statement on Civic Dialogue in Hayes Valley
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 12:15:20 PM
Attachments: [Hayes Valley Civic Dialogue Statement 07142026.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding Hayes Valley.

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: HVS <team@hvsafe.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 3:06 PM
To: Tang, Katy (ECN) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; DPW, (DPW) <dpw@sfdpw.org>; FireAdministration, FIR (FIR) <fireadministration@sfgov.org>; McCormick, Patrick (POL) <Patrick.McCormick@sfgov.org>; SFPD Northern Station, (POL) <sfpdnorthernstation@sfgov.org>; Silva, Christine (MTA) <Christine.Silva@sfmta.com>; Simpliciano, Sophia (MTA) <Sophia.Simpliciano@sfmta.com>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; MTABoard <MTABoard@sfmta.com>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Polselli, Angelina (MYR) <angelina.polselli@sfgov.org>; Sider, Dan (CPC) <dan.sider@sfgov.org>; Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC) <sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS)

<matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Thompson, Marianne (ECN) <marianne.thompson@sfgov.org>; Garcia, Moises (MYR) <moises.garcia@sfgov.org>; Jones, Ej (MYR) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>; Mayor, MYR (MYR) <mayor@sfgov.org>; Sweet, Alexandra (MTA) <Alexandra.Sweet@sfmta.com>; Ketcham, Dana (REC) <dana.ketcham@sfgov.org>; eric.anderson@sfgov.org; Short, Carla (DPW) <Carla.Short@sfdpw.org>; Walsh, Ryan (POL) <ryan.walsh@sfgov.org>; VanHouten, Ben (ECN) <ben.vanhouten@sfgov.org>; MYR Comm Affairs Staff <moca@sfgov.org>

Cc: Hayes Valley Safe Team <team@hvsafe.com>; team <team@hvsba.org>

Subject: Statement on Civic Dialogue in Hayes Valley

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

Good afternoon,

Attached is our statement on the current state of civic dialogue surrounding the Hayes Street closure and related public processes.

This statement is not submitted as a request for action. It is intended to document broader concerns regarding civic engagement, public participation, and the condition of civic dialogue in Hayes Valley.

Thank you for your attention to this statement.

Respectfully,
Hayes Valley Safe (HVS)



hayesvalleysf.com



info@hvsafe.com



Hayes Valley • San Francisco, California

A Community Should Never Come to This

A Statement on Civic Dialogue in Hayes Valley

For more than five years, we have participated in Hayes Valley through the ordinary channels of civic life. We attended meetings, submitted comments, met with City officials, documented conditions, proposed alternatives, and continued to engage because we believed that healthy neighborhoods are built through open dialogue, mutual respect, and the willingness to consider more than one point of view.

Over time, we have watched something else emerge.

Healthy communities do not require unanimous agreement. They require confidence that different viewpoints can be expressed openly, considered fairly, and debated respectfully. They depend on dialogue—not because everyone reaches the same conclusion, but because every resident, business, and community member knows they have a legitimate place in the conversation.

We believe that civic confidence has steadily eroded in Hayes Valley.

Communities do not become this divided overnight.

This past weekend, as part of a public information campaign, an informational poster was placed on the sidewalk along the 500 block of Hayes Street. Within hours, it was intentionally torn down. The incident was recorded. When asked why, the individual responsible reportedly answered simply:

"I don't agree."

This statement is not about one poster.

It is about what that moment revealed.

What concerns us is the condition of civic dialogue that such a response reflects.

This did not happen in isolation. It follows years of increasingly strained civic engagement around the Hayes Street closure. Residents and businesses seeking to restore the street as a functioning public thoroughfare have repeatedly encountered a pattern that goes well beyond

ordinary disagreement. Community communication has become one-sided. Opportunities for real dialogue have narrowed. Public processes have left many questioning whether differing viewpoints are genuinely valued. Community resources meant to serve everyone have too often become symbols of division rather than inclusion. At one point, the permit holder of the Hayes Street closure sought a civil harassment restraining order against a resident engaged in civic documentation of the operation of the street closure and its permit conditions—an effort to stop the recording and reporting of conditions on a public right-of-way. Now even public information intended to invite discussion is met with destruction rather than conversation.

Many residents and businesses now share their views privately rather than publicly—a clear sign of eroded confidence in the neighborhood’s civic climate. This environment did not appear overnight. It developed through years of missed opportunities to broaden dialogue and keep differing viewpoints at the table. Those who operate publicly permitted activities, administer public programs, and hold elected office all share responsibility for preserving civic trust. Too often that responsibility has not been met.

Leadership is measured not simply by advancing projects, but by ensuring that people with different perspectives continue to feel heard, respected, and welcome at the same table.

Too often, that has not been our experience.

Perhaps most troubling is that all of this surrounds a single block of one neighborhood street.

It never should have reached this point. That alone should give all of us pause.

No organization owns Hayes Valley.

No permit holder owns Hayes Valley.

No elected official owns Hayes Valley.

No single viewpoint owns Hayes Valley.

The neighborhood belongs equally to every resident, every business, and every member of the community who cares enough to participate in its future.

Healthy dialogue requires more than the opportunity to speak. It requires confidence that differing viewpoints will be heard with respect. Rebuilding that confidence is now one of Hayes Valley’s most urgent civic challenges.

We place this statement into the public record because communities rarely recognize these moments while they are still unfolding. Hayes Valley is at such a moment.

A community should never come to this.

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: Requesting a meeting about Crocker Amazon
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:58:06 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication 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: Imani Jaldin Hartsough <i_jaldinhartsough@u.pacific.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 8:05 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Requesting a meeting about Crocker Amazon

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I would like a meeting with you folks about Crocker Amazon Park.

I live in Glen Park and work for Enterprise for Youth. I am the Program Assistant for a team of 25 interns who have been working on weeding, mulching, and field maintenance at Crocker Amazon this summer.

I am not a big fan of grass, but I do love trees, and cutting down a hundred of them doesn't sit right with me. We've seen hawks who live in the trees on multiple occasions. And the trees have provided shade for passersby and us while we work.

If this goes through, please confirm that there will be no forever chemicals in the fake grass kids play on. Not much will be able to be done about the microplastics that break off and end up in the water table.

In general, paying for fences does not appeal to me; I think public land belongs to the public. I would also like a promise that the gate will not be locked.

Another thing that will negatively impact neighboring humans and animals is the light pollution you are suggesting until 10 pm.

Also, before anything like this goes forward, I would like an Environmental Impact report so that we have more than speculation.

Thank you,

Imani

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: SF Centre mall
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 10:01:53 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding the San Francisco Centre.

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: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 1:52 PM
To: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Centre mall

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

Supervisor Dorsey, Full SF BOS, Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I know the SF Board of Supervisors has no control over the sale of the SF Centre property. However, I would like to enlighten you all on why San Francisco elected officials could and should be more aggressive about this property's future. First, I must state, the San Francisco Chronicle had no problem outing Oliver Sipple but they have no interest in honoring this San Francisco hero. I wrote an Opinion piece on what San Francisco should do with the SF Centre mall property and the declined to run the piece. I only ask that you read my 900-word suggestion:

San Francisco Chronicle "[Exclusive](#): Buyers walk away from S.F. Centre deal, sending shuttered mall back to market," July 8, 2026, should be a call to action for San Francisco. It's time to restore our hope and pride by transforming this space into something that unites us-like a heroism-themed museum as the anchor tenant in this mall.

I am a longtime resident of San Francisco (1960). A week before I graduated from John O'Connell High School in 1975, my drafting teacher of 3 years said to me, "Allen, you will never get a drafting job." I could hear the same type of people saying something like that to me about what I believe San Francisco should do with the SF Centre Mall.

From my perspective on the conversation, my drafting teacher was not challenging me. But I did take on the challenge. Less than 24 hours after graduating from high school, I had a drafting job and stayed in the profession for 20 years.

A few other things happened in 1975 that make me confident that turning the San Francisco Center Mall into an anchor tenant for a museum dedicated to heroes of the world will not only bring people back to this mall but also remind the world again, why it is "Everyone's favorite city."

How many school-aged children know that Oliver Sipple, a disabled Vietnam veteran, saved President Gerald R. Ford's life outside the St. Francis hotel at Union Square on September 22, 1975?

San Francisco owes the late Oliver Sipple a lot. But for more than fifty years, his heroic story has been buried for the strangest reason, he was homosexual. In 2010, I learned of Oliver Sipple while researching a project and was shocked to discover how a hero could be so disrespected and dishonored simply because he was homosexual in of all places, San Francisco. Yes, I am saying the museum should bear his name. [BOS RESOLUTION 110162](#)

The world is full of heroes. Their innate humility should be respected when they choose not to make a big deal of their heroics. However, I would argue they are the best teachers of what we all need to be as citizens of this world. And because we all need teachers, I do not doubt that these heroes would humbly help us all become better citizens simply by allowing us to tell their stories in a museum.

The one person who comes to mind is Captain Chesley "Sully" Sullenberger III, a now-retired US Airways pilot. On January 15, 2009, he, along with his co-pilot, Jeffrey Skiles, successfully landed their Airbus A320-214 on what became known as the "Miracle on the Hudson," in which all 155 passengers and crew survived after geese struck the engines, causing the plane to lose power.

The Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum is now home to that plane, which, for the past 17 years or so, has inspired many youngsters to choose aviation as a career.

While many projects face challenges, the key goal for this mall should be to create a portion of the mall where people can teach, learn, and be inspired by heroics from people all over the world.

I also read that part of the issue with this mall involves the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) land interest. It owns a 75,675-square-foot lot beneath the mall. I cannot imagine SFUSD wanting nothing to do with educating its students by using a portion of the mall as a classroom for children all over the city to participate in, helping to create exhibits based on the true stories of heroism they researched and are allowed to bring forth with their art talents while at the same time making a modest profit for SFUSD.

Only the most inspiring stories should be displayed, but a panel of San Franciscans can be called upon to do the hard work of selecting the most inspirational stories to be turned into exhibits.

I was sitting on my couch one day and watching the news. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors was honoring someone whom I know. This man was riding his bike on Market Street and saw a woman go into labor. He helped deliver the baby. But why was I in tears listening to this story? This same man was still mourning from the time he learned his wife and daughter had died in a car accident months earlier.

None of us knows when we will be called on to be a hero. But I do hear the call to save this mall. But because there are so many like my high school drafting teacher, it will be hard for me to see the same look on their faces like I saw on my drafting teacher's face.

Before summer break, I went into his classroom as a high school graduate during the final week of school to tell my teacher, "I got a drafting job." He was shocked but happy for me, as he announced it to that class to inspire the seniors for the next semester.

Ironically, and thanks to a teacher from the San Francisco Unified School District, I learned that a goofball and a hero can share something in common.

Allen Jones
jones-allen@att.net
(415) 756-7733
californiaclemency.org

The only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it. -- Allen Jones --

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: URGENT - 2 People Shot at Mayes Oyster Bar Last Night
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:59:26 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication from Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects.

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 <julien.defrance@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 12, 2026 9:06 AM
To: danny@dannyd3.com; DPW, (DPW) <dpw@sfdpw.org>; info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; SFPD Northern Station, (POL) <sfpdnorthernstation@sfgov.org>; McCormick, Patrick (POL) <Patrick.McCormick@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; Chris Schulman <cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; SFPD, Chief (POL) <sfpdchief@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS)

<DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; McCormick, Patrick (POL) <Patrick.McCormick@sfgov.org>; SFPD Northern Station, (POL) <sfpdnorthernstation@sfgov.org>; Info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com; Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>

Subject: URGENT - 2 People Shot at Mayes Oyster Bar Last Night

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

Another Saturday. Another shit show in the neighborhood.

It isn't the first time. It likely won't be the last. We just can't have that.

<https://go.citizen.com/0q7lHvjxl4b>

We need our streets patrolled, regularly, day and night, by SFPD officers (not community workers) who'd actually be able to make immediate arrests in situations like these.

Between the illegal homeless encampments, drug dealers, crackheads, all the trash/filth, and now this... The sanitary and safety conditions of our streets, especially, once again, in Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill are beyond unacceptable.

In our liberal city and state, and with our 2nd amendment constantly under attack, law abiding citizens, unfortunately aren't armed. Only the scum gets to carry guns, leaving the rest of us totally defenseless.

This needs to change.

What's your proposed detailed plan of action?

Please advise.

JD.

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: FW: Written Comment regarding File No. 260469 (July 21, 2026 Board of Supervisors Meeting)
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 9:45:10 AM
Attachments: [7.14.26 Letter to SFBOS re DT CBD.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication regarding **File No. 260469:**

Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on July 21, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., to consider renewal and expansion of a property-based business improvement district, known as the Downtown Community Benefit District, pursuant to the California Property and Business Improvement District Law of 1994 (Streets and Highways Code, Sections 36600 et seq.), and City and County of San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, Article 15; scheduled pursuant to Resolution No. 295-26 (File No. 260466); adopted on May 19, 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.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: Mike Astanahe <mikeastanehe@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 1:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR)

<daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>

Subject: Written Comment regarding File No. 260469 (July 21, 2026 Board of Supervisors Meeting)

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

Hello,

Please see the attached.

I also sent you a copy of the letter via the U.S. Mail.

From,

Michael Astanehe

Attachment

MICHAEL M. ASTANEHE

50 California Street, 15th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111 | | mikeastanehe@gmail.com

July 14, 2026

Angela Calvillo
CLERK OF THE BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244 & 250
San Francisco, California 94102

P | | (415) 554-5184
E | | board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

To Angela Calvillo,

On July 14, 2026, I received a Notice of Public Hearing related to File No. 260469 regarding the renewal and expansion of the Downtown Community Benefit District ("DCBD"). I write in support of the expansion and renewal of the DCBD.

As someone who frequently walks, bikes, and drives through downtown, as well as operates a small business in the downtown area, I greatly enjoy and appreciate the benefits and work that the DCBD and its employees undertake every day. Their presence has improved the quality of life in the area. Their presence not only makes the downtown area safer, but they also improve the area by cleaning up trash and removing graffiti, which are both problems that have longed plagued the Financial District and surrounding areas. I frequently see them hard at work sweeping and cleaning, and notice an improvement due to their presence. I support their presence in the area.

Therefore, I respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors approves this Legislation so that the Mayor may sign it into law.¹

Thank you!

¹ I hope that the Mayor does not veto the Legislation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael M. Astanehe".

Michael M. Astanehe

Cc: Mayor Daniel Lurie (via email at daniel.lurie@sfgov.org)
Supervisor Danny Sauter (via email at sauterstaff@sfgov.org)
The San Francisco Board of Supervisors (via email at
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)

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: Renatta Harrison
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 10:20:03 AM
Attachments: [PC Rentta Harrison - 7 Letters.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 7 letters from Renatta Harrison.

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.*

June 2026

Dear San Francisco Board
of Supervisors:

Grew up in San Francisco,
CA. Consistently propositioned,
including a city of San Francisco
CA bus driver public transportation
propositioned me. hurriedly
walking to class SFSU a
man approached me, interpreted
me, no he wasn't handsome,
Champaign BMW was the car he
was driving. Got together with
the man. He is yet stalking
me. He's a transient. Sincerely,
Renetta Ann Harrison

June 2026 My inheritance stolen.

Dear USA:

Grew up in San Francisco,
CA. Relocated, to NM.

I'm almost sixty
years old.

I don't know why
my parents gravesite
is military? Haven't
visited the gravesite in
CA. Stolen from
consistently.

Sincerely,
Renetta Ann Harrison

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM08:43

Box - 11

June 2026

Dear San Francisco Board
of Supervisors:

Grew up in San Francisco,
CA. Relocated, to NM.

I'm American, heterosexual, insisted on taking my kid
female, recently outside years, out for the day. My
College degrees from CA.

My kids are grown. Each
graduated ^{from} the school systems

of NM,

When my kid was about
3 or 4 years old, in
San Francisco, CA, cousins (2)

cousin Elizabeth Beham
said she gave her a gun ball.
Dentist or PA Diana M Baca
Albany, NM, assuming did cosmetic
work on my 4 yr old without
my permission. Also →

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM 08:43

Box - 11

Church member more than
10 yrs ago Alby NM gave
my other kid (about 3 yrs
old) a hard peppermint
candy she was choking,
my adolescent at  the
time, ran into a restaurant
to get water for the toddler.
Female name Sister Kathy
Grace Covenant Church Alby NM.
I'm mostly  single.

This product is printed on FSC®-certified paper.

www.papyrusonline.com

Facebook and Instagram: @papyrus

Sincerely, Renetta Ann Harrison

Nd. 7108589 | © Francesca Iannaccone mrs eliotbooks



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM08:43

Bo - 11

June 2026

Dear San Francisco Board

of Supervisors!

God bless American Love,

peace, always.

[Handwritten signature]

Sincerely,

Renetta Ann Harris

[Extensive handwritten scribbles and signatures]

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM08:43

Bcs - 11

June 24, 2026

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM 09:00
805-11

Dear USA:

Grew up in San Francisco, California. Relocated, to New Mexico. I'm American, heterosexual, female, black, recently outside years, college degrees from California. Raised Christian.

Some in society raised in dysfunctional families. It has spilled over into the public schools. Homeowners pay taxes. Many homeowners send their kids to public schools. Rough kids and families that are dysfunctional most likely believe that generational poverty is a guarantee. Most likely, decent students are often hassled by rough students in the school systems.

The local university, University of New Mexico in general it needs correcting. Too many workers are probably illegal immigrants. Too many of the students most likely are bullies, or experiencing bullying? I was stolen from, the Bursar's Office at UNM. The workers too concerned about my FAFSA. I honesty, don't think I qualify for FAFSA? Trying to enroll at the local UNM Law School, the UNM university saying I owe \$28,000? Couldn't get refunds few years ago, for classes I dropped, and requested refunds. Experienced ageism communication against me.

Years, ago a victim of medication poisoning. Many doing drugs in Albuquerque, NM. Recently, outside years, nightmare communication. Tried staying awake forever, almost impossible. Graffiti, throughout the city of Albuquerque, NM. Waking up in the middle of the night, outside, cockroaches crawling up my legs into my crevices. I'm American, heterosexual, female, black, single, outside recently years, College degrees from California. I was never married to Lawrence M Woods, a common thief, drug user, transient. My kids are grown. I'm single, most men in American society are full of STDs.

The graduates of public schools are part of a puzzle established by the student body, that's similar to most other public schools. The maze of maneuvering away from bullies. After public high schools mostly, the petty communication continues. Say No to bullies.

The rough communication continues after the graduation from high school. Too many not contributing in a positive way in today's society. Attended a Catholic School in the 9th to 10th grade. An earthquake 1989 in San Francisco, CA took St Rose Academy away. The student Jocelyn Freeman tricked me into being with her adult cousin, who raped me at sixteen years. Haven't forgotten such greedy communication. He stayed around me for a few years. He even smoked weed. I tried the weed. He was stealing stuff. No, I don't know much about it? Say No to bullies.

An American problem is corrupt children, or corrupt adults want to corrupt others because someone(s) corrupted he or she. Not having to encounter dirty people means not living in communities where dirty people congregate. The obnoxious communication is spilling into other communities.

Night life, street life comes with a catch. It continues into the day. Searching for all my kids: Benjamin, Lauren, Thea. Brianna is my oldest, I'm with the oldest kid of mine. Too many street people in Albuquerque, and nearby cities too corrupt. I'm not responsible for poverty communication.

Say Yes to Green communication. Yes to clean cities. Say No to incest, No to drug users, No to child abuse, No to Identity Theft, No to johns, No to perverts, No to bullies, No to domestic violence, No to discriminatory communication, No to discriminatory hiring. Say Yes to Green. No to incest. Say Yes to Green. Say No to generational poverty.

Get the music programs out of the public school systems. It's too much of a freebie. Public schools all grade, make sure the parents acknowledge the student's report card by signing the report card, each semester.

Get rid of illegal immigration in American society it's too much of a freebie, and the poor communities of Americans are confused, and some distraught because of lack of resources drained to accommodate the illegal immigrant communities.

Say no to rapist. Too many in American society are getting raped. Say No to bullies. Say No to workplace discrimination. Say Yes, to Green.

Love bicycling, love going to the local music store. Sometimes I busk: sing, or play mostly my violin. Yes, I have collected money as I busk. My activities: shopping, going to the local music store, enrolling and completing college classes and degrees are activities I did years ago in San Francisco, CA. Mostly, alone. My kids are grown. Lawrence M Woods, he's the father of my grown kids. I told him to leave me alone, years ago when my kids were little. He did not contribute in a positive way. I'm a survivor of domestic violence. Negative communication 24/7, that's Lawrence M Woods. My happiness is my inner peace.

My grown kids each graduates from the school systems of New Mexico. I'm trying for law school. I'm assuming many of the students at the local university UNM are bullies. The professors, some are rude. Get rid of the UNM Migrant Office at the local Albuquerque, NM University of New Mexico campus.

My inheritance money wasn't given to me. For some reason, my Uncle Earl Hayes is of the opinion that he doesn't have to give me my inheritance money? My Mother past away few years ago. My Father past away 1995. Ordered, flowers yesterday for the gravesite of my Mother and Father. It's located in California. Grew up in San Francisco, California. Too many creeps approached me in California. Creeps are in New Mexico as well. Bought myself a card of fashion jewelry rings, and a necklace, from H&M: Father's Day just past. Attending the local Catholic Church occasionally. Most likely, not going to enroll in the Catechism classes. I'm in bad mood. Took the Eucharist as a high schooler. No, not a Catholic. Attended a Catholic Grammar school 5th to 8th grade. Attended Catholic school for girls 9th to 10th, completed high school at a non-denominational Christian school. It's no longer around. It was an extremely small private Christian school, few kids identified as not Christian. Walking home from high school a tall, burly Caucasian man approached me. The school was located in a secluded neighborhood of San Francisco, California. He asked me if I wanted any money. I said no. He walked with me for a while. He eventually walked away. Not sure he had an accent, sounded Polish or Russian? No. I'm not in high school anymore.

Recently, bought myself a rosary. At times, I pray the rosary.

God bless America. Love, peace, always.

Sincerely,
Renetta Ann Harrison

Resume

Renetta Ann Harrison

Email: renettaharrisonann@aol.com

Telephone: (505) 918-8580

Objective: Employment

Education:

San Jose State University, MLIS: Master Library Information Science, 1994

San Francisco State University, BA: Bachelor of American Studies, 1992

City College of San Francisco, AA: Associate of General Studies, 1990

Employment:

Street Performer (Entrepreneur)

Study Skills Tutor (Entrepreneur)

Ambercare, Home Health Aide, 2026

JC Penney Department Store, 2022

Albertsons Market, 2022

Macys Department Store, 2010

Global Pathways, Sewing Instructor, 2009

Albuquerque Public Library, 1996 to 1999

San Francisco Public Library, 1986 to 1993

Bridgemont High School, Summer Camp Counselor Assistant, 1985

Volunteerism:

Catholic Charities, 2009

Women's Collective, Day Shelter (Refugees, Low-Income), 2008

Intern:

San Francisco Public Library, 1993

Daly City Public School Elementary, 1993

Achievements:

SFCC, Japanese I

UNM, Spanish IV

June 24, 2026

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM09:01
BOS-11

Dear USA:

Grew up in San Francisco, California. Relocated, to New Mexico. I'm American, heterosexual, female, black, recently outside years, college degrees from California. Raised Christian.

Some in society raised in dysfunctional families. It has spilled over into the public schools. Homeowners pay taxes. Many homeowners send their kids to public schools. Rough kids and families that are dysfunctional most likely believe that generational poverty is a guarantee. Most likely, decent students are often hassled by rough students in the school systems.

The local university, University of New Mexico in general it needs correcting. Too many workers are probably illegal immigrants. Too many of the students most likely are bullies, or experiencing bullying? I was stolen from, the Bursar's Office at UNM. The workers too concerned about my FAFSA. I honesty, don't think I qualify for FAFSA? Trying to enroll at the local UNM Law School, the UNM university saying I owe \$28,000? Couldn't get refunds few years ago, for classes I dropped, and requested refunds. Experienced ageism communication against me.

Years, ago a victim of medication poisoning. Many doing drugs in Albuquerque, NM. Recently, outside years, nightmare communication. Tried staying awake forever, almost impossible. Graffiti, throughout the city of Albuquerque, NM. Waking up in the middle of the night, outside, cockroaches crawling up my legs into my crevices. I'm American, heterosexual, female, black, single, outside recently years, College degrees from California. I was never married to Lawrence M Woods, a common thief, drug user, transient. My kids are grown. I'm single, most men in American society are full of STDs.

The graduates of public schools are part of a puzzle established by the student body, that's similar to most other public schools. The maze of maneuvering away from bullies. After public high schools mostly, the petty communication continues. Say No to bullies.

The rough communication continues after the graduation from high school. Too many not contributing in a positive way in today's society. Attended a Catholic School in the 9th to 10th grade. An earthquake 1989 in San Francisco, CA took St Rose Academy away. The student Jocelyn Freeman tricked me into being with her adult cousin, who raped me at sixteen years. Haven't forgotten such greedy communication. He stayed around me for a few years. He even smoked weed. I tried the weed. He was stealing stuff. No, I don't know much about it? Say No to bullies.

An American problem is corrupt children, or corrupt adults want to corrupt others because someone(s) corrupted he or she. Not having to encounter dirty people means not living in communities where dirty people congregate. The obnoxious communication is spilling into other communities.

Night life, street life comes with a catch. It continues into the day. Searching for all my kids: Benjamin, Lauren, Thea. Brianna is my oldest, I'm with the oldest kid of mine. Too many street people in Albuquerque, and nearby cities too corrupt. I'm not responsible for poverty communication.

Say Yes to Green communication. Yes to clean cities. Say No to incest, No to drug users, No to child abuse, No to Identity Theft, No to johns, No to perverts, No to bullies, No to domestic violence, No to discriminatory communication, No to discriminatory hiring. Say Yes to Green. No to incest. Say Yes to Green. Say No to generational poverty.

Get the music programs out of the public school systems. It's too much of a freebie. Public schools all grade, make sure the parents acknowledge the student's report card by signing the report card, each semester.

Get rid of illegal immigration in American society it's too much of a freebie, and the poor communities of Americans are confused, and some distraught because of lack of resources drained to accommodate the illegal immigrant communities.

Say no to rapist. Too many in American society are getting raped. Say No to bullies. Say No to workplace discrimination. Say Yes, to Green.

Love bicycling, love going to the local music store. Sometimes I busk: sing, or play mostly my violin. Yes, I have collected money as I busk. My activities: shopping, going to the local music store, enrolling and completing college classes and degrees are activities I did years ago in San Francisco, CA. Mostly, alone. My kids are grown. Lawrence M Woods, he's the father of my grown kids. I told him to leave me alone, years ago when my kids were little. He did not contribute in a positive way. I'm a survivor of domestic violence. Negative communication 24/7, that's Lawrence M Woods. My happiness is my inner peace.

My grown kids each graduates from the school systems of New Mexico. I'm trying for law school. I'm assuming many of the students at the local university UNM are bullies. The professors, some are rude. Get rid of the UNM Migrant Office at the local Albuquerque, NM University of New Mexico campus.

My inheritance money wasn't given to me. For some reason, my Uncle Earl Hayes is of the opinion that he doesn't have to give me my inheritance money? My Mother past away few years ago. My Father past away 1995. Ordered, flowers yesterday for the gravesite of my Mother and Father. It's located in California. Grew up in San Francisco, California. Too many creeps approached me in California. Creeps are in New Mexico as well. Bought myself a card of fashion jewelry rings, and a necklace, from H&M: Father's Day just past. Attending the local Catholic Church occasionally. Most likely, not going to enroll in the Catechism classes. I'm in bad mood. Took the Eucharist as a high schooler. No, not a Catholic. Attended a Catholic Grammar school 5th to 8th grade. Attended Catholic school for girls 9th to 10th, completed high school at a non-denominational Christian school. It's no longer around. It was an extremely small private Christian school, few kids identified as not Christian. Walking home from high school a tall, burly Caucasian man approached me. The school was located in a secluded neighborhood of San Francisco, California. He asked me if I wanted any money. I said no. He walked with me for a while. He eventually walked away. Not sure he had an accent, sounded Polish or Russian? No. I'm not in high school anymore.

Recently, bought myself a rosary. At times, I pray the rosary.

God bless America. Love, peace, always.

Sincerely,
Renetta Ann Harrison

Resume

Renetta Ann Harrison

Email: renettaharrisonann@aol.com

Telephone: (505) 918-8580

Objective: Employment

Education:

San Jose State University, MLIS: Master Library Information Science, 1994

San Francisco State University, BA: Bachelor of American Studies, 1992

City College of San Francisco, AA: Associate of General Studies, 1990

Employment:

Street Performer (Entrepreneur)

Study Skills Tutor (Entrepreneur)

Ambercare, Home Health Aide, 2026

JC Penney Department Store, 2022

Albertsons Market, 2022

Macys Department Store, 2010

Global Pathways, Sewing Instructor, 2009

Albuquerque Public Library, 1996 to 1999

San Francisco Public Library, 1986 to 1993

Bridgemont High School, Summer Camp Counselor Assistant, 1985

Volunteerism:

Catholic Charities, 2009

Women's Collective, Day Shelter (Refugees, Low-Income), 2008

Intern:

San Francisco Public Library, 1993

Daly City Public School Elementary, 1993

Achievements:

SFCC, Japanese I

UNM, Spanish IV

June 24, 2026

Dear USA:

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2026 JUL 14 AM09:00
BOS-11

Grew up in San Francisco, California. Relocated, to New Mexico. I'm American, heterosexual, female, black, recently outside years, college degrees from California. Raised Christian.

Some in society raised in dysfunctional families. It has spilled over into the public schools. Homeowners pay taxes. Many homeowners send their kids to public schools. Rough kids and families that are dysfunctional most likely believe that generational poverty is a guarantee. Most likely, decent students are often hassled by rough students in the school systems.

The local university, University of New Mexico in general it needs correcting. Too many workers are probably illegal immigrants. Too many of the students most likely are bullies, or experiencing bullying? I was stolen from, the Bursar's Office at UNM. The workers too concerned about my FAFSA. I honesty, don't think I qualify for FAFSA? Trying to enroll at the local UNM Law School, the UNM university saying I owe \$28,000? Couldn't get refunds few years ago, for classes I dropped, and requested refunds. Experienced ageism communication against me.

Years, ago a victim of medication poisoning. Many doing drugs in Albuquerque, NM. Recently, outside years, nightmare communication. Tried staying awake forever, almost impossible. Graffiti, throughout the city of Albuquerque, NM. Waking up in the middle of the night, outside, cockroaches crawling up my legs into my crevices. I'm American, heterosexual, female, black, single, outside recently years, College degrees from California. I was never married to Lawrence M Woods, a common thief, drug user, transient. My kids are grown. I'm single, most men in American society are full of STDs.

The graduates of public schools are part of a puzzle established by the student body, that's similar to most other public schools. The maze of maneuvering away from bullies. After public high schools mostly, the petty communication continues. Say No to bullies.

The rough communication continues after the graduation from high school. Too many not contributing in a positive way in today's society. Attended a Catholic School in the 9th to 10th grade. An earthquake 1989 in San Francisco, CA took St Rose Academy away. The student Jocelyn Freeman tricked me into being with her adult cousin, who raped me at sixteen years. Haven't forgotten such greedy communication. He stayed around me for a few years. He even smoked weed. I tried the weed. He was stealing stuff. No, I don't know much about it? Say No to bullies.

An American problem is corrupt children, or corrupt adults want to corrupt others because someone(s) corrupted he or she. Not having to encounter dirty people means not living in communities where dirty people congregate. The obnoxious communication is spilling into other communities.

Night life, street life comes with a catch. It continues into the day. Searching for all my kids: Benjamin, Lauren, Thea. Brianna is my oldest, I'm with the oldest kid of mine. Too many street people in Albuquerque, and nearby cities too corrupt. I'm not responsible for poverty communication.

Say Yes to Green communication. Yes to clean cities. Say No to incest, No to drug users, No to child abuse, No to Identity Theft, No to johns, No to perverts, No to bullies, No to domestic violence, No to discriminatory communication, No to discriminatory hiring. Say Yes to Green. No to incest. Say Yes to Green. Say No to generational poverty.

Get the music programs out of the public school systems. It's too much of a freebie. Public schools all grade, make sure the parents acknowledge the student's report card by signing the report card, each semester.

Get rid of illegal immigration in American society it's too much of a freebie, and the poor communities of Americans are confused, and some distraught because of lack of resources drained to accommodate the illegal immigrant communities.

Say no to rapist. Too many in American society are getting raped. Say No to bullies. Say No to workplace discrimination. Say Yes, to Green.

Love bicycling, love going to the local music store. Sometimes I busk: sing, or play mostly my violin. Yes, I have collected money as I busk. My activities: shopping, going to the local music store, enrolling and completing college classes and degrees are activities I did years ago in San Francisco, CA. Mostly, alone. My kids are grown. Lawrence M Woods, he's the father of my grown kids. I told him to leave me alone, years ago when my kids were little. He did not contribute in a positive way. I'm a survivor of domestic violence. Negative communication 24/7, that's Lawrence M Woods. My happiness is my inner peace.

My grown kids each graduates from the school systems of New Mexico. I'm trying for law school. I'm assuming many of the students at the local university UNM are bullies. The professors, some are rude. Get rid of the UNM Migrant Office at the local Albuquerque, NM University of New Mexico campus.

My inheritance money wasn't given to me. For some reason, my Uncle Earl Hayes is of the opinion that he doesn't have to give me my inheritance money? My Mother past away few years ago. My Father past away 1995. Ordered, flowers yesterday for the gravesite of my Mother and Father. It's located in California. Grew up in San Francisco, California. Too many creeps approached me in California. Creeps are in New Mexico as well. Bought myself a card of fashion jewelry rings, and a necklace, from H&M: Father's Day just past. Attending the local Catholic Church occasionally. Most likely, not going to enroll in the Catechism classes. I'm in bad mood. Took the Eucharist as a high schooler. No, not a Catholic. Attended a Catholic Grammar school 5th to 8th grade. Attended Catholic school for girls 9th to 10th, completed high school at a non-denominational Christian school. It's no longer around. It was an extremely small private Christian school, few kids identified as not Christian. Walking home from high school a tall, burly Caucasian man approached me. The school was located in a secluded neighborhood of San Francisco, California. He asked me if I wanted any money. I said no. He walked with me for a while. He eventually walked away. Not sure he had an accent, sounded Polish or Russian? No. I'm not in high school anymore.

Recently, bought myself a rosary. At times, I pray the rosary.

God bless America. Love, peace, always.

Sincerely,
Renetta Ann Harrison

Resume

Renetta Ann Harrison

Email: renettaharrisonann@aol.com

Telephone: (505) 918-8580

Objective: Employment

Education:

San Jose State University, MLIS: Master Library Information Science, 1994

San Francisco State University, BA: Bachelor of American Studies, 1992

City College of San Francisco, AA: Associate of General Studies, 1990

Employment:

Street Performer (Entrepreneur)

Study Skills Tutor (Entrepreneur)

Ambercare, Home Health Aide, 2026

JC Penney Department Store, 2022

Albertsons Market, 2022

Macys Department Store, 2010

Global Pathways, Sewing Instructor, 2009

Albuquerque Public Library, 1996 to 1999

San Francisco Public Library, 1986 to 1993

Bridgemont High School, Summer Camp Counselor Assistant, 1985

Volunteerism:

Catholic Charities, 2009

Women's Collective, Day Shelter (Refugees, Low-Income), 2008

Intern:

San Francisco Public Library, 1993

Daly City Public School Elementary, 1993

Achievements:

SFCC, Japanese I

UNM, Spanish IV

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: 4 Letters Regarding 15 Marina Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 12:06:19 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding 15 Marina Blvd.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see the attached 4 letters, regarding a proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard.

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: [Zolezzi](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](#); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#); [ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 9:41:38 AM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	John
Last Name	Zolezzi
Email Address	Ztinman@yahoo.com
Street Address	2455 Francisco
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project

Email Message Body

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

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

From: [Greenstein](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](#); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#); [ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 9:45:34 AM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Lisa
Last Name	Greenstein
Email Address	lgreenst@pacbell.net
Street Address	5745 Futura way
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project

Email Message Body

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

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

From: [Zolezzi](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](#); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#); [ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 10:58:29 AM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Victor
Last Name	Zolezzi
Email Address	vmz@pacbell.net
Street Address	2455 Francisco st
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project

Email Message Body

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

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

From: [McGrath](#)
To: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](#); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#); [ssemblymember.stefani@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 3:40:25 PM

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



YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

First Name	Loretta
Last Name	McGrath
Email Address	zgal55@gmail.com
Street Address	2455 Francisco
Email Subject	Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project

Email Message Body

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

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 8 Letters Regarding Animal Sales
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 12:07:31 PM
Attachments: [8 Letters Regarding Animal Sales.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 8 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: [Maverick Haghighat Schiller](#)
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: Ban the retail sale of animals in San Francisco
Date: Friday, July 3, 2026 9:30:28 AM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I'm a resident of SF and I'm reaching out to encourage you to please 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,
Maverick Haghighat Schiller
Resident of San Francisco

From: [Jill Mistretta](#)
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: Ban the retail sale of animals in San Francisco
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 8:12:28 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I'm a resident of SF and I'm reaching out to encourage you to please 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,
Jill Mistretta
Resident of San Francisco

From: [Bridget Profumo](#)
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: Ban the retail sale of animals in San Francisco
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 7:09:28 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I'm a resident of SF and I'm reaching out to encourage you to please 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,
Bridget Profumo
Resident of San Francisco

From: [Carlos lojero](#)
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: Ban the retail sale of animals in San Francisco
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 8:17:40 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I'm a resident of SF and I'm reaching out to encourage you to please introduce a ban on the cruel and unnecessary retail sale of animals in our city!

San Francisco is a city that cares about the welfare of all living creatures. San Francisco can lead the way in ending unnecessary suffering of "exotic" animals bred only for corporate profits.

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,
Carlos lojero
Proud Resident of San Francisco

From: [Gabriele Wampfler](#)
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: Ban the retail sale of animals in San Francisco
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 5:14:27 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I'm a resident of SF and I'm reaching out to encourage you to please 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,
Gabriele Wampfler
Resident of Redwood City

From: [tami bennett](#)
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: Ban the retail sale of animals in San Francisco
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 5:48:29 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I'm a resident of SF and I'm reaching out to encourage you to please 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,
tami bennett
Resident of San Francisco

From: [Krista Maloney](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: New legislation
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 6:49:44 AM

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support legislation ending the retail sale of live animals in San Francisco pet stores.

San Francisco has long been a leader in animal welfare. While California has already prohibited the retail sale of commercially bred dogs, cats, and rabbits, many other animals (including birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish, and small mammals) remain part of a commercial trade that often relies on large-scale breeding facilities, wildlife capture, and stressful transport. Meanwhile, shelters and rescue organizations continue to care for countless animals in need of homes. I know this firsthand because I volunteer with San Francisco Animals Care and Control.

By ending the retail sale of live animals and encouraging adoption instead, San Francisco can once again set a compassionate example while helping reduce demand for inhumane breeding and wildlife trafficking.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Krista Maloney

San Francisco, CA 94110

From: [pinkyjain pan](#)
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: Ban the retail sale of animals in San Francisco
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 7:16:57 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I'm a resident of SF and I'm reaching out to encourage you to please 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,
pinkyjain pan
Resident 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: 35 Letters Regarding SCRT
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 12:13:34 PM
Attachments: [35 Letters Regarding SCRT.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 35 letters regarding the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT).

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: [Jcr 57](#)
Subject: Please Reconsider Removing SCRT Peer Counselors
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 10:27:53 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT. This action may increase the strain on small business to operate safely. I believe this action to be regressive. I consider this action to be wasteful to our taxpayers.

The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crisis, and the homeless— which, Peers are uniquely qualified to do. I support the creation of permanent civil service opportunities with clear job classifications for Peer Support Specialists, as there are in other counties.

From: [Emily Harwitz](#)
Subject: Lived Experience Belongs on SCRT!
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 11:31:07 PM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I am writing as a Bay Area resident regarding the Fire Department's restructuring of the 911-dispatched Street Crisis Response Team, and specifically the removal of Peer Counselors from those teams.

I oppose this change. It is regressive, and it is wasteful of taxpayer resources.

The SCRT's effectiveness depends on its ability to connect with people who are using drugs, experiencing a mental health crisis, or living unsheltered. Peers are uniquely qualified to make that connection. Lived experience is not an add-on to the clinical model; it is often the thing that makes engagement possible at all. If efficiency is the goal, keeping peers embedded in the 911 response is the most efficient route forward, not the least.

Placing peers on separate teams is not an adequate substitute. I ask that they continue to be deployed with our community's 911 calls, at the moment of crisis, where their skills matter most.

I would also note that this proposal cuts against the Mayor's Office's own work on street team coordination. Fragmenting response roles across teams undermines the integration that effort was meant to achieve.

Finally, I support the creation of permanent civil service positions with clear job classifications for Peer Support Specialists, as other counties have already established. Stable classifications would strengthen retention, accountability, and the quality of this workforce.

Thank you,
Emily

From: [Annie Roth](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors Office](#)
Subject: [Local Experience: Salage on SCRT](#)
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 11:32:15 AM

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

To whom it may concern,

The exceptional peer counselors on SF's street crisis response team are doing critical work that keeps our communities safer and we need them now more than ever!! Their positions are underpaid and traumatizing yet they show up day after day because they care about the most vulnerable people in our community. To fire them would be cruel unjust, and a harm to the safety of our community.

Cheers,
Annie

Annie Roth
Freelance Science Writer
Phone: (917) 620 - 7535
Website:
https://url.avanan.click/v2/t01/___www.RothReporting.com___YXAzOnNmZHZyOmE6hzo1Yjc0OWFjNjZiY2E4OGJ0YmRmOWMxYjAwZDknNjBmNTQ3Qjk4YmE6YWIJNwUzYzA3ZDZkOWY2YTBlNjM5NWQ2MzRjOTkwNTc5MWYyOGQ5ZGZGM5OTc4YzUwYzdmYmRBMjgzMTIyNGM0Yzp0OQ6Tg

From: [Meli Harmon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment for review 7/14/26
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 10:09:10 AM
Attachments: [7-14 BOS.pdf](#)

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

Good morning,

Please see attached for my scripted public comment for this afternoon's BoS meeting. I should hope this reaches the Board before the Mayor's Q&A early on the session.

Please let me know if anything else may be needed or useful in this communications process.

Thank you,

Amelia

Good afternoon, supervisors. My name is Amelia Harmon. I want to thank you all for the opportunity to serve on the Behavioral Health Council — though I'm speaking today only for myself, as a direct service provider of almost 9 years, with five years on the Street Crisis Response Team.

I have been impressed by this administration's ability to carefully integrate street teams. Despite the growing pains, I can see the vision, as can many of my colleagues.

However, at this moment, we are facing the removal of Peer Counselors from the Street Crisis Response Team.

As someone who studies crisis behavioral health services personally, professionally, and academically, I can say: At this moment of growth in our 24-hour crisis continuum of care, loss of the Peers' institutional knowledge and field expertise is an oversight San Francisco canNOT afford.

I have already presented value assessments to both the Health Commission, and the Fire Commission.

Additionally, after a years long analysis published by San Jose State University regarding our team, researchers mention there is a "sense of disconnect between decision-makers' understanding of the work and team members' experiences of the work." They show how this leads to burnout and moral injury among our first responders, which "impedes their ability to serve clients and **can create structural challenges for municipalities.**"

I have full faith that the actors in this room can reverse this decision, as it didn't even seem to be made on budgetary concerns. But, let's look forward.

If we want our Peer responders to graduate into permanent civil service positions, I have a long term plan for that, and I ask for this board's partnership when that work reaches you.

In the interim, as we repair this blunder, I have multiple plans to standardize training accountability, and I have multiple plans to increase operational efficiency.

Keeping Peer Counselors responding to 911 behavioral health crises is the responsible decision to our city, and the responsible decision for our first responders. Our officers, our paramedics, EMTs, Peer Counselors, would much rather be out there running calls and serving San Franciscans than in here proving their worth.

With word getting out over the weekend, I've already heard field reports from San Francisco Police Officers calling this a mistake. Tomorrow I will be warning the Police Commission that their work is about to change. Let's repair this now, while we still can. Thank you.

From: [Yahoo](#)
Subject: Don't Cut Peer Counselors from San Francisco's Crisis Response
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 9:10:39 AM

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

To whom it may concern - I am writing as a San Francisco resident to urgently advocate for the full retention of peer counselors on our city's Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT). As our city continues to navigate complex behavioral health and homelessness challenges on our streets, the unique role of peer counselors remains absolutely vital. Unlike traditional first responders, these specialists approach individuals in acute distress from a place of shared, lived experience. By bringing specialized skills for understanding of recovery and housing instability, they immediately lower institutional distrust and prevent volatile situations from escalating. According to national guidelines from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), integrating peer support into mobile crisis teams is a proven best practice specifically because it mitigates the fear of criminalization or forced institutionalization among our most vulnerable neighbors.

The quantitative data clearly demonstrates that keeping these dedicated professionals on the frontline is both a compassionate choice and an incredibly smart investment for our city's infrastructure. Data from the SCRT's operations shows that the team handles thousands of calls annually, successfully resolving over 50% of direct client engagements right on the scene. This means hundreds of individuals are safely stabilized in the community rather than being transported to our already overcapacity emergency rooms or psychiatric wards. Furthermore, by utilizing this peer-led, health-first model, the team drastically reduces unnecessary law enforcement encounters, with less than 2% of their thousands of calls requiring police assistance.

Retaining our peer counselors ensures that San Francisco maintains a highly effective, equity-driven alternative response that saves critical city resources and treats our unhoused and distressed residents with the dignity they deserve.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to effective, community-based care on our streets.

Kristine Sumi, SF Resident

Kristine Sumi
Sent from my iPhone
415-602-5322

From: [Jack Fogel](#)
Subject: Support Trust-Based Crisis Response — Keep Peers
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 10:36:06 AM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

Removing the Peers will create more frequent 911 use from our most vulnerable.

If I ever had to call 911 on a community member, I would hope that staff with appropriate training and context (the Peer) would respond.

From: [Nancy Galves](#)
Subject: Support Specialized 911 Crisis Peer Counselors
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 12:33:31 PM

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

I believe peers can be a valuable part of crisis response teams. They are especially useful for de-escalating a situation and helping the person calm down.

AI Galves, Phd.

From: [Cindy Swann](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: letter of support
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 1:20:38 PM

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

July 10, 2026

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong support for the members of the Crisis Specialists on the Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT) who serve the San Francisco community with dedication, professionalism, and compassion.

Every day, HOT Crisis Specialists and the RAM peers work on the front lines to assist some of the city's most vulnerable residents. Their work extends far beyond outreach—they build trust with individuals experiencing homelessness, connect people to shelter, medical care, behavioral health services, housing resources, and other essential support, often under challenging and unpredictable circumstances. These professionals need to continue to be part of the multidisciplinary teams as the program was designed to be.

The work of the HOT Crisis Specialists and the RAM peers requires patience, resilience, empathy, and a deep commitment to public service. By engaging individuals with dignity and respect, they help reduce barriers to care while improving public health and community safety. Their efforts benefit not only those experiencing homelessness but also neighborhoods, businesses, and the broader San Francisco community.

Addressing homelessness is a complex challenge that requires collaboration across agencies, service providers, and community organizations. The specialists on the team play a vital role in that coordinated response by providing consistent outreach and helping individuals take meaningful steps toward stability and long-term housing solutions.

I encourage continued recognition, support, and investment in the multidisciplinary team members and the critical services they provide. Their commitment to serving others reflects the values of compassion, accountability, and community that strengthen San Francisco.

Thank you for your consideration and for recognizing the important contributions of the Crisis Specialists on the Street Crisis Response Team who serve the city every day.

Sincerely,

Cindy Swann

Cindy Swann

Concerned citizen

cindyswann@pointloma.edu

From: jediwushu@yahoo.com
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 9:02:46 AM

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

Good Morning,

I am a born and raised San Francisco native who still resides in the City and County.

Over the past few years, I have seen a massive improvement to the quality of life on the streets and to the strain on 911 calls for service regarding individuals experiencing crisis -whether that would be mental health, substance abuse-related, or a combination -as a direct result of the implementation of the Street Crisis Response Team [SCRT] which INCLUDES Peer Counselors. The teams have done a tremendous job, specifically the Peer Counselors whose role acts as a resource that differs from first responders such as Fire and the Police.

I have become aware that the San Francisco Fire Department is restructuring their SCRT teams with plans to remove Peer Counselors. I believe this change is detrimental to the effectiveness of the SCRT program and city resource.

Peer Counselors are an integral part of the SCRT. Peer Counselors have different training, experience, and access to resources which Fire lack. I have seen firsthand numerous instances where the Peer Counselors were able to gain rapport and cooperation with individuals in crisis that first responders like Fire and Police were unable to due to the uniform they wear. I have seen the resources which the Peer Counselors were able to connect individuals to that Fire did not have access to. I have also worked with and personally requested SCRT, specifically for the Peer Counselors' expertise and resources they can offer. Peer Counselors represent an invaluable city resource which has not only gained the trust of vulnerable populations [unhoused and substance abuse users] through their compassion and professionalism but also a plethora of non-profits/programs who they frequently work with to serve these individuals. I have seen how these individuals have been persuaded by Peer Counselors to accept resources instead of remaining on the streets, where they otherwise had refused from FIRE and Police.

The Peer Counselors have demonstrated their effectiveness as the heart of SCRT, and to remove them would be detrimental to SCRT as being the valuable resource that it currently is. The Street Crisis Response Team WITH Peer Counselors represent a task force -a multi agency approach which, in my opinion, is working and helping to improve the safety and quality of life on the streets and in this city overall. FIRE, Police, DPW, and DPH cannot tackle these complicated issues this city faces everyday ALONE.

In conclusion, I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT and am asking city leaders to revisit this decision.

Thank you for your time and all of your hard work,

-SF Resident

From: [E Lum](#)
To: [E Lum](#)
Subject: Please Reconsider Removing SCRT Peer Counselors
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 4:33:36 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the removal of Peer Counselors from the Street Crisis Response Team (SCRT).

The SCRT must maintain the ability to connect effectively with individuals experiencing substance use issues, mental health crises, and homelessness. Peer Counselors possess unique qualifications and lived experience that are essential for this outreach. Reassigning these professionals to different teams is an inadequate solution; therefore, I request that Peer Counselors continue to be deployed directly alongside the teams responding to our community's 911 calls.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Best regards

From: [Shea Oades](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 10:52:19 PM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I am concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I believe this action to be regressive. I consider this action to be wasteful to our taxpayers. This action may increase the strain on small business to operate safely.

The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crisis, and the homeless— which, Peers are uniquely qualified to do.

If I ever had to call 911 on a family member, I would rather a non-uniformed counselor lead the response— with a supporting team that would be able to assess for 5150s.

Peers on different teams is inadequate. I ask they continue to be deployed *with* our community's 911 calls.

This proposed removal will undermine the Mayor's Office's efforts in street team coordination.

Sincerely,
Shea Oades

From: [Miranda N.](#)
Subject: Protect the Peer Counselor Role on SCRT
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 6:27:08 AM
Attachments: [Protect the Peer Counselor Role on SCRT.msg](#)

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

From: [Miranda N.](#)
Subject: Protect the Peer Counselor Role on SCRT
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 6:27:08 AM
Attachments: [Protect the Peer Counselor Role on SCRT.msg](#)

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

From: [Marisa Ornelas](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 3:58:08 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I have become aware that the San Francisco Fire Department is restructuring their 911-dispatched Street Crisis Response Team. I have first hand experience with this model and team as I was a clinician through HealthRight360 until the contract was pulled and 5150 power was handed over to paramedics instead of license and trained clinicians. This was disheartening then and even more so now. Peers are crucial to any street response team and lived experience is sometimes the only way to de-escalate a situation without using physical force or drastic measures. It is no secret that public opinion has changed over the years regarding law enforcement and emergency services. The trust is already thin and removing the grounding presence that peers bring to the community will in no way help bring that trust back. I strongly urge the powers that be to reconsider this model change and keep peers incorporated with street crisis response.

Thank you,

Marisa O.

From: [Miles Davis](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 4:04:54 PM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I am concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I believe this action to be regressive.

The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crisis, and the homeless— which, Peers are uniquely qualified to do.

Peers on different teams is inadequate. I ask they continue to be deployed *with* our community's 911 calls.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Alise/Samuel Minor](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 8:33:19 PM

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

To whom it may concern.

I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT. our clients relate and can open up to us in many situations . The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crisis, and the homeless— which, Peers are uniquely qualified to do.

I have personal experience with crisis, and I would rather speak to a non-uniformed Peer rather than a uniformed first.

From: megjohnson510@icloud.com
To: [Meg Johnson](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 8:43:57 PM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I have become aware that the San Francisco Fire Department is restructuring their 911-dispatched Street Crisis Response Team.

I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I believe this action to be regressive and wasteful to our taxpayers.

Peers on different teams is inadequate. I ask they continue to be deployed *with* our community's 911 calls.

Meg Johnson
San Francisco Resident and Taxpayer

From: [Rachael Smith](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 9:12:29 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

It is vital to keep the peer counselors as part of the SCRT in San Francisco. Removing them from the team will undoubtedly lead to lost lives and livelihoods for unhoused people in San Francisco.

I worked in Civic Center for 8.5 years and am well aware of the crisis facing the unhoused population. The SCRT is able to provide vital services and resources, but without the peer counselors, actually connecting people with the resources that are most relevant to their honest situation will be, at best a challenge, and at worst entirely unfeasable.

The peers are a necessary part of SCRT and must be protected, supported, and built up to continue doing life saving work.

Sincerely,
Rachael Smith

From: [Savannah Landau](#)
To: [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 9:26:51 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

I am a District 4 resident and taxpayer who is deeply concerned about the restructuring of our city's budget and how it will impact programs that serve our communities. Particularly, programs that serve people who are in a mental health crisis.

Earlier this year, I nearly lost a friend to suicide. This friend told me that - in one of the most vulnerable moments of their life - Peer Counselors were there to support them. Without their support, I'm afraid I would have lost my friend to suicide or from being killed by a police officer who is not trained to support someone in a crisis.

My roommate is also a Peer Counselor who has worked tirelessly to help people like my friend. She attended a town hall earlier this year, which Supervisor Wong was a part of to ask how he would support their work. **As District 4 residents, we need you to support this work.**

Their work has saved lives, and more lives will need to be saved given that people are facing more and more crises. Please do not make this deeply regressive step, save this program and save lives!

I look forward to your office's response.

Thank you,
Savannah Landau
Outer Sunset resident on 41st Ave, between Lawton and Moraga St.

From: [Sara Moss-horwitz](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 9:35:52 PM

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

Hello,

I am concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I believe this action to be regressive and wasteful to our taxpayers.

If efficiency is the goal, including peers in the 911 system is the best route forward.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Rachel Howsmon](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 9:52:40 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I have become aware that the San Francisco Fire Department is restructuring their 911-dispatched Street Crisis Response Team.

I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT because I believe this action to be regressive.

The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crisis, and the homeless, which Peers are uniquely qualified to do. Having called the SCRT more than once to help a person having a crisis in public, most people would rather speak to a non-uniformed Peer rather than a uniformed first responder due to the unique skills and compassion that Peers have.

Peers on different teams is inadequate. I ask they continue to be deployed with our community's 911 calls.

As a taxpayer in San Francisco, it is my strongly held opinion that Peers must stay on the Street Crisis Response Team.

Sincerely,
Rachel Howsmon

636 4th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Matt Berg](#)
Subject: Please Reconsider Removing SCRT Peer Counselors
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 11:58:23 PM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I have personal experience with crisis, and I would rather speak to a non-uniformed Peer rather than a uniformed first responder.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Sarah Wong](#)
Subject: Requesting Peer Counselors Stay in 911
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 2:35:31 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I'm writing to express my concern about removing the peer counselors from the 911 dispatch response team. I believe this action to be regressive and I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

Removing the Peers will create more frequent 911 use from our most vulnerable. This action may increase the strain on small business to operate safely. I have personal experience with crisis, and I would rather speak to a non-uniformed Peer rather than a uniformed first responder.

If efficiency is the goal, including peers in the 911 system is the best route forward. This proposed removal will undermine the Mayor's Office's efforts in street team coordination.

Thank you for your time!

Best,
Sarah

From: [Marilyn O'donnell-Valencia](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Lived Experience Belongs on SCRT
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 6:11:44 AM

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

Honorable Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to ask that you keep the Peer Counselors “on the call.”

Their work is vital to those who are struggling with addiction.

The manner in which we treat those in need, says everything about our character and our City.

Respectfully,

Marilyn O'Donnell

Max Valencia

Native San Franciscans

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Ella Adams](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 6:27:13 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

Do not remove the peer counselors! You are only making this city even more unlivable for regular citizens by removing the best proven way to help with the addiction and mental health crisis SF IS KNOWN FOR NATIONWIDE

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jes Martinez](#)
Subject: Please Reconsider Removing SCRT Peer Counselors
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 7:17:23 AM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I have become aware that the San Francisco Fire Department is restructuring their 911-dispatched Street Crisis Response Team.

I am concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I believe this action to be regressive.

This action may increase the strain on small business to operate safely.

If I ever had to call 911 on a family member, I would rather a non-uniformed counselor respond.

Sincerely,
Jes Martinez

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Dana](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Reconsider Removing SCRT Peer Counselors!!
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 7:24:31 AM

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

Hi, I'm writing with great concern about the removal of the Peer Counselors from SCRT. I do not agree with the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT. This is absolutely a step in the wrong direction and is going to make the San Francisco I hold so near and dear to my heart into a worse place. San Francisco is my favorite place in the world and those who struggle the most in our city deserve to have someone they can trust in their times of need. The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crisis, and the homeless—which Peers are uniquely qualified to do. If I ever had to call 911 on a community member, I would hope that staff with appropriate training and context (the Peer) would respond.

Dana
they/them

From: [Jocelyn Pou](#)
Subject: Protect the Peer Counselor Role on SCRT
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 7:53:25 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern, I am concerned about the peer counselors being taken off the response teams. All people on the Streets should be handled with care and compassion. A peer can help them feel safe, can build trust with the team and therefore there will be a better outcome for the person needing help.

I have personal experience with crisis, and I would rather speak to a non-uniformed Peer rather than a uniformed first responder.

I am concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

From: [Heather Ehrgott](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs Peers on Every Crisis Call
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 7:55:44 AM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

I am a resident of U.S. Congressional District 11. I am concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT. I thought the city was moving towards de-escalation policies and a more holistic approach to the issues on the street SF faces. I believe this action to be regressive and a waste of a trained workforce of capable individuals.

Best,
Heather Carson

From: [amanda.b](#)
Subject: Protect Peer Counselors on San Francisco's Street Crisis Response Teams
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 8:24:32 AM

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

To Decision makers,

I urge you to reject any proposal that would remove Peer Counselors from San Francisco's Street Crisis Response Teams.

Peer Counselors are essential—not supplemental. Their lived experience allows them to build trust, de-escalate crises, and connect people to care in ways that traditional approaches often cannot. For many individuals in crisis, a peer is the reason they accept help at all.

Removing Peer Counselors would weaken a nationally recognized crisis response model and move San Francisco away from the community-based, trauma-informed care our city has worked so hard to build. This is especially concerning for communities that have historically been underserved and harmed by traditional systems.

If the goal is safer, more effective crisis response, the answer is to invest in peers—not eliminate them.

I respectfully urge you to protect Peer Counselor positions and ensure lived experience remains at the heart of San Francisco's Street Crisis Response Teams.

Thank you for your time and leadership.

Sincerely,

Amanda Brown

From: [Juliet Dinkins](#)
Subject: Keep Peer Counselors on the Street Crisis Response Team
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 8:26:58 AM

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

Dear Decision-Maker,

Peers and outreach workers are being removed from the Street Crisis Response Team units. San Francisco is known for being progressive, however, removing peers from the units is a regressive step. The fire department/peer model works. Peers have a deep understanding of what individuals face on the street. They also have a deep understanding of how to navigate city resources and have connections with other providers. The fire department does not have the breadth of knowledge and connections that peers have regarding city resources (which are notoriously hard for clients to navigate on their own). Removing peers will do a disservice to the clients, and the SCRT units will not be able to do as much work with the clients. Removing peers will also undermine street team coordination, as peers have connections to numerous other providers that the fire department does not. San Francisco residents want the unhoused off the street and in shelter/treatment, and removing peers from the units will do the opposite. Please reconsider the decision to remove the peers.

Thank you,

Juliet

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jocelyn Sumi](#)
Subject: Requesting Peer Counselors Stay in 911
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 8:47:23 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

Removing the Street Crisis Team shows the administrations lack of concern for underserved communities and the mental health needs of the community. This removes support for groups of people who are already underserved, and are in need of mental health and other services. The Street Crisis Team is a valuable part of the community and provides important services. As a long time San Francisco resident I am writing to urge you to rethink this decision, reinstate this team, and commit funds to this team and the integral services they provide.

Signed,
A concerned citizen

From: [Steve Leeds](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No Funding Cuts to the SF Street Crisis Team
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 2:04:52 PM

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

Dear Decision-Makers,

I am a resident of District 7. The impact of AI and the rising cost of rents and simply living here in San Francisco has created both an economic and emotional crisis for a significant number of our neighbors, both housed and unhoused. Who shows up to help is most important. I strongly urge you, as the city's leadership, to keep in place funding for workers of the SF Street Crisis Team, who have lived experience on this 911-dispatched crisis response team.

With the rise of incredible amounts of wealth in this city, San Francisco must and can do better. We as a city must do more for the most vulnerable among us. No more funding cuts. A lack of services for those most in need hurts us all as community and as a city.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steve Leeds
Inner Sunset

From: [Sayuri Falconer](#)
To: sayuri.anya@gmail.com
Subject: Please Reconsider Removing SCRT Peer Counselors
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 7:05:10 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of District 7.

I am concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

I believe this action to be regressive and wasteful to our taxpayers.

The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crisis, and the homeless— which, Peers are uniquely qualified to do.

If efficiency is the goal, including peers in the 911 system is the best route forward.

I support the creation of permanent civil service opportunities with clear job classifications for Peer Support Specialists, as there are in other counties.

Sincerely,

Sayuri Falconer

From: [Kristine Craig](#)
Subject: San Francisco Needs Peers on Every Crisis Call
Date: Saturday, July 11, 2026 12:49:17 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

The Homeless Outreach Team is essential to keeping our streets safe. Cutting this role would weaken public safety and erode trust in city services — trust that's already in short supply and central to why this crisis persists.

I urge you to reconsider this decision.

I am a resident of District 8.

Thank you,
Kristine Craig

From: [Nick Stanley](#)
Subject: Lived Experience Belongs on SCRT
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 4:06:57 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of District 9 in San Francisco. My partner was born and raised in the Mission and Bayview, and I have lived here for 12 years. We are deeply concerned about the removal of Peer Counselors from the SCRT.

The SCRT needs to be able to connect with drug users, people in mental health crises, and the homeless— which, Peers are uniquely qualified to do. Peers on different teams are not adequate. I ask they continue to be deployed **with** our community's 911 calls.

If I ever had to call 911 on a family member, I would rather a non-uniformed counselor lead the response— with a supporting team that would be able to assess for 5150s.

Thank you,
Nick Stanley

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: 20 Letters Regarding File No. 260539
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 12:11:00 PM
Attachments: [20 Letters Regarding File No. 260539.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 20 letters regarding **File No. 260539:**

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to simplify and streamline procedures for local compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including removing shadow analysis as a specific type of environmental impact, reducing the time to appeal CEQA determinations to the Board of Supervisors from 30 to 15 days, and removing some procedures for environmental documents that are not required by CEQA; to implement recent changes in state law regarding the timing of compliance with CEQA; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under CEQA.

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: [Bonnie Lumaghi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 9:00:53 AM

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

Hello. I live in North Beach and use the Washington Square Park often and the plans for a new building on the Verdi Building site will shade the Park—the living heart of our community. Please do not remove the shade considerations from the environmental tests for developments.

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely

Bonnie Lumaghi
2060 Stockton Street

From: [Dick Lumaghi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 9:02:50 AM

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

Hello. I live in North Beach and strongly oppose removing shading issues from environmental assessments for new development. Our lovely Washington Square Park would be shaded by a tall replacement for the Verdi Building—a huge loss to this beloved center of the North Beach community.

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

Dick Lumaghi

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Chris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 10:42:00 AM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

From: [Courtney Damkroger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 10:51:35 AM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

From: [Christa Lewis](#)
To: [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Mcgarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Zushi, Kei \(CPC\)](#); [Shum, Ryan \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [Baldauf, Hans \(CPC\)](#); [Cox, Eleanor \(CPC\)](#); [Vergara, Robert \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [Tsern Strang, Gayle \(CPC\)](#); [Baroni, Dan \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: OPPOSITION to SHADE ACT LEGISLATION 2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 12:35:16 PM

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

Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda, Commissioners, and Board of Supervisors,

I am sharing my opposition to the proposed Shade Act Legislation with the letter below from Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan of Telegraph Hill Dwellers.

Regards,
Christa Lewis

“Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly OPPOSE the above-cited proposed ordinance. This ordinance would significantly amend procedures governing the City’s implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The ordinance has been represented as intended to remove shadow analysis as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review. However, the ordinance disguises a major assault on San Francisco’s environmental review process, significantly reducing long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and thwarting public participation.

For reasons, such as those set forth below, we urge the Commission to oppose this proposed legislation:

- Removal of shadow analysis is a violation of Proposition M.
- Shadow is a physical environmental effect that must be considered under CEQA, as long acknowledged by Planning Department practice.
- The ordinance’s major limitation or elimination of Planning Commission review and public notice, comment, and appeal is in direct conflict with the core purpose of CEQA.
- The ordinance is subject to CEQA analysis prior to consideration by the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors.

Removal of Shadow Analysis is a Violation of Proposition M

The proposed amendment to “remove shadow analysis as a specific type of environmental impact” would violate the provisions of Proposition M adopted by the

voters in November 1986. Proposition M established eight Priority Policies in the General Plan, including: “8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.”

The specific provisions of Proposition M prohibit the City from adopting any legislation that is inconsistent with the Priority Policies and require that prior to issuing a permit for any project which requires an initial study under CEQA, the City must find that the project is consistent with the Priority Policies, including protecting from development our parks and open space and their access to sunlight. Compliance with Proposition M requires shadow analysis to be included in each initial study as a potential environmental effect under CEQA. Therefore, the proposed ordinance cannot remove shadow, or the other Priority Policies, as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review.

The proposed amendments would eliminate the long standing requirement that local CEQA review include:

“consistency with the environmental issues included in the Eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code and incorporated into the General Plan; shadow impacts, including the analysis set forth in Planning Code Section 295, and such other data and information specific to the urban environment of San Francisco or to the specific project.” [emphasis added]

By deleting this language, the proposed ordinance would eliminate reference to two major propositions approved by voters emphasizing the importance of access to sunlight, and successfully used for more than 40 years. In addition to the Eight Priority Policies in Proposition M, it would eliminate from environmental review the shadow ban on parks and other public spaces adopted by voters as Proposition K in June 1984. Even if both of these propositions remain in place elsewhere in the code, deleting them from the local CEQA guidelines would eliminate them as critical factors in informing decision makers and the public about the environmental impacts of projects that the San Francisco electorate have twice voted to protect.

Shadow is a Physical Environmental Effect and Should Continue to be Considered Under CEQA, as Long Acknowledged by Planning Department Practice

The findings in the proposed ordinance state that “It is the intent of the Board [sic] of Supervisors to remove shadow as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review.” Sec. 1(j) of the proposed findings would require the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to find that “shadow is not a physical environmental effect under CEQA because its impacts are subjective, variable, dependent on personal preference and the weather, and can have both positive and negative health implications.”

Not only would this finding be in violation of Proposition M, but it would be inconsistent with long-standing Planning Department practice. Shadow is a physical

environmental effect under Sec. 15382 of the California CEQA Guidelines, which defines “Significant Effect on the Environment” to mean “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.” Few physical effects are more readily apparent than shadows, especially when they affect public spaces. Under a plain reading of the CEQA Guideline’s definition, shadow is clearly a “physical condition,” and thus must not be excluded from CEQA analysis.

That shadow is a physical environmental effect to be considered under CEQA has long been acknowledged by the Planning Department. For example, the Department’s CEQA Initial Study Checklist (as downloaded on July 3, 2026 from the Department’s environmental review website at sfplanning.org/permit/environmental-review-resources) specifically lists “Shadow” as an environmental impact category to be considered when determining if a project requires a CEQA Negative Declaration or a full Environmental Impact Report. Shadow has been included in the Department’s Checklist for many years.

Information about shadow impacts is commonly developed during environmental impact assessments, and is an important factor in informing decision makers and the public about the environmental impacts of a project, especially in the dense urban environment of San Francisco. Analyses of shadow can also be central to the evaluation of such other CEQA environmental impact categories as Recreation, Land Use / Planning, Public Services, Cultural, and Aesthetics.

Major Limitation or Elimination of Planning Commission Review and Public Notice, Comment, and Appeal is in Direct Conflict with Core Purpose of CEQA

The core purpose of CEQA is to provide decision makers and the public information on the environmental effects of a proposed project. According to Sec. 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines: “An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.”

Limiting or eliminating public notice, comment, and information access directly conflicts with this stated purpose. Numerous instances of such limitation or elimination are found in the proposed ordinance, with any resulting “streamlining” of local CEQA review coming at the expense of the public right-to-know. The authority of the Planning Commission, the HPC, and Board of Supervisors would be subsumed by Planning Department staff at the expense of public’s right to notice, comment and appeal, reducing transparency and opportunities for public participation. In other words, the right of the public to appeal Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) would be significantly limited by decreasing public notice and eliminating public hearings at the Planning Commission or HPC.

Without enumerating them all, several illustrative examples include the following:

- Eliminates the existing requirement that each initial study address the eight priority policies set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1, including That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development, in violation of voter approved Proposition M.
- Significantly limits or eliminates public notice of Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs.
- Shortens project public comment periods from 30 to 15 days making it virtually meaningless.
- Eliminates all currently required public hearings on Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs at the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission, as well as the right to appeal Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations or Draft EIRs to the Planning Commission.
- Shortens the period to appeal EIRs and Negative Declarations to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) from 30 to 15 days making the possibility of any meaningful appeal virtually impossible.
- Shortens the time for the BOS to hear the appeal from 30 days to two weeks which does not allow for a fair, adequately briefed hearing.
- Limits the Board of Supervisors to only two weeks to prepare findings which does not allow for a fair, well-informed hearing and decision making process.
- Eliminates appeals of any housing project which is first approved at the Board of Supervisors.
- Eliminates the requirement for Planning Department staff to prepare annual reports to the Planning Commission and BOS of all appeals.
- Removes Planning Commission and HPC review of Planning Department decisions to add to or modify the lists of categorical exemptions and “ministerial” projects not requiring environmental review.
- Gives the Planning Department staff discretion to change mitigation measures adopted by the Planning Commission or BOS for an already approved project outside of the Planning Commission’s or BOS’s review and to forgo additional environmental review to reevaluate a project that has been substantially modified following a CEQA determination.

Proposed Ordinance is Subject to CEQA Analysis Prior to Consideration by Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors

The proposed ordinance itself is subject to CEQA because it significantly reduces or eliminates long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and public participation that currently exist under Chapter 31. Therefore, CEQA analysis is required before the City can consider the proposed ordinance.

In conclusion, for reasons that include those listed above, we urge the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission to oppose this proposed ordinance in its entirety.

Sincerely,
Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan
Co-Chairs Planning and Zoning
Telegraph Hill Dwellers”

From: [Mary Sullivan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 12:36:29 PM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhone. Please pardon typos.

From: [Neighborhoods United SF](#)
To: [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Mcgarra, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Dennis Phillips, Sarah \(CPC\)](#); [Zushi, Kei \(CPC\)](#); [Shum, Ryan \(CPC\)](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [Baldauf, Hans \(CPC\)](#); [Cox, Eleanor \(CPC\)](#); [Vergara, Robert \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [Tsern Strang, Gayle \(CPC\)](#); [Baroni, Dan \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#)
Subject: Neighborhoods United SF Opposition to the Proposed "Shade Act" Ordinance (Board File No. 260539)
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 8:14:28 AM
Attachments: [NUSF Commnets Board File No. 260539 SHADE.pdf](#)

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

Dear Commissioners and City Officials,

Attached please find Neighborhoods United SF's opposition letter regarding the proposed "Shade Act" ordinance (Board File No. 260539).

While the legislation has been presented as a measure addressing shadow analysis, we believe it extends far beyond that issue. As outlined in the attached letter, the proposal would significantly reduce long-standing environmental protections, limit public participation, and conflict with voter-approved policies governing environmental review in San Francisco.

We respectfully request that you carefully consider the concerns raised in the attached letter and oppose this ordinance.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lori Brooke
Co-founder, Neighborhoods United SF

July 15, 2025

Amy Campbell, President, San Francisco Planning Commission
Diane Matsuda, President, San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
49 South Van Ness, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Via email: Commission Secretary commissions.secretary@sfgov.org; Clerk of the Board
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

RE: OPPOSITION to SHADE ACT LEGISLATION
2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]

Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda and Commissioners,

We write to strongly OPPOSE the above-cited proposed ordinance. This ordinance would significantly amend procedures governing the City's implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The ordinance has been represented as intended to remove shadow analysis as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review. However, the ordinance disguises a major assault on San Francisco's environmental review process, significantly reducing long-standing, pre-existing environmental protections and thwarting public participation.

For the following reasons, we urge both the Historic Preservation and Planning Commissions to oppose this proposed legislation:

- The ordinance removes required shadow analysis; a violation of Proposition M.
- Shadow is a physical environmental effect that must be considered under CEQA, as long acknowledged by Planning Department practice.
- The ordinance limits or eliminates Planning Commission review, public notice, comment, and appeal; a direct conflict with the core purpose of CEQA.
- The ordinance itself is subject to CEQA analysis prior to consideration by the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors.

Removal of Shadow Analysis is a Violation of Proposition M

The proposal to "remove shadow analysis as a specific type of environmental impact" would violate the provisions of Proposition M adopted by the voters in November 1986. Proposition M established eight Priority Policies in the General Plan, including

Policy 8: “That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.”

The specific provisions of Proposition M prohibit the City from adopting any legislation that is inconsistent with its Priority Policies and require that prior to issuing a permit for any project which requires an Initial Study under CEQA, the City must find that the project is consistent with the Priority Policies, including protection of our parks and open space and their access to sunlight. Compliance with Proposition M requires shadow analysis to be included in each CEQA Initial Study as a potential environmental effect. Therefore, the proposed ordinance cannot remove shadow, or the other Priority Policies, as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review.

The proposed amendments would eliminate the long standing requirement that local CEQA review include:

“consistency with the environmental issues included in the Eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code and incorporated into the General Plan; shadow impacts, including the analysis set forth in Planning Code Section 295, and such other data and information specific to the urban environment of San Francisco or to the specific project.”

By deleting this language, the proposed ordinance would eliminate reference to two major propositions approved by San Francisco voters emphasizing the importance of access to sunlight, and successfully applied for more than 40 years. In addition, the ordinance would eliminate from environmental review the shadow ban on parks and other public spaces adopted by voters as Proposition K in June 1984. Even if both propositions remain in place elsewhere in the code, deleting them from the local CEQA guidelines would eliminate them as critical factors in informing decision makers and the public about the environmental impacts of projects that the San Francisco electorate have twice voted to protect.

Shadow is a Physical Environmental Effect and Should Continue to be Considered Under CEQA, as Long Acknowledged by Planning Department Practice

The findings in the proposed ordinance state that “It is the intent of the Board [sic] of Supervisors to remove shadow as a topic to be considered in local CEQA” Sec. 1(j) of

the proposed findings would require the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to find that “shadow is not a physical environmental effect under CEQA because its impacts are subjective, variable, dependent on personal preference and the weather, and can have both positive and negative health implications.”

Not only would this finding be in violation of Proposition M, but it would be inconsistent with long-standing Planning Department practice. Shadow is a physical environmental effect under Sec. 15382 of the California CEQA Guidelines, which defines “Significant Effect on the Environment” to mean “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.” Few physical effects are more readily apparent than shadows, especially when they affect public spaces. Under a plain reading of the CEQA Guideline’s definition, shadow is clearly a “physical condition,” and thus must not be excluded from CEQA analysis.

That shadow is a physical environmental effect to be considered under CEQA has long been acknowledged by the Planning Department. For example, the Department’s CEQA Initial Study Checklist (as downloaded on July 3, 2026 from the Department’s environmental review website sfplanning.org/permit/environmental-review-resources) specifically lists “Shadow” as an environmental impact category to be considered when determining if a project requires a CEQA Negative Declaration or a full Environmental Impact Report. Shadow has been included in the Department’s Checklist for many years.

Information about shadow impacts is commonly developed during environmental impact assessments, and is an important factor in informing decision makers and the public about the environmental impacts of a project, especially in the dense urban environment of San Francisco. Analyses of shadow can also be central to the evaluation of such other CEQA environmental impact categories as Recreation, Land Use / Planning, Public Services, Cultural, and Aesthetics.

Major Limitation or Elimination of Planning Commission Review and Public Notice, Comment, and Appeal is in Direct Conflict with Core Purpose of CEQA

The core purpose of CEQA is to provide decision makers and the public information on the environmental effects of a proposed project. According to Sec. 15121 of the CEQA

Guidelines: “An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.”

Limiting or eliminating public notice, comment, and information access directly conflicts with this stated purpose. Numerous instances of such limitation or elimination are found in the proposed ordinance, with any resulting “streamlining” of local CEQA review coming at the expense of the public right-to-know. The authority of the Planning Commission, the HPC, and Board of Supervisors would be subsumed by Planning Department staff at the expense of the public’s right to notice, comment, and appeal, reducing transparency and opportunities for public participation. In other words, the right of the public to appeal CEQA Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) would be significantly limited by decreasing public notice and eliminating public hearings at the Planning Commission or HPC.

Without enumerating them all, several illustrative examples include the following:

- Eliminates the existing requirement that each CEQA Initial Study address the eight priority policies set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1, including that our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development, in violation of voter approved Proposition M.
- Significantly limits or eliminates public notice of CEQA Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs.
- Shortens project public comment periods from 30 to 15 days making it virtually meaningless.
- Eliminates all currently required public hearings on CEQA Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs at the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission, as well as the right to appeal Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations or Draft EIRs to the Planning Commission.
- Shortens the period to appeal CEQA EIRs and Negative Declarations to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) from 30 to 15 days making the possibility of any meaningful appeal virtually impossible.
- Shortens the time for the BOS to hear the appeal from 30 days to two weeks which does not allow for a fair, adequately briefed hearing.
- Limits the Board of Supervisors to only two weeks to prepare findings which does not allow for a fair, well-informed hearings and decision-making process.

- Eliminates appeals of any housing project which is first approved at the Board of Supervisors.
- Eliminates the requirement for Planning Department staff to prepare annual reports to the Planning Commission and BOS of all appeals.
- Removes Planning Commission and HPC review of Planning Department decisions to add to or modify the lists of categorical exemptions and “ministerial” projects not requiring environmental review.
- Gives the Planning Department staff discretion to change mitigation measures adopted by the Planning Commission or BOS for an already approved project outside of the Planning Commission’s or BOS’s review and to forgo additional environmental review to reevaluate a project that has been substantially modified following a CEQA determination.

Proposed Ordinance is Subject to CEQA Analysis Prior to Consideration by Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors

The proposed ordinance itself is subject to CEQA because it significantly reduces or eliminates long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and public participation that currently exist under Chapter 31. Therefore, CEQA analysis is required before the City can consider the proposed ordinance.

In conclusion, for the four primary reasons enumerated above, NUSF strongly urges both the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission to oppose this harmful, disingenuous proposed ordinance in its entirety.

Sincerely,



Lori Brooke
Co-founder, Neighborhoods United SF

cc:

Mayor Daniel Lurie

Ned Segal, Chief of Housing and Economic Development

Amy Campbell, President amy.campbell@sfgov.org

Lydia So, Commissioner lydia.so@sfgov.org
Sean McGarry, Commissioner sean.mcgarry@sfgov.org
Derek Braun, Commissioner, derek.braun@sfgov.org
Jonas Ionin, Secretary commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Sarah Denis Philips, Planning Director sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
Kei Zushi, Senior Planner kei.zushi@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, Senior Planner ryan.shum@sfgov.org
Clerk of the Board board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Diane Matsuda, President HPC diane.matsuda@sfgov.org
Hans Baldauf, Commissioner hans.baldauf@sfgov.org
Eleanor Cox, Commissioner eleanor.cox@sfgov.org
Robert Vergara, Commissioner robert.vergara1@sfgov.org
Chris Foley, Commissioner chris.foley@sfgov.org
Gayle Strang, Commissioner gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org
Dan Baroni, Commissioner dan.baroni@sfgov.org

All Neighborhoods United SF Partner Organizations:

Aquatic Park Neighbors
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Catalysts for Local Control
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Cow Hollow Association
Cow Hollow-Marina Neighbors and Merchants
D2 United
D4ward
Diamond Heights Community Association
Dolores Heights Improvement Club
East Mission Improvement Association
Excelsior District Improvement Association
Forest Hill Association
Francisco Park Conservancy
Geary Boulevard Merchants and Property Owners Association

Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association
Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Ingleside Terrace Homeowners Assoc
Jordan Park Improvement Association
Lakeside Property Owners Association
La Playa Park Coalition
La Playa Village
Laurel Heights Neighborhood Association
Lombard Hill Improvement Association
Marina - Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants
Marina Community Association
Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association
Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
Noe Valley Council
North Beach Tenants Committee
Oceanview/Merced Heights/Ingleside - Neighbors in Action
Our Neighborhood Voices
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
Parkmerced Action Coalition
Planning Association for the Richmond
Rincon Point Neighborhood Association
Russian Hill Community Association
Russian Hill Improvement Association
San Francisco Land Use Coalition
San Francisco Tenants Union
Save Our Amazing Richmond
Save Our Neighborhoods SF
Sensible D7
St. Francis Homes Association
Small Business Forward
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People

Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

Sunset United Neighbors

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

University Terrace Association

Waterfront Action Committee

Westwood Park Association

From: [Kim Pendleton](#)
To: [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [Vergara, Robert \(CPC\)](#); [Cox, Eleanor \(CPC\)](#); [Baldauf, Hans \(CPC\)](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [Tsern Strang, Gayle \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Shum, Ryan \(CPC\)](#); [secretary@sfgov.org](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Zushi, Kei \(CPC\)](#); [Baroni, Dan \(CPC\)](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Shade Act
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 9:14:43 PM

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

Please protect our public spaces!
I strongly oppose SHADE ACT LEGISLATION
2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]

People need sunshine and parks. (Not highrises for wealthy condo owners.)

Please listen to the people of our city, not the interests of developers

Respectfully,
Kim Pendleton
Resident of Telegraph Hill

From: [blandina farley](#)
To: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Mcgarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Zushi, Kei \(CPC\)](#); [Shum, Ryan \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [Baldauf, Hans \(CPC\)](#); [Cox, Eleanor \(CPC\)](#); [Vergara, Robert \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [Tsern Strang, Gayle \(CPC\)](#); [Baroni, Dan \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: OPPOSITION to SHADE ACT LEGISLATION
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 9:20:36 PM

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

Amy Campbell, President
San Francisco Planning Commission

Diane Matsuda, President

San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
49 S. Van Ness, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: OPPOSITION to SHADE ACT LEGISLATION
2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]

Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda and Commissioners,

I stand strongly with the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) in opposition to the Shade Act legislation. On behalf of the THD, I write to strongly oppose the proposed ordinance which would significantly amend procedures governing the City's implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

While represented as an effort to remove shadow analysis from local CEQA review, this ordinance represents a major rollback of San Francisco's environmental review process, reducing long-standing environmental protections and limiting public participation.

We urge the Commissions to oppose this proposed legislation for the following key reasons:

* Violation of Proposition M: Removing shadow analysis violates Proposition M, adopted by voters in November 1986, which established

eight Priority Policies in the General Plan. This includes protecting parks, open spaces, and their access to sunlight from development. Compliance with Proposition M requires shadow analysis to be included in each initial study as a potential environmental effect under CEQA. Removing these guidelines also undermines Proposition K (June 1984), which established a shadow ban on parks and public spaces.

* Shadow is a Physical Environmental Effect: The ordinance's intent to declare that shadow is not a physical environmental effect contradicts Section 15382 of the California CEQA Guidelines and long-standing Planning Department practice. The Planning Department's own CEQA Initial Study Checklist has long listed "Shadow" as an environmental impact category. In a dense urban environment like San Francisco, shadow analysis is vital to evaluating impacts on recreation, land use, public services, culture, and aesthetics.

*Conflict with the Core Purpose of CEQA: The core purpose of CEQA is to inform decision-makers and the public about the environmental effects of proposed projects. The proposed ordinance limits transparency and public participation by:

- Eliminating the requirement that initial studies address the eight priority policies of Proposition M.
- Significantly limiting public notice of Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations, and Draft EIRs.
- Shortening public comment periods from 30 to 15 days.
- Eliminating public hearings on Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs at the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission, as well as the right to appeal these decisions to the Planning Commission.
- Shortening the period to appeal EIRs and Negative Declarations to the Board of Supervisors from 30 to 15 days, and reducing the Board's hearing and finding preparation time frames to two weeks.
- Eliminating appeals for housing projects first approved by the Board of Supervisors.
- Removing Commission oversight regarding modifications to categorical exemptions and ministerial project lists.
- Granting staff unilateral discretion to modify adopted mitigation measures without public or Commission review.
- Required CEQA Analysis for the Ordinance: Because this ordinance proposed to significantly reduce pre-existing environmental protections and public participation, the ordinance itself is subject to CEQA analysis before it

can be considered by the City.

On a personal note, I deeply value our public parks, open spaces, and access to sunlight. Having lived in New York and witnessed the restriction of Gramercy Park, and remembering the attempt to fence off Huntington Park here in San Francisco, I know how vital these shared, sunlit green spaces are for our community to gather and thrive. We must prioritize the well-being of our residents and the protection of our public spaces over development interests.

For these reasons, we urge the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission to oppose this proposed ordinance in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Blandina Farley
1432 Stockton St.
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: [Dick Lumaghi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 5:30:30 AM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Tina Costa Delaney](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please oppose the Shade Act
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 6:57:13 AM

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

To our Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act. The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,
Tina Delaney
1145 Union St. #3, San Francisco, CA 94109

From: [Marc Bruno](#)
To: [Marc Bruno](#)
Cc: [D3DC](#)
Subject: My Opposition to Shade Act Legislation, 2026-004685PCA, Board File No. 260539
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 7:59:58 PM
Attachments: [THD Anti-Anti-Shade Letter.pdf](#)
[Land as Airspace How Rezoning Privatizes Public Space and Why Governments Should Not Give It Away for Free .pdf](#)

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

My Opposition to Shade Act Legislation, 2026-004685PCA, Board File No. 260539

July 14 2026

Dear Commission Members and Supervisors,

I support the tenor and conclusions of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers opposition to the Shade legislation being considered by the City and County of San Francisco. [See attached THD letter.] I am opposed to this as a 40 year resident of one of our city's most dense neighborhoods, North Beach, and as a believer in parks and the need for more open space-- conclusions I draw from my 25+ years as a social worker for those living on the streets of our city, or are otherwise unhoused. (Hospitalized, couch surfing, living in cars, etc.)

Parks- Open Space- Clean Air and Water. These life needs are the basis of all state and local environmental protections, including CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act. They are cardinal qualities of happiness and progress, significant to the poor and rich alike, to those who live in our city today and those who might live here tomorrow.

Parks, open space, clean air and water are expansive in their effect on the community. They are not confined to a single part of our City, and neither is our need for them. A loss of one park is a loss to everyone to everyone who lives here. All of us.

Changes proposed by the Shade Act Legislation (2026-004685PCA, Board File No. 260539) will harm all City residents equally, as well as those who visit. For this reason, I am adamantly opposed to it.

The battle by the powers that be to take over the most valued parts of our environment, without recompense or mitigation.

In parts of many cities, including Manhattan, private parks are valued because they are protected from the public. "Gramercy Park" in New York is but one example, a park where the users must have a key to enter, and an address facing the park. They pay for this privilege.

The shade legislation currently under consideration would have the same long-term effect here: to remove from the public good the open space that CEQA protects and that all of us deserve. To shift essential life goods from the public to the private sphere.

In a recent Routledge Forum, "The Price of Upzoning," Colin Murray and Joshua Gordon write, "A popular but contested view is that mass rezoning is essential to address housing affordability. Obscured in debates about this is that rezoning involves privatization of public space. Rezoning to

provide rights to airspace for upzoning is not costless. It transfers valuable property rights from the public to existing private landowners for free, creating a more unequal distribution . . .”

[See attached *Land as Airspace: How Rezoning Privatizes Public Space, and Why Government should not give it away for free*, Murray and Gordon, February 16, 2023]

This is an accurate description of what will happen if San Francisco pares down the CEQA requirements that protect our parks and open space. Nothing less than an attempt at rezoning in favor of real estate developers, in many case contributors to the very politicians favoring this harmful change. It is not a change that would benefit the everyday San Franciscan. It has been written to benefit real estate investors.

Please vote against it.

Yours,

Marc Bruno, President
St. Vincent de Paul Society, North Beach Chapter
and Vice-President, District 3 Democratic Club of San Francisco
15 Nobles Alley, Apartment 3
San Francisco, CA 94133

July 13, 2026

Amy Campbell, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
Diane Matsuda, President
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
49 S. Van Ness, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Via email: commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Re: Opposition to Shade Act Legislation
2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]

Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly OPPOSE the above-cited proposed ordinance. This ordinance would significantly amend procedures governing the City's implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The ordinance has been represented as intended to remove shadow analysis as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review. However, the ordinance disguises a major assault on San Francisco's environmental review process, significantly reducing long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and thwarting public participation.

For reasons, such as those set forth below, we urge the Commission to oppose this proposed legislation:

- Removal of shadow analysis is a violation of Proposition M.
- Shadow is a physical environmental effect that must be considered under CEQA, as long acknowledged by Planning Department practice.
- The ordinance's major limitation or elimination of Planning Commission review and public notice, comment, and appeal is in direct conflict with the core purpose of CEQA.
- The ordinance is subject to CEQA analysis prior to consideration by the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors.

Removal of Shadow Analysis is a Violation of Proposition M

The proposed amendment to “remove shadow analysis as a specific type of environmental impact” would violate the provisions of Proposition M adopted by the voters in November 1986. Proposition M established eight Priority Policies in the General Plan, including: “8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.”

The specific provisions of Proposition M prohibit the City from adopting any legislation that is inconsistent with the Priority Policies and require that prior to issuing a permit for any project which requires an initial study under CEQA, the City must find that the project is consistent with the Priority Policies, including protecting from development our parks and open space and their access to sunlight. Compliance with Proposition M requires shadow analysis to be included in each initial study as a potential environmental effect under CEQA. Therefore, the proposed ordinance cannot remove shadow, or the other Priority Policies, as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review.

The proposed amendments would eliminate the long standing requirement that local CEQA review include:

“consistency with the environmental issues included in the Eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code and incorporated into the General Plan; shadow impacts, including the analysis set forth in Planning Code Section 295, and such other data and information specific to the urban environment of San Francisco or to the specific project.”
[emphasis added]

By deleting this language, the proposed ordinance would eliminate reference to two major propositions approved by voters emphasizing the importance of access to sunlight, and successfully used for more than 40 years. In addition to the Eight Priority Policies in Proposition M, it would eliminate from environmental review the shadow ban on parks and other public spaces adopted by voters as Proposition K in June 1984. Even if both of these propositions remain in place elsewhere in the code, deleting them from the local CEQA guidelines would eliminate them as critical factors in informing decision makers and the public about the

environmental impacts of projects that the San Francisco electorate have twice voted to protect.

Shadow is a Physical Environmental Effect and Should Continue to be Considered Under CEQA, as Long Acknowledged by Planning Department Practice

The findings in the proposed ordinance state that “It is the intent of the Board [sic] of Supervisors to remove shadow as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review.” Sec. 1(j) of the proposed findings would require the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to find that “shadow is not a physical environmental effect under CEQA because its impacts are subjective, variable, dependent on personal preference and the weather, and can have both positive and negative health implications.”

Not only would this finding be in violation of Proposition M, but it would be inconsistent with long-standing Planning Department practice. Shadow is a physical environmental effect under Sec. 15382 of the California CEQA Guidelines, which defines “Significant Effect on the Environment” to mean “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.” Few physical effects are more readily apparent than shadows, especially when they affect public spaces. Under a plain reading of the CEQA Guideline’s definition, shadow is clearly a “physical condition,” and thus must not be excluded from CEQA analysis.

That shadow is a physical environmental effect to be considered under CEQA has long been acknowledged by the Planning Department. For example, the Department’s CEQA Initial Study Checklist (as downloaded on July 3, 2026 from the Department’s environmental review website at sfplanning.org/permit/environmental-review-resources) specifically lists “Shadow” as an environmental impact category to be considered when determining if a project requires a CEQA Negative Declaration or a full Environmental Impact Report. Shadow has been included in the Department’s Checklist for many years.

Information about shadow impacts is commonly developed during environmental impact assessments, and is an important factor in

informing decision makers and the public about the environmental impacts of a project, especially in the dense urban environment of San Francisco. Analyses of shadow can also be central to the evaluation of such other CEQA environmental impact categories as Recreation, Land Use / Planning, Public Services, Cultural, and Aesthetics.

Major Limitation or Elimination of Planning Commission Review and Public Notice, Comment, and Appeal is in Direct Conflict with Core Purpose of CEQA

The core purpose of CEQA is to provide decision makers and the public information on the environmental effects of a proposed project. According to Sec. 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines: “An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.”

Limiting or eliminating public notice, comment, and information access directly conflicts with this stated purpose. Numerous instances of such limitation or elimination are found in the proposed ordinance, with any resulting “streamlining” of local CEQA review coming at the expense of the public right-to-know. The authority of the Planning Commission, the HPC, and Board of Supervisors would be subsumed by Planning Department staff at the expense of public’s right to notice, comment and appeal, reducing transparency and opportunities for public participation. In other words, the right of the public to appeal Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) would be significantly limited by decreasing public notice and eliminating public hearings at the Planning Commission or HPC.

Without enumerating them all, several illustrative examples include the following:

- Eliminates the existing requirement that each initial study address the eight priority policies set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1, including That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development, in violation of voter approved Proposition M.

- Significantly limits or eliminates public notice of Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs.
- Shortens project public comment periods from 30 to 15 days making it virtually meaningless.
- Eliminates all currently required public hearings on Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs at the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission, as well as the right to appeal Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations or Draft EIRs to the Planning Commission.
- Shortens the period to appeal EIRs and Negative Declarations to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) from 30 to 15 days making the possibility of any meaningful appeal virtually impossible.
- Shortens the time for the BOS to hear the appeal from 30 days to two weeks which does not allow for a fair, adequately briefed hearing.
- Limits the Board of Supervisors to only two weeks to prepare findings which does not allow for a fair, well-informed hearing and decision making process.
- Eliminates appeals of any housing project which is first approved at the Board of Supervisors.
- Eliminates the requirement for Planning Department staff to prepare annual reports to the Planning Commission and BOS of all appeals.
- Removes Planning Commission and HPC review of Planning Department decisions to add to or modify the lists of categorical exemptions and “ministerial” projects not requiring environmental review.
- Gives the Planning Department staff discretion to change mitigation measures adopted by the Planning Commission or BOS for an already approved project outside of the Planning Commission’s or BOS’s review

and to forgo additional environmental review to reevaluate a project that has been substantially modified following a CEQA determination.

Proposed Ordinance is Subject to CEQA Analysis Prior to Consideration by Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors

The proposed ordinance itself is subject to CEQA because it significantly reduces or eliminates long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and public participation that currently exist under Chapter 31. Therefore, CEQA analysis is required before the City can consider the proposed ordinance.

* * *

In conclusion, for reasons that include those listed above, we urge the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission to oppose this proposed ordinance in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan
Co-Chairs, Planning & Zoning, Telegraph Hill Dwellers

cc: Amy Campbell, President amy.campbell@sfgov.org
Lydia So, Commissioner lydia.so@sfgov.org
Sean McGarry, Commissioner sean.mcgarry@sfgov.org
Jonas Ionin, Secretary commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Kei Zushi, Senior Planner kei.zushi@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, Senior Planner ryan.shum@sfgov.org
Clerk of the Board board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Diane Matsuda, President diane.matsuda@sfgov.org
Hans Baldauf, Commissioner hans.baldauf@sfgov.org
Eleanor Cox, Commissioner eleanor.cox@sfgov.org
Robert Vergara, Commissioner robert.vergara1@sfgov.org
Chris Foley, Commissioner chris.foley@sfgov.org
Gayle Strang, Commissioner gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org
Dan Baroni, Commissioner dan.baroni@sfgov.org



Land as Airspace: How Rezoning Privatizes Public Space (and Why Governments Should Not Give It Away for Free)

Cameron K. Murray & Joshua C. Gordon

To cite this article: Cameron K. Murray & Joshua C. Gordon (2024) Land as Airspace: How Rezoning Privatizes Public Space (and Why Governments Should Not Give It Away for Free), *Housing Policy Debate*, 34:2, 228-241, DOI: [10.1080/10511482.2023.2234878](https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2023.2234878)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2023.2234878>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 31 Jul 2023.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 3290



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



Citing articles: 7 [View citing articles](#)

Land as Airspace: How Rezoning Privatizes Public Space (and Why Governments Should Not Give It Away for Free)

Cameron K. Murray^a and Joshua C. Gordon^b

^aHenry Halloran Trust, The University of Sydney, Camperdown, Australia; ^bDigital Society Lab, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

ABSTRACT

A popular but contested view is that mass rezoning is an essential policy measure to address housing affordability. Often obscured in debates about this measure is that rezoning involves the privatization of public space. We clarify the nature of the policy by recognizing that property rights over land are, conceptually, a bundle of socially negotiated rights to parcels of airspace. This view shows that rezoning to provide rights to airspace for existing landowners is not costless. It involves transferring valuable property rights from the public to existing private landowners for free, creating a more unequal distribution of property rights ownership without necessarily generating faster housing development. We argue that giving away public rights to airspace should not be done for free and explore what policy measures retain value from residential rezoning for the public.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 8 February 2023

Accepted 16 February 2023

KEYWORDS

Housing supply; zoning; property rights; airspace

That's what I do for a living, I sell air ... (Finn, 2013)

1. Planning Creates Property

Rising dwelling prices in major cities have spurred intense policy debates (Williams, 2020). One position in this debate holds that a major cause of high dwelling prices is restrictive or “exclusionary” zoning (e.g., Glaeser & Gyourko, 2018; Metcalf, 2018). In this view, there is an urgent need to rezone vast swathes of urban land to higher densities to spur faster new housing supply and reduce house prices. Single-family zoning is particularly maligned, and cities are urged to eliminate this type of zoning in favor of “legalizing” triplexes, fourplexes, and even denser forms of housing (Kahlenberg, 2019; Manville, 2020).

This position has been adopted by politicians and analysts from across the political spectrum in countries like the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand. However, it is especially associated with representatives and analysts of the political left. Liberal columnists at publications like *The New York Times* have repeatedly invoked this argument (Dougherty, 2020; Klein, 2021; Manjoo, 2020), whereas the Biden administration in the United States has proposed a \$5 billion program that will incentivize cities to rezone areas with single-family zoning to combat “exclusionary zoning” (Logan, 2021). At the municipal level too, many progressive politicians have urged the “liberalization” of zoning (Badger & Bui, 2019; Shaw, 2020).

CONTACT Cameron K. Murray  c.murray@sydney.edu.au

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

As we will show, these mass rezoning proposals amount to a major privatization of public space. We clarify that land (real property) is best thought of as a set of property rights over airspace, with zoning defining the scope of that airspace through its regulations about building form. In this sense, zoning does not impinge on a landowner's property rights; rather, zoning *defines* property rights. This previously uncontroversial view of property appears to be widely ignored in current policy debate about the interaction of zoning and housing markets (Penner, 1995).

Rezoning to higher density, therefore, involves the transfer of a property right—to volumetric space and a right to a different use—from the public to an existing private landowner, who formerly owned a different set of property rights at a location. Moreover, by their nature, all private property rights are exclusionary, including newly privatized airspace property rights that are granted to the same existing property owners. Thus, the frequent invocation of “exclusionary zoning” in housing debates may confuse more than enlighten because regardless of zoning or housing type, access to an area is rationed by price.¹

What this illustrates, we believe, is a perversion of the typical pattern of left–right politics. The left has usually resisted privatization. What makes rezoning calls by the left quite different to historical privatizations is that in most cases the public is not being compensated for the value of the privatized airspace property rights. There is thus an enormous implicit cost to this policy approach that is being ignored. The value of the property rights given away are equivalent to potential government revenue, because in an alternative policy approach the market value of these rights could be captured by governments.

In what follows, we explain the “bundle of rights” approach to property and present simplified conceptual diagrams that can be used for educational purposes. The latter illustrate that when land is conceptualized as three-dimensional airspace, upzoning simply involves the expansion of private airspace at the expense of what is currently either public or quasi-public airspace. The literature on land rights also makes clear that the ownership of land is usually highly conditional and constrained in law, which makes transferring it without conditions or compensation a questionable policy move.

We also explain how zoning defines the location of different property rights but not the speed at which those rights are utilized, such as by redeveloping a site into higher density housing. Property rights are a real option—a right, but not an obligation, to undertake the allowable uses. Density (dwellings per unit of space) and the rate of new housing supply (dwellings per unit of time) are conceptually distinct. As an analogy, lane markings on a road that regulate where vehicles must locate are conceptually distinct from speed limits. The rate of new housing supply, known as the market absorption rate, is a built-in speed limit on new housing supply even without planning and zoning regulations, or where there is a large amount of zoned capacity to develop new housing (Murray, 2020, 2021a). Privatizing public airspace does not necessarily change any private economic incentives to develop new housing faster.

We then look at the implications of this reconceptualization for policy and note a variety of alternative housing policy options that can address the key issues identified with the privatization of airspace rights for free, such as value capture, incentivizing faster market development, and direct housing development alternatives.

Lastly, we discuss potential explanations for why, in the case of mass rezoning, there seems to be an inversion of typical left–right politics. Ultimately, greater conceptual clarity about the economics and property rights situation involved in rezoning will help planners to formulate better approaches to foster higher density and faster new housing supply, while capturing significant value for the public along the way.

2. The Bundle of Property Rights in Three Dimensions

Despite being a fundamental legal concept, the nature of property is regularly debated and generally regarded as conceptually ambiguous.² One useful way to conceptualize property is as a

composite bundle of rights and obligations granted by the state (Baron, 2013). It is thus inherently a collective agreement about the relationship amongst people with regard to the physical world. Property rights are not absolute, nor God-given. They are a product of regulation and law. In the case of land, property usually comprises a bundle of exclusive rights granted to the title holder over the activities within a defined three-dimensional space.

The issue we wish to highlight here is the vertical dimension of real property (land rights). The principle of *Cuius est solum, eius est usque ad coelum et ad inferos*—a Latin phrase that means *For whoever owns the soil, it is theirs up to heaven and down to hell*—is a popular but misleading basis for understanding real property. The vertical extent of property rights to space is not unlimited. It is defined via statutory and common law. Historically, common law provisions for access to wind or sunlight could limit vertical uses of neighboring property by allocating those vertical spaces as easements and part of the property rights bundle of the neighboring property owner.³ With the advent of air travel, the rights to the airspace above certain heights become detached from private property rights bundles and reserved for the specific public flying purposes. Rights to space deep underground are also not part of the private property bundle. Tunnels can be built without impinging on private property rights provided they are of a sufficient depth.

Nowadays, the three-dimensional nature of property rights is enshrined in the property titles systems of many countries (Karki et al., 2013; van Oosterom et al., 2018). In Australia, property can be subdivided in three dimensions using a volumetric titling system, an example of which is shown in the top left panel of Figure 1. In this system, the spatial extent of exclusive rights is defined in three dimensions in the title system itself. This approach provides certainty in complex situations, such as buildings situated above roads or rail corridors, or with multiples uses and ownership within the same building structure.

Formalizing the third dimension of property rights was required before creation of condominium towers in large cities could occur, for instance (Harris, 2011; So, 1962). With the legal innovation of the condominium, it was made explicit that rights to distinct parcels of airspace exist. Many cities have rules about view corridors, which are airspace rights owned by the public that exclude fixed buildings being built in the space, such as in Auckland and Vancouver. The protected view rights in Vancouver are shown in the bottom panels of Figure 1. These are airspace rights explicitly reserved for the public through planning laws. Railways and subways are often granted airspace rights to pass below and through buildings. Some cities even allow the rights to airspace to be traded independently, such as New York's system that evolved on the back of a 1977 zoning resolution (top right panel of Figure 1).

Within the three-dimensional space defined by common and statutory laws, property rights are not absolute. Many national and state governments reserve the rights to minerals and oil and gas located within private property spaces.⁴ Property rights may limit the use of wild vegetation and animals or the storing or use of certain substances, for example, depending on a variety of local, state, and national laws. Even the right to dispose of property via sale or inheritance is not absolute. Compulsory acquisition (eminent domain) laws exist to avoid hold-out problems from private property owners who refuse to voluntarily sell to the government to allow public works to take place.

The interplay between neighboring property rights has always been a contested area. In fact, zoning was used to overcome some of the limitations of traditional land-use property rights and improve coordination between uses. As Quigley and Rosenthal explain:

Before the 1920s, experimentation with planning and zoning in U.S. cities and towns was sparse and arose primarily as a consequence of the desires of large-tract residential developers to eliminate industrial and commercial activities in their path. With the common law "coming to the nuisance" defense to such property tort claims still intact, developers turned to city councils for relief in the form of authorizing ordinances clearing the way. One such measure adopted in Los Angeles outlawed the operation of a brick kiln in place long before any of the nearby residences were built. The ordinance was upheld in the face of constitutional challenges in the U.S. Supreme Court's 1915 decision in *Hadacheck v. Sebastian* (239 U.S. 394). Answering the kiln owner's claims of wrongful




Figure 1. Example of volumetric title plans in isometric view in panel (a) (Chambers, 2011), a conceptual diagram of New York airspace trading in panel (b) (NYC Panning, 2021), and a Vancouver view corridor in plan view (c) with its volumetric airspace nature shown in panel (d) (City of Vancouver, 2021).

confiscation of his business, the court remarked, “There must be progress and if in its march private interests are in the way they must yield to the good of the community.” (Quigley & Rosenthal, 2005, p. 71)

We have so far described the conventional notion of property as a bundle of rights to three-dimensional space, and how laws of all types can define the limits to those rights. This legal conceptual background thus leads to the idea of zoning as a set of laws that define the extent of property rights in three dimensions, and thus demonstrate how a policy of mass rezoning amounts to the privatization of public space for free.

3. Zoning and Airspace Property Rights

Zoning laws define which rights are in a property bundle and which are not. Typically, zoning rules, like condominium laws and volumetric subdivision, provide tight definitions of the vertical

limit to property rights and permissible use types. By defining a vertical limit to private property, zoning also implicitly defines a vertical space above which the right to build is not held by a private property owner, but by the public. This is publicly owned airspace. This is a crucial insight from the property rights approach to zoning.

In Figure 2 we visualize the three-dimensional nature of property rights and the spatial implications of zoning. Conceptually, there are three portions of the vertical space that can be part of private property that are of interest—underground, on-ground, and above-ground. Above and below these spaces are regulated airspace and public underground space, respectively. The left column in Figure 2 shows the different spatial property rights in an apartment/condominium tower. The right to build in the underground, on-ground, and above-ground space is part of the private property rights bundle as defined by zoning and other laws. Within that volume of space, further volumetric subdivisions create spaces that are for the exclusive use of one property owner, and spaces that are owned in common by building owners (for a discussion of the condominium form, see Harris (2011)). These subspaces are defined three-dimensionally, usually with reference to building features.




Figure 2. Property as a right to three-dimensional space (authors' diagram).

The center column of Figure 2 shows the case of property where zoning defines a lower vertical limit to building height than in the first column. The right to build in that airspace is held by the public. The collective nature of this right means that, for example, a neighboring landowner cannot cantilever a building into that space either, as they do not possess exclusive rights to do so.

The right column in Figure 2 is a public space, where property rights to all vertical space is held collectively by the public, with access and use rights managed with alternative systems.

This simple three-dimensional conception of zoning and property rights shows that rezoning to allow more intensive building on private property entails a privatization of public airspace. It is little different conceptually from privatizing adjacent space in the form of neighboring public property, such as granting rights to public forest land near the urban boundary to adjacent private landowners (the middle-right square in Figure 2), allowing them to increase housing development on their new larger site. The airspace privatization concept applies generally, even in the case of “missing middle” housing, which typically involves an expansion of building volume rights in a parcel of airspace. Even if the vertical building limit does not change, the right to use the airspace more intensively is a new property right, separable from existing rights, and with its own market value.

4. The Optional Nature of Property Rights

Property rights in land have the nature of a real option. They confer a right but not an obligation. It is up to the property rights owner to choose whether, and when, they develop property by investing in new buildings. This lack of obligation is one of the inherent economic inefficiencies of the property rights systems, and why historical legal debates about the nature of property rights often centered on the principle of “use-it-or-lose-it” provisions (Epstein, 2015; Posner & Weyl, 2017). Buildings that are economical to build today may be delayed for a variety of reasons, including because investment is irreversible in the short term. Building a five-storey building today may make it uneconomical to build a 10-storey building in the medium term, and hence striking the development option comes at the cost of future alternatives that may have higher total economic returns. In practice, this means that there is a limited connection between the amount of so-called “zoned capacity” and the rate of new housing construction (Limb & Murray, 2020).

This is a relevant insight for the debate about upzoning and housing supply. It is assumed that current zoning rules are a binding constraint and that only by privatizing airspace rights will private property owners be able to change the rate of new housing supply. This is the logic behind the policy push for mass upzoning.

However, government reviews into the rate of homebuilding in the United Kingdom have noted that market factors determine the rate of housing supply (Letwin, 2018). Known as the absorption rate, the rate of supply appears unaffected by the density of allowable housing development (Murray, 2021a). Privatizing airspace on the assumption that increased density equates to a faster absorption rate is, therefore, highly questionable. Evidence from private housing developers in Australia confirms that zoned land is managed as a capital asset (it is “land banked”), not an inventory, with development sequenced in such a way as to maximize total returns on property rights assets over time (Murray, 2020). This means that when prices fall, housing developers reduce supply, creating an automatic speed limit on new market-led development.

An analysis of Los Angeles housing development found that only between 0.1% and 0.3% of land parcels are developed into new housing each year, in a city where zoned capacity for extra dwellings is greater than the current total stock of housing. Moreover, 45% of approved developments exceeded zoned capacity via changes to zoning or exemptions (Romem, 2021). The three-fold variation in the rate of supply was driven by market conditions, not zoning, which is less than observed by Murray (2022), who found a seven-fold variation in the rate of development year on year within approved housing projects.

Thus, the real options nature of property rights means that the privatization of public airspace may not lead to a change in the overall quantity of new housing supplied by the market each period, which has been a key argument in its favor. This means that the economic redistribution from falling dwelling prices that is usually taken to accompany the policy may not exist, or might be minimal, compared to the redistribution of valuable airspace to existing property owners.

5. Three Implications for Policy

5.1. Airspace Has a Market Value, Often a High One

Airspace property rights (or intensification rights) have a market value, and often a very high one. One study in Australia showed that the rezoning of just six areas targeted for more intensive uses in Queensland, Australia, increased property values by \$720 million (Murray & Frijters, 2016). Another study highlights the example of a 363 ha site 40 km west of Melbourne that increased in value from \$120 million to \$400 million after its rezoning from rural to residential (Kendall & Tulip, 2018). Freemark (2019) looked at upzoning in Chicago and found that it increased property values by 15–23%.

Thus, city upzoning decisions not only decide where different types of housing are built in the future but also decide which existing landowners receive windfall gains due to the value of new airspace rights they are granted. This incentivizes landowners to actively invest in either political persuasion or outright corruption to gain these valuable rights (Murray & Frijters, 2016), and indeed helps explain why proposals for large-scale rezoning have become so popular, despite the weak empirical evidence behind them.⁵

5.2. Privatizing Airspace Redistributes Property Rights Unequally

Second, when rezoning occurs the value of those airspace rights goes to existing property owners, not new property owners. This exacerbates the already unequal distribution of property rights ownership seen in most developed countries (Causa et al., 2019).

Although privatizing airspace is often thought to have large downward redistributive consequences, the initial reallocation of property rights from the public is an upward redistribution of wealth as existing landowners tend to be wealthier. For subsequent market actions that result from mass upzoning to have a downward redistributive effect, there must be an extraordinarily large effect on the rate of new housing supply above the counterfactual, sufficient to generate large reductions in housing rents.

5.3. Privatizing Airspace May Have No Effect on Dwelling Supply

Because upzoning confers the property right to develop higher density housing, but not an obligation to do so, it is unclear whether there will be a noticeable increase in overall new dwelling supply (i.e., across newly upzoned locations and locations with existing zoned capacity). If the situation is that the market absorption rate is the limiting factor on the rate of new supply in a region, then there will be little or no change in total new dwellings, but potentially a change in their composition by location and type. Although we certainly support the intensification of urban uses as cities grow and evolve, rather than excessive low-density city growth, it is not clear that zoning is a key determinant of the overall rate of housing supply. Even if there are circumstances where mass upzoning has a marginal effect on the rate of new housing supply, it still comes at an enormous cost in the form of the privatized value of airspace rights and is likely to be an inefficient and unequal way to achieve that supply outcome.

6. Using the Public Airspace Realm for Social Benefit

In this section, we suggest ways to ensure that the economic value of airspace property rights that are privatized from rezoning are captured for the public, and how governments can design incentives to accelerate new housing development and address affordability concerns with non-market housing alternatives.

6.1. Capture Airspace Value by Tax, Sale, or Public Purchase and Rezone

Because upzoning involves a redistribution of valuable property rights to existing landowners, capturing that value for the public can reduce the upward wealth redistribution that arises from it. There are multiple ways to achieve this outcome, and we describe some here with examples, although this is not an exhaustive description.

A first example is the taxation of the value gain due to rezoning, sometimes known as a “betterment tax,” which retains a portion of the value of the airspace property right. In the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), when zoning is changed to allow higher value uses at a location, property owners must “buy” the property right necessary to rebuild to that newly allowable use from the ACT government in the form of a Leave Variation Charge (LVC). It is applied at a rate of 75% to a tax base that is calculated as the difference in value of the current property right, assuming only the current use is the allowable use, and the new property right for the higher value use. In a city of fewer than 500,000 people, this has recently raised \$50 million per year on average (Murray, 2021b).

In Sydney, Australia, between 1969 and 1973 a tax of 30% of the value difference between rural-zoned property rights and urban-zoned rights was enacted, payable on conversion of land use (Archer, 1976). It raised \$12 million but faced fierce political opposition. Great Britain at various times enacted a betterment levy at rates between 40% and 75% since the 1909 town planning system was introduced, but as in the case of Sydney, the interests of property owners prevailed, and they manoeuvred politically to quickly repeal the taxes (Plimmer & McGill, 2003). In 2021, variations of this betterment tax concept are being proposed by governments in New South Wales and Victoria.

In the City of Vancouver, for most rezoning proposals, the municipal government attempts to capture around 70% of the “land lift” (or land appreciation) associated with a rezoning through what are called Community Amenity Contributions (CACs; City of Vancouver, 2018; Moore, 2013). This can take the form of either direct cash transfers or the delivery of in-kind contributions, such as the provision of community centers or park upgrades. During the recent building boom, the City brought in hundreds of millions in revenue or “public benefits” each year (City of Vancouver, 2018). Although some areas of the city have a preset CAC rate, in many cases contributions are negotiated on a case-by-case basis. This system relies on an administration that is committed to meeting the stated ambitions regarding land lift capture, however, because the way contributions are calculated is often hidden from public view.

A second way to capture the value is to sell airspace rights. São Paulo, Brazil, sells right to build to higher density in city areas targeted for densification and redevelopment. Although these recover the value of airspace property rights, they do not change investment timing incentives. The World Bank describes the system as follows:

The city of São Paulo, for example, has used an instrument called *Certificados de Potencial Adicional de Construção*, or CEPACs (translated as certificates of additional construction potential bonds) as a tool to create development rights for upzoning. The city then sold these rights to developers to raise funds to finance infrastructure construction. The total number of CEPACs, which is capped by law, is determined by the municipality. CEPACs can be used only in certain designated areas that the city government has targeted for public investments. One attractive feature of CEPACs from the developers’ perspective has been that they are not required to undertake their development projects immediately after the acquisition

of building rights. Instead, they can decide on the timing of their investments according to market conditions. (World Bank, 2021)

The New York airspace trading system is somewhat unique in that it firstly gives airspace rights to landowners, who are then able to trade them independently of the rights to existing uses (Finn, 2013). The risk with this approach is that future policy changes will simply grant additional new airspace rights to property owners who have already sold theirs.

A third way to capture value from airspace rights is for a public agency to purchase, voluntarily or compulsorily, property targeted for intensification of uses. Singapore does this with its public housing provider, the Housing Development Board (HDB). A unique part of Singapore's system is that the private owners of land acquired by the government for public uses have historically not been compensated at market values for their land (Haila, 2015). This approach opens up a way for governments to claw back value from private landowners in addition to getting the value from the rezoning (and redevelopment) into dense new housing estates.

In the Netherlands, a common system for urban development involves government agencies purchasing property rights in rural uses, then selling the sites with new property rights for higher intensity uses after public works and lot realignments have taken place, known as Active Land Policy (ALP) (Shahab, 2021). This is an approach also adopted in the ACT in Australia, where rural-to-urban land conversion is solely done by a public developer. It has been calculated that if other Australian states enacted the ACT's combined betterment tax and public ownership systems for capturing upzoning value they would raise \$19 billion annually (Murray & Frijters, 2017).

Public purchase of land and rezoning can also capture value accruing to property rights owners from transport investments, such as the Hong Kong urban rail (the MTR Corporation). The MTR Corporation owns the airspace and buildings above the rail stations, capturing the economic value of the high accessibility that the new rail stations create via the rents of those buildings. Their business has profited predominantly from their property assets following development and from later management of buildings, enabling a high degree of reinvestment in the transit system and low ticket prices. Rather than the value of the property rights for redevelopment near station locations being granted to existing nearby private landowners, these are predominantly internalized into the transit system. Analysis of MTR corporation profits over time reveals that airspace rights generate the bulk of its profits through property development and management (Aveline-Dubach & Blandeau, 2019).

6.2. Inclusionary Zoning

Another approach to generating public benefits from rezoning is inclusionary zoning. Inclusionary zoning requires that a certain proportion of new construction be designated for below-market rents (or prices), such that low- or middle-income residents can afford them. Rather than a cash payment, the subsidy value of the affordable housing units is the public benefit received in exchange for the granting of valuable additional property rights.

These policies come in a variety of forms (see, e.g., Ramakrishnan et al., 2019). They mainly vary in terms of the share of units that must be below market, the extent of that discount, and the length of time in which those units will be held at below market rents (in the case of rental units). There are also often rules that govern what size of new developments such an approach would apply to, as well as regulations about the units themselves (e.g., whether they must be indistinguishable from the market-rate units, whether they need to be located in the same building, etc.). They are typically imposed by local governments, and there are usually various inducements to developers to incentivize adoption, in cases where it is not mandatory for all developments. These inducements include faster permit times, lower development charges, and especially "density bonuses," which grant additional units or density on a plot of land (i.e., more significant airspace privatization).

Inclusionary zoning programs have been challenged on several grounds. One criticism is that they slow the production of market-rate units, because they represent a “tax” on development, and thereby raise rents overall (for a discussion of this, see Ramakrishnan et al., 2019; Schuetz et al., 2011). There is limited evidence for this view, however (Schuetz et al., 2011). In most jurisdictions, relatively few affordable units have been generated, and the below-market discount is either modest or still beyond the reach of many low-income residents (Schuetz et al., 2011). As a result, the hoped-for neighborhood integration that inclusionary zoning promises has not materialized in a substantial way (see, e.g., Zhang, 2019).

Although inclusionary zoning is an important potential tool to capture public benefits from rezoning, its limited existing success serves as a caution. In many programs, the extent to which the below-market units capture a substantial part of the value of upzoning may be questionable, and this may be the result of lacking a clear formula or mechanism that links previous land value to the new (rezoned) land value, as exists in some of the approaches documented in Section 6.1. At worst, inclusionary zoning policies can serve as a virtuous “cover” for major development or density concessions by local governments (see, e.g., Condon, 2020).

6.3. Change Development Timing Incentives

In addition to capturing the value of airspace rights, one of the challenges of the planning system is that it can change the inter-temporal trade-off faced by property owners in their choice of development timing. Flexible planning systems may incentivize slower development if they allow for denser buildings in the future, although we suspect this effect is relatively small (Murray, 2021a).

Two possible approaches for changing the timing incentives are as follows. The first is to offer time-limited incentives for development, either through expiring development rights or through incrementally increasing charges on development, which reduce payoffs to future development compared to developing now.

A second approach is the traditional land value tax on the market value of the property right, net of improvements. Most British colonies have inherited some form of land value taxation, as distinct from property taxation which includes the value of buildings and improvements. Although land value taxes are traditionally understood as economically efficient from a static perspective, they can change intertemporal incentives to accelerate higher value uses of property rights (Murray & Hermans, 2021).

These approaches can work in tandem with approaches to recover the value of airspace property rights. For example, in the ACT, betterment taxes and land value taxes exist in parallel without any double counting, as market property values already factor in land value tax obligations.

6.4. Directly Invest in Housing Development

A final way to use the public airspace realm for public benefit involves direct housing development by government agencies. Again, this can operate in tandem with other mechanisms to capture value and change dynamic incentives.

Singapore has perhaps the most well-known publicly owned housing developer, the HDB, with 90% of residents living in a dwelling developed by HDB. These units are sold at construction cost price, facilitated by discounted mortgages, with each citizen eligible to purchase one dwelling. Most western countries had large-scale direct housing development for decades. In Australia, for example, 15% of new housing was publicly developed in the 1960s, whereas in the United Kingdom it was an astonishing 46% in that same decade (Ryan-Collins & Murray, 2021).

Modern variations on the theme are possible. For example, one bold possibility is a publicly owned direct housing developer that could target dwelling rent stability in much the same way that central banks intervene in money asset markets to stabilize the price of money. Such a publicly owned developer could purchase sites and begin construction in a countercyclical manner to stabilize the construction industry, but sell dwellings, either surplus or rentals, in a procyclical manner to dampen market price cycles. Design contests could be used to generate quality outcomes, and the agency could also foster rapid adoption of new building technologies in a sector that is often slow to innovate.

The history of effective direct housing investment, and the scope for radical new approaches, would appear to make these favorable policy options for those on the political left looking for a fairer and cheaper housing system. It comes without the privatization of public airspace or the reliance on market processes to operate in an unusual and unlikely way—that is, by supplying rapidly in the face of declining rents and prices.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

Although broad upzoning is desirable in many cities as a matter of urban design, without a system to capture a share of the value of privatized airspace rights, it is a high-cost way to achieve the policy goal of lower priced housing. The high cost comes from the forgone privatization revenue, which is equivalent in budgetary terms to government spending. We believe the main barrier to retaining the public value of new airspace rights is political. Landowners and developers who can get these high-value property rights for free (or cheaply) through existing rezoning mechanisms do not want to pay for them.

It is hence a puzzle that segments of the political left, traditionally against the privatization of public assets, and especially against giving them away for free, would be so strongly in favor of this policy. We can only speculate about the reasons for this curious pattern. One factor appears to be a generalized aversion to anything that might be characterized as NIMBYism (a preference that development is Not In My BackYard). Because NIMBYism has been associated with efforts to limit the public provision of affordable housing in certain communities, opposition to mass rezoning—which is also often justified with NIMBY arguments—then becomes characterized as similarly “exclusionary” and contrary to affordable housing. Yet, as we have argued, direct public provision of affordable housing and mass rezoning are very different policies, because the latter is usually merely an expansion of (volumetric) property rights for existing owners, with no guarantee that supply will accelerate and lead to lower market prices or rents.

Building upon a shared disdain for alleged “NIMBYism,” a new clever rhetorical strategy has been employed by actors aligned with the development industry. Claims about “legalizing housing,” creating a “diversity of housing forms,” fighting “exclusionary zoning,” and achieving “spatial equity”—common prorezoning refrains in the academic debate and on social media—play upon left-wing sympathies for the ascendant identity politics of “equity, diversity and inclusion” and liberal social policy (e.g., legalization). This language is particularly employed by the so-called YIMBY (Yes In My BackYard) movement, which has sprouted up in several countries in recent years, often with the encouragement of the development industry (Bronstein, 2018; Shaw, 2020).

Yet, whereas YIMBYs usually claim to represent renters, the preferred policy option of mass rezoning will primarily benefit established landowners, at least in the absence of a strong mechanism to capture public value. It is important, then, that policymakers think clearly about the implications of mass rezoning. Reconceptualizing land as airspace will, we hope, help to demystify some of the existing rhetoric that surrounds proposals for large-scale rezoning.

Notes

1. We of course do not claim that all zoning rules that exist are good. We are merely arguing that in a world where property rights are being modified by new zoning rules, the distribution of benefits matters to the overall outcomes.
2. We use the term “property” to mean a bundle of legal rights rather than physical space or buildings.
3. In English law the doctrine of “ancient lights” provided that an established period of enjoyment of direct sunlight crossing a neighboring property could establish an ongoing right to that light by way of an implied easement (Kerr, 1865). This doctrine has been repudiated in the United States, as described in the decision of *Fontainebleau Hotel Corp. v. Forty-Five Twenty-Five, Inc.* (1959) in the Florida Appellate Court.
4. For example, Canada retains rights to minerals for “the Crown” (Pearse, 1988).
5. For example, Australian anticorruption regulators pursue cases involving donations, bribery, and extortion by property owners seeking upzoning decisions. Two recent examples are Operation Sandon by Victoria’s Independent Broad-Based Anti-Corruption Commission (IBAC) and Operation Belcarra by Queensland’s Crime and Corruption Commission. More generally, developers are keen to have municipal authorities be receptive to requests for rezonings, and thus have invested in the promotion of supply-side narratives around housing affordability, including the YIMBY movement (see section 7).

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributorNotes on Contributors

Cameron K. Murray is a post-doctoral research fellow in the Henry Halloran Trust at The University of Sydney. His interests include property markets, environmental economics, and corruption. He writes the Fresh Economic Thinking newsletter and co-authored a book about the game of grey corruption entitled *Rigged*.

Joshua C. Gordon is a visiting research fellow in the Digital Society Lab at McMaster University. His research interests include housing policy, labour market policy, union movements, and the politics of immigration.

References

- Archer, R. W. (1976). The Sydney Betterment Levy, 1969–1973: An experiment in functional funding for metropolitan development. *Urban Studies*, 13(3), 339–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420987620080631>
- Aveline-Dubach, N., & Blandeau, G. (2019). The political economy of transit value capture: The changing business model of the MTRC in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies*, 56(16), 3415–3431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018821519>
- Badger, E., & Bui, Q. (2019, June 18). Cities start to question an American ideal: A house with a yard on every lot. *The New York Times*.
- Baron, J. B. (2013). Rescuing the bundle-of-rights metaphor in property law. *University of Cincinnati Law Review*, 82, 57.
- Bronstein, Z. (2018, September). California’s “Yimby’s”: The growth machine’s shock troops. *Dollars & Sense*. <https://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2018/0918bronstein.html>
- Causa, O., Woloszko, N., & Leite, D. (2019). *Housing, wealth accumulation and wealth distribution: Evidence and stylized facts*. OECD.
- Chambers, L. (2011). *Development titling: What planners need to know (a legal perspective)* [Presentation of Planning Institute of Australia]. Allens Arthur Robinson.
- City of Vancouver (2018). *Annual report on community amenity contributions and density bonusing* [Staff report]. <https://vancouver.ca/home-property-development/community-amenity-contributions.aspx>.
- City of Vancouver (2021). *Protecting Vancouver’s views: Alder terrace view*. <https://vancouver.ca/home-property-development/alder-terrace-protected-view.aspx>
- Condon, P. (2020). *Vancouver’s incentives to get affordable homes built are too rich*. The Tyee.
- Dougherty, C. (2020, February 13). Build Build Build Build Build Build Build Build Build Build Build Build. *New York Times*.
- Epstein, R. A. (2015). Property rights in water, spectrum and minerals. *Colorado Law Review*, 86(2), 389–429.
- Finn, R. (2013, February 22). The great air race. *New York Times*.
- Freemark, Y. (2019). Upzoning Chicago: Impacts of a zoning reform on property values and housing construction. *Urban Affairs Review*, 56, 758–789.
- Glaeser, E., & Gyourko, J. (2018). The economic implications of housing supply. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32(1), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.32.1.3>

- Haila, A. (2015). *Urban land rent: Singapore as a property state*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Harris, D. C. (2011). Condominium and the city: The rise of property in Vancouver. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 36(03), 694–726. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2011.01247.x>
- Kahlenberg, R. D. (2019). *How Minneapolis ended single-family zoning*. The Century Foundation.
- Karki, S., Thompson, R., & McDougall, K. (2013). Development of validation rules to support digital lodgement of 3D cadastral plans. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 40, 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2012.10.007>
- Kendall, R., & Tulip, P. (2018). *The effect of zoning on housing prices. (Issues 2018–03)*. Research Discussion Paper RDP 2018-03. Reserve Bank of Australia. <https://www.rba.gov.au/publications/rdp/2018/pdf/rdp2018-03.pdf>
- Kerr, R. (1865). *On ancient lights: And the evidence of surveyors thereon: With tables for the measurement of obstructions*. London: J. Murray.
- Klein, E. (2021, April 19). The ‘New Redlining’ Is Deciding Who Lives in Your Neighborhood. *New York Times*.
- Kolnick, K. A. (2008). *Order before zoning: Land use regulation in Los Angeles, 1880–1915*. University of Southern California.
- Letwin, O. (2018). *Independent review of build out rates: Draft analysis*. Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government.
- Limb, M. & Murray, (2020). *We zoned for density and got higher house prices: Supply and price effects of upzoning over 20 years*. Open Science Foundation Pre-Print.
- Logan, E. B. (2021, May 19). Biden targets housing rules that hurt low-income earners. Will the suburbs buy in? *Los Angeles Times*.
- Manjoo, F. (2020, February 5). Let’s quit fetishizing the single-family home. *New York Times*.
- Manville, M., Monkkenon, P., & Lens, M. (2020). It’s time to end single-family zoning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 86(1), 106–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2019.1651216>
- Metcalfe, G. (2018). Sand castles before the tide? Affordable housing in expensive cities. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32(1), 59–80. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.32.1.59>
- Moore, A. A. (2013). *Trading density for benefits: Toronto and Vancouver compared*. Institute on Municipal Finance and Governance.
- Murray, C. K., & Frijters, P. (2017). *Game of mates: How favours bleed the nation*. Publicious.
- Murray, C. K. (2020). Time is money: How landbanking constrains housing supply. *Journal of Housing Economics*, 49, 101708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhe.2020.101708>
- Murray, C. K. (2021a). A housing supply absorption rate equation. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 64(2), 228–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11146-020-09815-z>
- Murray, C. K. (2021b). *Explainer: Taxing rezoning windfalls (betterment)*. OSF Preprints.
- Murray, C. K., & Frijters, P. (2016). Clean money, dirty system: Connected landowners capture beneficial land rezoning. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 93, 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2016.04.001>
- Murray, C. K., & Hermans, J. (2021, July). Land value is a progressive and efficient property tax base: Evidence from Victoria. *Australian Tax Forum*.
- Murray, C. K. (2022). *What’s the rush? New housing market absorption rate metrics and the incentive to slow housing supply*. OSF Preprints.
- NYC Planning. (2021). *About zoning: Glossary of zoning terms*. Department of City Planning, New York City. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/planning/zoning/glossary.page>
- Pearse, P. H. (1988). Property rights and the development of natural resource policies in Canada. *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques*, 14(3), 307–320. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3550433>
- Penner, J. E. (1995). The bundle of rights picture of property. *UCLA Law Review*, 43, 711.
- Plimmer, F., & McGill, G. (2003). *Land value taxation: Betterment taxation in England and the potential for change*. https://www.fig.net/resources/proceedings/fig_proceedings/fig_2003/TS_9/TS9_4_Plimmer_McGill.pdf
- Posner, E. A., & Weyl, E. G. (2017). Property is only another name for monopoly. *Journal of Legal Analysis*, 9(1), 51–123. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/lax001>
- Quigley, J. M., & Rosenthal, L. A. (2005). The effects of land use regulation on the price of housing: What do we know? What can we learn? *Cityscape*, 8(1), 69–137.
- Ramakrishnan, K., Treskan, M., & Greene, S. (2019). *Inclusionary zoning: What does the research tell us about the effectiveness of local action?* Urban Institute.
- Romem, I. (2021). *Technical summary of econometric approach to estimating housing element site capacity in the City of Los Angeles. (Appendix 4.6 Housing Element 2021–2029 Regression Methodology)*. Appendix report – City of Los Angeles Element 2021–2029. https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/15117d38-35ca-416b-9980-25eb20201ba2/Appendix_4.6_-_Regression_Methodology.pdf
- Ryan-Collins, J., & Murray, C. (2021). When homes earn more than jobs: The rentierization of the Australian housing market. *Housing Studies*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2021.2004091>
- Schuetz, J., Meltzer, R., & Been, V. (2011). Silver bullet or trojan horse? The effects of inclusionary zoning on local housing markets in the United States. *Urban Studies (Edinburgh, Scotland)*, 48(2), 297–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009360683>

- Shahab, S., Hartmann, T., & Jonkman, A. (2021). Strategies of municipal land policies: housing development in Germany, Belgium, and Netherlands. *European Planning Studies*, 29(6), 1132–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2020.1817867>
- Shaw, R. (2020). *Generation priced out: Who gets to live in the new Urban America, with a new preface*. University of California Press.
- So, F. (1962). *Condominium*. (Information Report No. 159). American Society of Planning Officials.
- van Oosterom, P., Erba, D. A., Aien, A., Grant, D., Kalantari, M., Karki, S., Shojaei, D., Thompson, R., Muggenhuber, G., & Navratil, G. (2018). *Best practices 3D cadastres: Extended version*. International Federation of Surveyors (FIG). http://www.fig.net/resources/publications/figpub/FIG_3DCad/FIG_3DCad-final.pdf
- Williams, C. (2020, January 16). Housing is at the root of many of the rich world's problems. *The Economist*. <https://www.economist.com/special-report/2020/01/16/housing-is-at-the-root-of-many-of-the-rich-worlds-problems>
- World Bank (2021). *Transferable development rights (urban regeneration)*. World Bank. <https://urban-regeneration.worldbank.org/node/22>.
- Zhang, T. (2019). Making inclusionary zoning more inclusive. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy*, 27(1), 171–195.

From: [Greg Giachino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 2:28:26 PM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

From: [Lynn Butler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 2:35:08 PM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

Carolyn W. Butler

From: [CJ Verburg](#)
To: [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Mcgarra, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Zushi, Kei \(CPC\)](#); [Shum, Ryan \(CPC\)](#); [Baldauf, Hans \(CPC\)](#); [Cox, Eleanor \(CPC\)](#); [Vergara, Robert \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [Tsern Strang, Gayle \(CPC\)](#); [Baroni, Dan \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Don't be conned by the "Shade Act"!
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 5:34:39 PM
Attachments: [b81c7b7d.png](#)

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

TO: Amy Campbell, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
Diane Matsuda, President
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
Board of Supervisors, Senior Planners, and Commissioners

RE: so-called SHADE ACT legislation
2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]

Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda, Supervisors, Senior Planners,
and Commissioners:

Think of any photograph you've ever seen of San Franciscans enjoying our city's beloved parks.

Picnics on the grass. Babies in strollers. Office workers (and their dogs) greeting each other after a long day inside. Joggers. Walkers. Ladies forming tai chi poses around an altar of pocketbooks. Men telling jokes on park benches. The Mime Troupe, concerts, festivals and other performances.

What do all these happy images have in common? CALIFORNIA SUNSHINE!

Our parks and open spaces are our neighborhoods' back yards. They're where tourists pause for breath. They testify in 3-D real time that everyone is welcome here, and everyone is a neighbor.

The travesty known as the Shade Act aims to do the OPPOSITE. First, it recklessly removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces -- which are not merely cosmetic, but essential to our communities' social, physical and mental health. It removes more long-standing environmental protections and public processes than I can list. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and transfers decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance! These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate. Last but not least, it would endanger San Francisco's identity by radically changing our ability to enjoy our parks and open spaces -- a centuries-old tradition going back to both the European Commons and the indigenous understanding of interdependence between living beings and their environment.

Please, please oppose the Shade Act!

Sincerely,

Carol Verburg
561 Greenwich St.
San Francisco 94133

carolverburg.com



From: [Liam Hennessy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 5:57:59 PM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate.

Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,
Liam Hennessy

From: [Katie Hopkins](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 6:57:35 PM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department. This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate. Please oppose the Shade Act. Sincerely,

From: [powkatz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I write to strongly oppose the proposed legislation referred to as the Shade Act.
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 7:03:33 PM

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

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA analyses the impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces but also removes other long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings, and public notice, and gives decision-making to the planning department. This is not good governance. These are not technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate. Please oppose the Shade Act.

Sincerely,

Judith Powell

From: [Stan Hayes](#)
To: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Mcgarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Zushi, Kei \(CPC\)](#); [Shum, Ryan \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [Baldauf, Hans \(CPC\)](#); [Cox, Eleanor \(CPC\)](#); [Vergara, Robert \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [Tsern Strang, Gayle \(CPC\)](#); [Baroni, Dan \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: OPPOSITION to SHADE ACT LEGISLATION 2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 1:51:57 PM
Attachments: [THD Com Ltr SHADE Legis FINAL 7-13-26.pdf](#)

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

Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly **OPPOSE** the above-cited proposed ordinance.

The ordinance has been represented as intended to remove shadow analysis as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review. However, the ordinance disguises a major assault on San Francisco's environmental review process, significantly reducing long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and thwarting public participation.

For reasons such as those set forth in our attached letter, we urge both the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission to oppose this proposed legislation in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan

Co-Chairs, Planning & Zoning
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

July 13, 2026

Amy Campbell, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
Diane Matsuda, President
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
49 S. Van Ness, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Via email: commissions.secretary@sfgov.org



**RE: OPPOSITION to SHADE ACT LEGISLATION
2026-004685PCA [Board File No. 260539]**

Dear Presidents Campbell and Matsuda and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), we write to strongly **OPPOSE** the above-cited proposed ordinance. This ordinance would significantly amend procedures governing the City's implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The ordinance has been represented as intended to remove shadow analysis as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review. However, the ordinance disguises a major assault on San Francisco's environmental review process, significantly reducing long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and thwarting public participation.

For reasons, such as those set forth below, we urge the Commission to oppose this proposed legislation:

- Removal of shadow analysis is a violation of Proposition M.
- Shadow is a physical environmental effect that must be considered under CEQA, as long acknowledged by Planning Department practice.
- The ordinance's major limitation or elimination of Planning Commission review and public notice, comment, and appeal is in direct conflict with the core purpose of CEQA.
- The ordinance is subject to CEQA analysis prior to consideration by the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors.

Removal of Shadow Analysis is a Violation of Proposition M

The proposed amendment to "remove shadow analysis as a specific type of environmental impact" would violate the provisions of Proposition M adopted by the voters in November 1986. Proposition M established eight Priority Policies in the General Plan, including: *"8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development."*

The specific provisions of Proposition M prohibit the City from adopting any legislation that is inconsistent with the Priority Policies and require that prior to issuing a permit for any project which requires an initial study under CEQA, the City must find that the project is consistent with the Priority Policies, including protecting from development *our parks and open space and their access to sunlight*. Compliance with Proposition M requires shadow analysis to be included in each initial study as a potential environmental effect under CEQA. Therefore, the proposed

ordinance cannot remove shadow, or the other Priority Policies, as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review.

The proposed amendments would eliminate the long standing requirement that local CEQA review include:

"consistency with the environmental issues included in the Eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code and incorporated into the General Plan; shadow impacts, including the analysis set forth in Planning Code Section 295, and such other data and information specific to the urban environment of San Francisco or to the specific project." [emphasis added]

By deleting this language, the proposed ordinance would eliminate reference to two major propositions approved by voters emphasizing the importance of access to sunlight, and successfully used for more than 40 years. In addition to the Eight Priority Policies in Proposition M, it would eliminate from environmental review the shadow ban on parks and other public spaces adopted by voters as Proposition K in June 1984. Even if both of these propositions remain in place elsewhere in the code, deleting them from the local CEQA guidelines would eliminate them as critical factors in informing decision makers and the public about the environmental impacts of projects that the San Francisco electorate have twice voted to protect.

Shadow is a Physical Environmental Effect and Should Continue to be Considered Under CEQA, as Long Acknowledged by Planning Department Practice

The findings in the proposed ordinance state that "It is the intent of the Boad [sic] of Supervisors to remove shadow as a topic to be considered in local CEQA review." Sec. 1(j) of the proposed findings would require the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to find that "shadow is not a physical environmental effect under CEQA because its impacts are subjective, variable, dependent on personal preference and the weather, and can have both positive and negative health implications."

Not only would this finding be in violation of Proposition M, but it would be inconsistent with long-standing Planning Department practice. Shadow **is** a physical environmental effect under Sec. 15382 of the California CEQA Guidelines, which defines "Significant Effect on the Environment" to mean "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project." Few physical effects are more readily apparent than shadows, especially when they affect public spaces. Under a plain reading of the CEQA Guideline's definition, shadow is clearly a "physical condition," and thus must not be excluded from CEQA analysis.

That shadow is a physical environmental effect to be considered under CEQA has long been acknowledged by the Planning Department. For example, the Department's CEQA Initial Study Checklist (as downloaded on July 3, 2026 from the Department's environmental review website at sfplanning.org/permit/environmental-review-resources) specifically lists "Shadow" as an environmental impact category to be considered when determining if a project requires a CEQA

Negative Declaration or a full Environmental Impact Report. Shadow has been included in the Department's Checklist for many years.

Information about shadow impacts is commonly developed during environmental impact assessments, and is an important factor in informing decision makers and the public about the environmental impacts of a project, especially in the dense urban environment of San Francisco. Analyses of shadow can also be central to the evaluation of such other CEQA environmental impact categories as Recreation, Land Use / Planning, Public Services, Cultural, and Aesthetics.

Major Limitation or Elimination of Planning Commission Review and Public Notice, Comment, and Appeal is in Direct Conflict with Core Purpose of CEQA

The core purpose of CEQA is to provide decision makers and the public information on the environmental effects of a proposed project. According to Sec. 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines: "An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project."

Limiting or eliminating public notice, comment, and information access directly conflicts with this stated purpose. Numerous instances of such limitation or elimination are found in the proposed ordinance, with any resulting "streamlining" of local CEQA review coming at the expense of the public right-to-know. The authority of the Planning Commission, the HPC, and Board of Supervisors would be subsumed by Planning Department staff at the expense of public's right to notice, comment and appeal, reducing transparency and opportunities for public participation. In other words, the right of the public to appeal Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) would be significantly limited by decreasing public notice and eliminating public hearings at the Planning Commission or HPC.

Without enumerating them all, several illustrative examples include the following:

- Eliminates the existing requirement that each initial study address the eight priority policies set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1, including *That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development*, in violation of voter approved Proposition M.
- Significantly limits or eliminates public notice of Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs.
- Shortens project public comment periods from 30 to 15 days making it virtually meaningless.
- Eliminates all currently required public hearings on Negative Declarations and Draft EIRs at the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission, as well as the right to appeal Exemption Determinations, Negative Declarations or Draft EIRs to the Planning Commission.

- Shortens the period to appeal EIRs and Negative Declarations to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) from 30 to 15 days making the possibility of any meaningful appeal virtually impossible.
- Shortens the time for the BOS to hear the appeal from 30 days to two weeks which does not allow for a fair, adequately briefed hearing.
- Limits the Board of Supervisors to only two weeks to prepare findings which does not allow for a fair, well-informed hearing and decision making process.
- Eliminates appeals of any housing project which is first approved at the Board of Supervisors.
- Eliminates the requirement for Planning Department staff to prepare annual reports to the Planning Commission and BOS of all appeals.
- Removes Planning Commission and HPC review of Planning Department decisions to add to or modify the lists of categorical exemptions and “ministerial” projects not requiring environmental review.
- Gives the Planning Department staff discretion to change mitigation measures adopted by the Planning Commission or BOS for an already approved project outside of the Planning Commission’s or BOS’s review and to forgo additional environmental review to reevaluate a project that has been substantially modified following a CEQA determination.

Proposed Ordinance is Subject to CEQA Analysis Prior to Consideration by Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors

The proposed ordinance itself is subject to CEQA because it significantly reduces or eliminates long standing, pre-existing environmental protections and public participation that currently exist under Chapter 31. Therefore, CEQA analysis is required before the City can consider the proposed ordinance.

* * *

In conclusion, for reasons that include those listed above, we urge the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission to oppose this proposed ordinance in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes and Nancy Shanahan

Co-Chairs, Planning & Zoning
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

cc: Amy Campbell, President amy.campbell@sfgov.org
Lydia So, Commissioner lydia.so@sfgov.org
Sean McGarry, Commissioner sean.mcgarry@sfgov.org
Jonas Ionin, Secretary commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
Kei Zushi, Senior Planner kei.zushi@sfgov.org
Ryan Shum, Senior Planner ryan.shum@sfgov.org
Clerk of the Board board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Diane Matsuda, President diane.matsuda@sfgov.org
Hans Baldauf, Commissioner hans.baldauf@sfgov.org
Eleanor Cox, Commissioner eleanor.cox@sfgov.org
Robert Vergara, Commissioner robert.vergara1@sfgov.org
Chris Foley, Commissioner chris.foley@sfgov.org
Gayle Strang, Commissioner gayle.tsernstrang@sfgov.org
Dan Baroni, Commissioner dan.baroni@sfgov.org

From: [Julie Herrod](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: PLEASE OPPOSE THE SHADE ACT
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 7:29:34 PM

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

As a 36-year resident of North Beach and a 45-year resident of San Francisco, I IMPLORE YOU TO OPPOSE the unfair, unconscionable Shade Act as proposed by incompetent supervisors Sauter, Mahmood, and Dorsey.

The Shade Act not only removes from CEQA its crucial analyses of impacts of shadows on our parks and open spaces, but also removes other vital and long-standing environmental protections and public processes. It limits public participation, appeals, hearings and public notice, and gives all decision-making to the planning department.

This is not good governance. These proposals are NOT technical or administrative changes. This legislation would fundamentally change who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, and how much the public is allowed to participate. IT DENIES THE VOTING PUBLIC THEIR RIGHTS.

PLEASE OPPOSE THE SHADE ACT.

Sincerely,
Julie Herrod-Lumsden
553A Greenwich Street
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 11 Letters Regarding File No. 260693
Date: Thursday, July 16, 2026 12:08:00 PM
Attachments: [11 Letters Regarding File No. 260693.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 11 letters regarding **File No. 260693:**

Motion ordering submitted to the voters at an election to be held on November 3, 2026, an Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to impose an excise tax, commencing in tax year 2027, on persons keeping vacant or using differently parcels last used, in whole or in part, as formula retail grocery stores or formula retail pharmacies on or after January 1, 2017; and increasing the City's appropriations limit by the amount collected under the tax for four years from November 3, 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.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: [Eleana Binder](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Invoke Rule 3.38 — Give the Affordable Groceries Act a Vote (File No. 260693)
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 1:15:52 PM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

GLIDE urges the Board to invoke Rule 3.38 to bring File No. 260693, the Abandoned Pharmacy and Grocery Tax, directly to the full Board for a hearing and a vote.

Across San Francisco, corporate grocery and pharmacy chains have shuttered stores and deliberately left the buildings vacant for years, keeping competitors out and leaving our neighbors, especially seniors, families, and low-income residents, without reliable access to fresh food or basic pharmacy needs. That is not how this city is supposed to work. A measure that would tax corporate landlords for deliberately keeping grocery and pharmacy storefronts vacant and support the neighborhood grocers and pharmacies still showing up for our communities, deserves a floor debate, not a backroom veto.

At GLIDE, we serve three meals a day and we know food insecurity runs rampant in the Tenderloin. One way to alleviate food insecurity is easy access to a grocery store (especially for the 3,500 kids who live in the Tenderloin). We believe that every neighborhood deserves an affordable, full-service grocery store. Neighborhoods such as the Tenderloin, Fillmore and Bayview have been abandoned by corporate grocery stores and face food apartheid conditions. Residents need access to affordable, culturally appropriate food that is accessible in their neighborhoods. We support legislation that both encourages grocery stores to open in the Tenderloin and holds accountable businesses that obstruct any process to open existing spaces to expand food access.

We are calling on the Board President to invoke Rule 3.38 without delay, and on every member of this Board to sign onto the motion. Give File No. 260693 the hearing and the vote it has been denied. Let the full Board, and ultimately the voters, decide.

Thank you for your consideration,

Eleana Binder

--

Eleana Binder

Director of Public Policy and Legislative Research

Center for Social Justice

GLIDE 330 Ellis Street, Room 511, San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICE (415) 674-6162 | **PRONOUNS** She/Her

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Glide. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. GLIDE accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

From: [Brian Webster](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Brian Webster](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
Subject: Supporting a vote to advance the Affordable Groceries Act
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:03:03 PM
Attachments: [BW letter Supporting a vote to advance the Affordable Groceries Act - 7-14-26.pdf](#)

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

Hello -

I live in the Union Square / Tenderloin district 5 neighborhood. I am a local community organizer, former UFCW union organizer, small business entrepreneur and grassroots Democratic Party activist. I have lived in our city for over 40 years.

I strongly support supervisor Bilal Mahmood's leadership on the Affordable Groceries Act.

I ask you to vote today to advance it going onto the ballot this November.

The Affordable Groceries Act will increase access to grocery stores and pharmacy chains by taxing empty storefronts to deter companies from leaving them vacant and establishing a fund to subsidize groceries.

Please vote today to advance the Affordable Groceries Act going onto the ballot this November.

Sincerely,
Brian E Webster

55 Mason Street, Apartment 316
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-243-8900
brian.e.webster@gmail.com

**From the Desk of Brian E. Webster
San Francisco, California**

Date: July 14, 2026

To: All members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From: Brian Webster / San Francisco Constituent

Subject: Supporting a vote to advance the Affordable Groceries Act

I live in the Union Square / Tenderloin district 5 neighborhood. I am a local community organizer, former UFCW union organizer, small business entrepreneur and grassroots Democratic Party activist. I have lived in our city for over 40 years.

I strongly support supervisor Bilal Mahmood's leadership on the Affordable Groceries Act.

I ask you to vote today to advance it going onto the ballot this November.

The Affordable Groceries Act will increase access to grocery stores and pharmacy chains by taxing empty storefronts to deter companies from leaving them vacant and establishing a fund to subsidize groceries.

Please vote today to advance the Affordable Groceries Act going onto the ballot this November.

Sincerely,



Brian Webster
55 Mason Street, Apartment 316
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-243-8900
brian.e.webster@gmail.com
www.brianwebster.com



From: [Jade Quizon](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [FAACTS Steering Committee](#)
Subject: Invoke Rule 3.38 - Give Community a Chance to Vote on the Affordable Groceries Act
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 12:02:22 PM
Attachments: [FAACTS - Letter of Support - Affordable Grocery Fund.pdf](#)

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

Hello,

Please see our attached letter.

thank you,

--

Jade Quizon
Project Director, FAACTS
[FAACTS](#) | [Book Time](#)





FAACTS

cultivating just food futures

77 Van Ness Avenue Suite 101-1613 San Francisco, CA 94102

hello@faactssf.org

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

14 July, 2026

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

Re: Invoke Rule 3.38 — Give the Affordable Groceries Act a Vote (File No. 260693)

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Food and Agriculture Action Coalition Toward Sovereignty, FAACTS, supports File No. 260693, the Abandoned Pharmacy and Grocery Tax, and strongly urges the Board to invoke Rule 3.38 to bring this measure directly to the full Board for a hearing and a vote.

Across San Francisco, corporate grocery and pharmacy chains have shuttered stores and deliberately left the buildings vacant for years, keeping competitors out and leaving our neighbors, especially seniors, families, and low-income residents, without reliable access to fresh food or basic pharmacy needs.

This measure hasn't even had the chance to see the light of day. It was quietly struck from the Budget and Finance Committee agenda by Chair Chan after Mayor Lurie intervened, and press reports indicate Amazon has been lobbying against it too. San Franciscans deserve to know why the Mayor's Office and one of the largest corporations on Earth teamed up to kill this policy before it ever got a public hearing.

That is not how this city is supposed to work. A measure that would tax corporate landlords for deliberately keeping grocery and pharmacy storefronts vacant, and support the neighborhood grocers and pharmacies still showing up for our communities, deserves a floor debate, not a backroom veto.

Our city needs creative and proactive solutions tackling our broken food system and holding large corporate retailers that abandon our communities accountable. FAACTS commends Supervisor Mahmood on his proposed legislation addressing San Francisco's growing grocery access challenges. We need approaches such as this that aim to strengthen local, affordable food access, protect food workers, boost our food economy, and ensure good food reaches the neighborhoods that need it most.

We are calling on the Board President to invoke Rule 3.38 without delay, and on every member of this Board to sign onto the motion. Give File No. 260693 the hearing and the vote it has been denied. Let the full Board, and ultimately the voters, decide — not the Mayor's Office, and not Amazon.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jade Quizon', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jade Quizon
Project Director

www.faactssf.org

From: [paula hendricks](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Invoke Rule 3.38 — Give the Affordable Groceries Act a Vote (File No. 260693)
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 5:17:42 PM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I strongly support File No. 260693, the Abandoned Pharmacy and Grocery Tax, and urge the Board to invoke Rule 3.38 to bring this measure directly to the full Board for a hearing and a vote.

Across San Francisco, corporate grocery and pharmacy chains have shuttered stores and deliberately left the buildings vacant for years, keeping competitors out and leaving our neighbors, especially seniors, families, and low-income residents, without reliable access to fresh food or basic pharmacy needs.

This measure hasn't even had the chance to see the light of day. It was quietly struck from the Budget and Finance Committee agenda by Chair Chan after Mayor Lurie intervened, and press reports indicate Amazon has been lobbying against it too. San Franciscans deserve to know why the Mayor's Office and one of the largest corporations on Earth teamed up to kill this policy before it ever got a public hearing.

That is not how this city is supposed to work. A measure that would tax corporate landlords for deliberately keeping grocery and pharmacy storefronts vacant, and support the neighborhood grocers and pharmacies still showing up for our communities, deserves a floor debate, not a backroom veto.

This has affected me personally as my main supermarket, Safeway on Webster + Geary, has been closed as well as several Walgreens in the neighborhood. I live downtown on O'Farrell St. and the closest shopping by walking or taking public transpo are small stores or require transfers or aren't open every day.

We are calling on the Board President to invoke Rule 3.38 without delay, and on every member of this Board to sign onto the motion. Give File No. 260693 the hearing and the vote it has been denied. Let the full Board, and ultimately the voters, decide — not the Mayor's Office, and not Amazon.

Thank you for your consideration,

Best,

-ph
paula hendricks
san francisco ~:~ 415.310.1168

From: [Mike Vuong](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Kate Robinson](#)
Subject: Access to affordable, healthy groceries & More
Date: Saturday, July 11, 2026 8:02:02 AM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Tenderloin Community Benefit District (TLCBD) writes in strong support of efforts to expand access to affordable, healthy groceries and essential neighborhood services, and respectfully urges the Board to allow this important proposal to receive a full hearing and vote.

Every day, TLCBD works to care for the Tenderloin's streets and parks, support our youth and families, and lift up the voices of the residents we serve. That work gives us a close, ground-level view of how much a neighborhood's daily life depends on reliable access to essential services, especially something as basic as affordable, healthy food.

For too many of our seniors, youth, and families, fresh groceries and pharmacy essentials shouldn't require a trip across town. People deserve to find what they need close to home, at a price they can afford. When storefronts that once served that purpose sit empty for years, the whole neighborhood feels it: not just as an inconvenience, but as a real strain on health and quality of life.

We also see real opportunity here. Bringing vacant storefronts back into active use doesn't just improve food access; it opens doors for small, neighborhood-serving businesses to grow and thrive. A healthy Tenderloin needs both: residents with reliable access to essential services, and a business environment where responsible local merchants can succeed.

It is also important that decisions affecting the Tenderloin reflect the experiences and priorities of the people who live and work here. Third parties from outside the neighborhood do not necessarily understand or reflect the needs of Tenderloin residents, families, and businesses. Those closest to these challenges should have a meaningful voice in shaping the solutions.

Community organizations like ours are proud to do our part, but we can't solve challenges like this alone. That's why we're encouraged by the work Supervisor Mahmood and others are doing to find real solutions that expand healthy grocery access and support the businesses already showing up for our community.

We believe a proposal to increase access, affordability, and healthy grocers and pharmacies deserves a full and public discussion before the Board, giving every Supervisor the opportunity to consider its merits and hear directly from the communities most affected.

Thank you for your continued partnership with the Tenderloin community, and for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Tenderloin Community Benefit District

--

Michael Vuong (He/His)

Deputy Director of Policy & Voice

Tenderloin Community Benefit District

988 Market, Suite 400 | San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 475-9520 | www.tlcbd.org

...a vibrant community for ALL.

From: [O'Farrell Neighbors Group](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Invoke Rule 3.38 — Give the Affordable Groceries Act a Vote (File No. 260693)
Date: Saturday, July 11, 2026 3:48:19 PM
Attachments: [image0.png](#)

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We (ONG ... O'farrell Neighbors Group) strongly support File No. 260693, the Abandoned Pharmacy and Grocery Tax, and urge the Board to invoke Rule 3.38 to bring this measure directly to the full Board for a hearing and a vote.

Across San Francisco, corporate grocery and pharmacy chains have shuttered stores and deliberately left the buildings vacant for years, keeping competitors out and leaving our neighbors, especially seniors, families, and low-income residents, without reliable access to fresh food or basic pharmacy needs.

This measure hasn't even had the chance to see the light of day. It was quietly struck from the Budget and Finance Committee agenda by Chair Chan after Mayor Lurie intervened, and press reports indicate Amazon has been lobbying against it too. San Franciscans deserve to know why the Mayor's Office and one of the largest corporations on Earth teamed up to kill this policy before it ever got a public hearing.

That is not how this city is supposed to work. A measure that would tax corporate landlords for deliberately keeping grocery and pharmacy storefronts vacant, and support the neighborhood grocers and pharmacies still showing up for our communities, deserves a floor debate, not a backroom veto.

The lack of an affordable full service grocery store and pharmacy negatively affects members of our group and our wider Tenderloin community on a daily basis. We live in a food + pharmacy desert.

We are calling on the Board President to invoke Rule 3.38 without delay, and on every member of this Board to sign onto the motion. Give File No. 260693 the hearing and the vote it has been denied. Let the full Board, and ultimately the voters, decide — not the Mayor's Office, and not Amazon.

Thank you for your consideration,

Best,

O'Farrell Neighbors Group



From: [Tiffany Chung](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Invoke Rule 3.38 — Give the Affordable Groceries Act a Vote (File No. 260693)
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 10:55:40 AM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Foodwise strongly supports File No. 260693, the Abandoned Pharmacy and Grocery Tax, and urges the Board to invoke Rule 3.38 to bring this measure directly to the full Board for a hearing and a vote.

Across San Francisco, corporate grocery and pharmacy chains have shuttered stores and deliberately left the buildings vacant for years, keeping competitors out and leaving our neighbors, especially seniors, families, and low-income residents, without reliable access to fresh food or basic pharmacy needs.

This measure hasn't even had the chance to see the light of day. It was quietly struck from the Budget and Finance Committee agenda by Chair Chan after Mayor Lurie intervened, and press reports indicate Amazon has been lobbying against it too. San Franciscans deserve to know why the Mayor's Office and one of the largest corporations on Earth teamed up to kill this policy before it ever got a public hearing.

That is not how this city is supposed to work. A measure that would tax corporate landlords for deliberately keeping grocery and pharmacy storefronts vacant, and support the neighborhood grocers and pharmacies still showing up for our communities, deserves a floor debate, not a backroom veto. Foodwise understands first-hand the need for accessible groceries for San Francisco families and removing this measure means many families will go without access to fresh, local, and affordable groceries.

We are calling on the Board President to invoke Rule 3.38 without delay, and on every member of this Board to sign onto the motion. Give File No. 260693 the hearing and the vote it has been denied. Let the full Board, and ultimately the voters, decide — not the Mayor's Office, and not Amazon.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Tiffany Chung (she/they)
Director of Education, Foodwise
1 Ferry Building, Suite 250
San Francisco, CA 94111 | [Ramaytush Ohlone Land](#)
tel: 415.291.3276 x 106 but email is preferred



From: [Sylvia Nguyen](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Invoke Rule 3.38 — Give the Affordable Groceries Act a Vote (File No. 260693)
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 10:58:24 AM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

My name is Sylvia Nguyen and I strongly support File No. 260693, the Abandoned Pharmacy and Grocery Tax, and I urge the Board to invoke Rule 3.38 to bring this measure directly to the full Board for a hearing and a vote.

Across San Francisco, corporate grocery and pharmacy chains have shuttered stores and deliberately left the buildings vacant for years, keeping competitors out and leaving our neighbors, especially seniors, families, and low-income residents, without reliable access to fresh food or basic pharmacy needs.

This measure hasn't even had the chance to see the light of day. It was quietly struck from the Budget and Finance Committee agenda by Chair Chan after Mayor Lurie intervened, and press reports indicate Amazon has been lobbying against it too. San Franciscans deserve to know why the Mayor's Office and one of the largest corporations on Earth teamed up to kill this policy before it ever got a public hearing.

That is not how this city is supposed to work. A measure that would tax corporate landlords for deliberately keeping grocery and pharmacy storefronts vacant, and support the neighborhood grocers and pharmacies still showing up for our communities, deserves a floor debate, not a backroom veto.

Yesterday, during the San Francisco Agency of Human Rights grantee convening, Mayor Lurie spoke about knowing that the City of San Francisco needs to do better and that the Mayor's Office would have our backs. This is a moment in which you, the Board of Supervisors, have a choice to provide tangible solutions for all San Franciscans especially during a time when so many neighbors are struggling to afford gas to get to work, MUNI lines have been reduced, and neighbors need to make the difficult decision of paying for medicine or food instead of being able to access and cover costs of all their essential needs.

At Farming Hope, we see and experience the direct impacts on food and housing insecure San Franciscans when grocery stores suddenly close and cause an additional strain for neighbors to access food and pharmacies.

We are calling on the Board President to invoke Rule 3.38 without delay, and on every member of this Board to sign onto the motion. Give File No. 260693 the hearing and the vote it has been denied. Let the full Board, and ultimately the voters, decide — not the Mayor's Office, and not Amazon.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sylvia

Sylvia Nguyen | she/her | Development Manager | 415.300.0265
[Donate](#) / [Events](#) / [Volunteer](#) / [Share](#)



From: [Danica Berry](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Invoke Rule 3.38 — Give the Affordable Groceries Act a Vote (File No. 260693)
Date: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 11:43:40 AM

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Danica Berry strongly supports File No. 260693, the Abandoned Pharmacy and Grocery Tax, and urges the Board to invoke Rule 3.38 to bring this measure directly to the full Board for a hearing and a vote.

Across San Francisco, corporate grocery and pharmacy chains have shuttered stores and deliberately left the buildings vacant for years, keeping competitors out and leaving our neighbors, especially seniors, families, and low-income residents, without reliable access to fresh food or basic pharmacy needs.

This measure hasn't even had the chance to see the light of day. It was quietly struck from the Budget and Finance Committee agenda by Chair Chan after Mayor Lurie intervened, and press reports indicate Amazon has been lobbying against it too. San Franciscans deserve to know why the Mayor's Office and one of the largest corporations on Earth teamed up to kill this policy before it ever got a public hearing.

That is not how this city is supposed to work. A measure that would tax corporate landlords for deliberately keeping grocery and pharmacy storefronts vacant, and support the neighborhood grocers and pharmacies still showing up for our communities, deserves a floor debate, not a backroom veto.

We are calling on the Board President to invoke Rule 3.38 without delay, and on every member of this Board to sign onto the motion. Give File No. 260693 the hearing and the vote it has been denied. Let the full Board, and ultimately the voters, decide — not the Mayor's Office, and not Amazon.

Thank you for your consideration.

Danica Berry

From: tamibryant@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Supervisor Mahmood's grocery store legislation
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 7:15:35 PM

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

As a San Franciscan since 1971, who raised three children in the Fillmore as a single welfare mom, I am urging you to support the Affordable Groceries Act.

I am not sure why I have to even ask this of this board. Don't you think people have the right to eat? Chan is wrong all day long on this as she seeks to please conservatives in her run for Congress, which will be a disaster for poor people given her SF track record, please do not be on the wrong side of history.

I lived across the street from the Fillmore Safeway before it was built, and I still live here long after they abandoned us. There were City employees who already put corporate greed over community need 40 years ago. We deserve accountability! The deal they gave Safeway was SO BAD for San Francisco, I'm sure they took bribes! Who gives millions of dollars of land to a corporation with nothing in return? SF staff who didn't care about our future. The windfall should belong to the Black community, not these greedy corporations.

Safeway has chained up the lot so pedestrians from my coop can't go directly to the Farmers Market, including my 98 year old neighbor who has to cross under chains! Do you understand, 98 years old and Safeway made his walk to the Farmers Market a health hazard.

This is vital and necessary legislation. Safeway has refused to let any food store temporarily occupy it.

Marina Safeway is not being treated like this. They're getting a sweet deal! Make corporations pay taxes or open grocery stores! San Francisco! If no big corporation wants our business, good! Let's open up community run coops like Rainbow.

As a white ally, I know Black people are not a priority and very few on this BOS care about the Black community, but I think a few of you do.

Please stand for justice. Please protect one of the last Black communities in S.F. Please put human being over corporate profit. I support this legislation and am shocked that there is not unanimous support!

San Franciscan of more than a half century.

Fillmore resident since 1979

A lonely voice for my Black neighbors

Tami Bryant

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: Fw: Affordable Groceries Act
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 9:17:21 PM

From: William Walker <wiyum@wiyum.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 9:15 PM
To: Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Affordable Groceries Act

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

Hi Supervisors Chen, Chan, Mahmood and Mandelman:

I support taxing vacant parcels whether they are supermarkets, other general retail, or even vacant residential units in complexes greater than five units.

For 15 years I have been a tenant in District 8. For 23 years I was a tenant in District 8. For three years I was in Districts 4 and 9.

I'm astonished that the Mayor would tell an Independent Board Chair that an item should not be heard at a Committee. I'm even more flummoxed that a Supervisor would listen. I don't know how I'd support someone in any office that would acquiesce in such a manner. I don't expect the legislative check on the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, to abdicate their authority.

Please invoke whatever rules are needed for the Board to consider the affordable groceries act.

Thank you,

William Walker
143 Louisburg Street
San Francisco CA 94112
415.260.2069