

FILE NO. 220563

Petitions and Communications received from May 5, 2022, through May 12, 2022, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on May 17, 2022.

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

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

Appointments pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(18) and 4.108

- **Fire Commission**

- Marcy Fraser - term ending January 15, 2025

From concerned citizens, regarding an Ordinance amending the Administrative Code - Shelter Expansion Program. File No. 220281. 89 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From concerned citizens, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive and closure of streets 9 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From concerned citizens, regarding a Hearing on the use of taxpayer-funded communications, media, and press offices, as well as their costs, policies, and procedures around conveying accurate information about public safety. File No. 220307. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From Paul Wermer, regarding a Hearing on the City's electric vehicle fleet, to determine when it would be expected to have an all-electric fleet at the current rate, and what are the departments' expected projections for the next four years towards electrifying their City fleet, and the status of each department's charging stations. File No. 210198. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, regarding the Redistricting Task Force Final Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Contract Monitoring Division, submitting the Local Business Enterprise Participation Quarterly Report for Quarter 3 FY2021-2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Antrina Crawford, regarding the Filmore Center. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the Department of Disability and Aging Services, submitting the Community Living Fund 6 Month Report and the Annual Plan for FY2022-2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, regarding their scheduled meeting on May 19, 2022. 2 Notices. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From concerned citizens, regarding a hearing on assessment cost for sidewalk and curb repair. 2 Letters. Files Nos. 220385 and 220388. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From concerned citizens, regarding a hearing on the use of taxpayer-funded communications, media, and press offices. 4 Letters. File No. 220307. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Supervisor Asha Safai, submitting a letter of inquiry to the Office of the City Attorney regarding a Charter Amendment for the Homeless and Supportive Housing Commission. (13)

From Supervisors Ronen, Chan, Melgar and Stefani, submitting a letter of inquiry to the Budget and Legislative Analyst regarding report that calculates the cost of a program (Program) sponsoring out of State women to receive safe and free travel, accommodation, and an abortion in San Francisco in the most economical way. (14)

From Dennis Hong, regarding the May 12, 2022, Planning Commission meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From the Controller's Office of Public Finance, regarding the results of the General Obligation Refunding Bonds sale. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Quynh Bui, regarding the MUNI mask mandate. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Jay Elliott, regarding the San Francisco Fire Department apartment house mandate. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Richard Harris, regarding a proposed ordinance on a ban on gas powered landscaping equipment. File No. 220199. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Paul Wermer, regarding a hearing on the status on the City's electric vehicle fleet. File No. 210198. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Adri Almaguer, regarding a resolution supporting the creation of an American Indian Truth and Healing Reparations Advisory Committee. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Donald Staley, regarding the eviction of tenants. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Chasel Lee, submitting the 2021-2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force Draft Final Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Board President Shamann Walton, submitting a memo regarding an update to the 2022 Board Committee assignments. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From San Francisco Animal Care and Control, submitting S.F. Administrative Code Chapters 12B and 14B Waiver Request forms for Patterson Veterinary Supply Inc., Idexx Distribution Inc., and Campbell Pet Company. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, submitting Departmental Racial Equity Action Plan Progress Reports per San Francisco Board of Supervisors Ordinance 188-19. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Matthew Binczek, regarding crime at 240 Delores Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Fennell, Tyra \(MYR\)](#); [Paulino, Tom \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointment 3.100(18) - Fire Commission
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 5:29:54 PM
Attachments: [Clerk's Memo 5.10.2022.pdf](#)
[Marcy Fraser Appointment Ltr.pdf](#)
[Marcy Fraser Form 700.pdf](#)
[Marcy Fraser Resume.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached, complete appointment package. Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instructions.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh

Executive Assistant

Office of the Clerk of the Board

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 10, 2022
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Appointment - Fire Commission

On May 10, 2022, the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package:

Appointment to the Fire Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.108:

- Marcy Fraser - term ending January 15, 2025

Pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), such appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (Thursday, June 9, 2022).

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

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

If you wish to hold a hearing on this appointment. Please let me know, in writing, by 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2022.

c: Aaron Peskin- Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino - Mayor's Legislative Liaison
Tyra Fennell - Director of Commissions and Community Relations

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

May 10, 2022

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Section 3.100 (18) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby make the following appointment:

Marcy Fraser to the Fire Commission for a term ending January 15, 2025, Ms. Fraser will be filling the unexpired term held by Ken Cleaveland.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Tyra Fennell, at 415-554-6696

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "London N. Breed".

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

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 89 Letters Regarding File #220281
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 2:01:00 PM
Attachments: [89 Letters Regarding A Place for All.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please find attached for 89 letters regarding the proposed Ordinance to implement the Place for All Program.

File #220281 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to submit to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a plan to implement a program to provide unsheltered persons in San Francisco with a safe place to sleep overnight (“Place for All Program”), including a cost estimate of implementation; requiring HSH to fully implement the Place for All Program; and affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Regards,

Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: [Prodan Statev](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, April 30, 2022 10:45:49 AM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Tony](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, April 30, 2022 8:41:03 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Margaret O'Day](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Sunday, May 1, 2022 6:54:41 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Margaret O'Day
1 Daniel Burnham Court, No. 506
San Francisco, CA, 95109

p.s. I've seen the small houses at 31 Gough Street. They, or similar ones, would be ideal to get people off the streets. We need to do this for the sake of the homeless people and also for the sake of more fortunate citizens. I'm an 86 year old San Francisco resident. I feel very uncomfortable and unsafe when I'm out walking and find myself suddenly in an enclave of tents and debris.

I also feel ashamed of our city. We can do better.

I have one more comment, this one regarding cost. I think the cost of caring for the homeless should be paid for either by the state or by the federal government. This would solve the problem of homeless people flocking to the cities offering the better benefits.

From: [Akanksha Lal](#)
To: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 6:24:12 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All." "A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach. Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.
[Your Name] [Your address or Supv District] [OR your Position/Org Name]

From: [Erika Kim](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 6:59:56 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Erika Kim
Jordan Park
District 2

From: [Alison Faison](#)
To: [Alison Faison](#)
Subject: Vote no on "A Place for All"
Date: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 10:53:21 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Leadership,

Vote no on "A Place for All" unless rewritten to not just focus on expanding and comparing costs of shelter alone but to include a comparison and expansion of prevention and housing.

I am in support of Coalition on Homelessness' stance on this issue. Unhoused people include children who attend SFUSD. Support unhoused families.

Housing and keeping people housed not only solves homelessness, but it is key to freeing up shelter space. In addition, we are concerned that because this legislation is unfunded, it could lead to cannibalizing working solutions such as housing and prevention. Lastly, Mandleman has made clear his intentions - he wants the system to have shelter beds to offer in order to remove people from public spaces. Any plan aiming to end unsheltered homelessness needs to move us towards ending homelessness, not just provide justification to criminalize unhoused people in public space through warehousing humans. We need a thoughtful and data driven approach to homelessness and "A Place for All" as written gets us "A Place for Nobody".

Peace,
Alison Faison
Director of Children and Family Ministries
Calvary Presbyterian Church, San Francisco

From: [Derek Yee](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All"
Date: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 11:31:36 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Derek Yee
310 Townsend St, #210, SF CA 94107

From: [Eihway Su](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Vote no on "A Place for All" unless rewritten
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 11:20:31 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors and Mayor,

Vote no on "A Place for All" unless rewritten to not just focus on expanding and comparing costs of shelter alone but to include a comparison and expansion of prevention and housing. Housing and keeping people housed not only solves homelessness, but it is key to freeing up shelter space. In addition, we are concerned that because this legislation is unfunded, it could lead to cannibalizing working solutions such as housing and prevention. Lastly, Mandelman has made clear his intentions - he wants the system to have shelter beds to offer in order to remove people from public spaces. Any plan aiming to end unsheltered homelessness needs to move us towards ending homelessness, not just provide justification to criminalize unhoused people in public space through warehousing humans. We need a thoughtful and data driven approach to homelessness and "A Place for All" as written gets us "A Place for Nobody".

Thank you!

Eihway Su
Voter registered at 170 Parnassus Ave., #2
SF CA 94117

From: [Royal Millen](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 1:47:15 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

We have to do this together and get serious about the fact that everyone needs a roof over their head. It's a basic human right.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Royal

From: [Masood Samereie](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Thornhill, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Masood Samereie](#)
Subject: SFCDMA Letter of support for "A Place For All"
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 2:41:32 PM
Attachments: [SFCDMA Letter of Support APFA 05_05_2022.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor Breed and Board of Supervisors,
Please find attached, SFCDMA letter of support for "A Place For All"
proposed Legislation.

****Please confirm receipt of this email****

With warmest regards, I remain

Masood Samereie
Broker/Owner
Aria Properties
BRE Lic.# 01364696

**President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants
Associations
Vice President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants
Associations Community Fund
President Emeritus, Castro Merchants**

Mobile | [415.215.6017](tel:415.215.6017)
Office | [415.552.5555](tel:415.552.5555)
Office | [415.552.6666](tel:415.552.6666)
Website | www.sflrealtor.com

From: [Carolyn Kenady](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [RescueSF](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 8:47:28 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Carolyn Kenady
District 8
San Francisco

From: [jennifer utter](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 8:07:28 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

jennifer utter
366 dolores st

From: [Sean Karlin](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 8:08:02 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Sean Karlin
800 Innes Ave Hunters Point, D-10

From: [cm Orth](#)
To: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 8:35:18 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All." "A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach. Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.
[Your Name] [Your address or Supv District] [OR your Position/Org Name]

From: [Cathi Vogel](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 8:51:33 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Ann C Vogel
3543 Divisadero
SF. 94123
[OR your Position/Org Name]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Kristen Langhoff Grannan](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 8:51:54 AM

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

Dear all,

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Kristen Grannan
49 Casa Way
San Francisco CA 94123

Kristen Langhoff Grannan
925-324-4519
klgrannan@gmail.com

Here's how to contact me:

- urgent? call me!
- pressing & quick? text me!
- something I need time to consider? email me!

From: [Nancy Stiner](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 8:58:48 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Nancy Stiner
[445 Wawona St
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: [Jim Connelly](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 9:04:35 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Jim Connelly
Green Street
San Francisco

From: [Aisling Ferguson](#)
To: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 9:12:31 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

[Aisling Ferguson
1448 Valencia st
District 8

--



Email: Aferguson@guaranteemortgage.com

Website: www.guaranteemortgage.com

To begin your application: [Apply with Aisling](#)

[See what my customers are saying about me online](#)



Need to send me a file securely? [Click Here](#)

Confidential: This electronic message and all contents contain information from Guarantee Mortgage which may be privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure. The information is intended to be for the addressee(s) only. If you are not an addressee, any disclosure, copy, distribution or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy the original message and all copies. Thank you

Alert: For your protection, we remind you that this is an unsecured email service that is not intended for sending confidential or sensitive information. Please do not include your social security number, account number, or any other personal or financial information in the content of the email.

From: [Robin Morales](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 10:23:04 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All." "A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach. Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee.

Thank you.

Robin Morales
85 Rico Way
District 2

From: [Conor O'Sullivan](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 10:26:04 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Conor O'Sullivan

From: [Andrew Vik](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 10:57:46 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Andrew Vik
District 8 (lifetime resident)

From: [David Troup](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 11:05:58 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

David Troup
2224 15th St, SF

From: [Debbie Horn](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 11:11:52 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Debbie Horn
323 Lexington district 9
Bartender

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Karen](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 11:13:10 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All." "A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach. Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee.
Thank you, Karen Schwartz, District 8 resident

From: [Jennifer Gee](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 11:21:10 AM

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

To all my elected leaders but especially those not yet supporting this initiative!

The solution for homelessness is housing – and for those that need it, supportive services that are there to help them get and stay stable. But the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Jennifer Gee
District 3 Constituent
Elder, Calvary Presbyterian Church

From: [Brian Key](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [José Juan Capó](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 12:57:57 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Brian Key
72 Prosper St, District 8

From: [Stephanie Ellis](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 1:17:09 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Stephanie Ellis
870 Church St. #1 94114

From: [Michael Ducker](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 1:55:38 PM

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

Hello!

I'm a voter in D5 and I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

-Michael Ducker
1949 McAllister St 94115
miradu@miradu.com

From: [José Capó](#)
Cc: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 1:58:34 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

José Capó
72 Prosper St, District 8

From: [Nathan Gheen](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 2:50:38 PM

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

I am an Emergency Department nurse at Saint Francis. The waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets and in our emergency departments. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Nathan Gheen RN MSN CEN
655 Goettingen Street
San Francisco, CA 94134

From: [C. Tucker](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 5:34:23 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Christina Tucker
670 Eddy St. #320
SF, CA 94109
Community Outreach Worker

From: [Kathleen O'Hara](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 8:26:26 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All." "A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach. Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you. [Your Name] [Your address or Supv District] [OR your Position/Org Name]

From: [Greg Novick](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@rescuesf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 10:37:01 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Greg Novick
District 8

Sent from my iPad

From: [Kevin Meehan](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Cc: [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:13:02 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Ronen,

I'm a resident of District 9. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Best Regards,

Kevin

From: [Nicholas Benavides](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:13:53 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Walton,

I'm a resident of District 10. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Chris Keene](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:22:44 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

I so admire your leadership on mental health, housing and safe public spaces!

I'm a resident of District 8. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Peter DiGiammarino](#)
To: [Chris Adams \(RSC\)](#) [Dariusz Ambrosini \(RSC\)](#) [Eugene Aaron \(RSC\)](#) [Mar. Goodwin \(RSC\)](#) [Funston, Brian \(RSC\)](#) [Haney, Matt \(RSC\)](#) [Melgar, Myra \(RSC\)](#) [Moguel-Graf \(RSC\)](#) [Mandelman, Rafael \(RSC\)](#) [Mandelman-Graf, \(RSC\)](#) [Eamon O'Malley](#) [William Stevenson \(RSC\)](#) [Jedid, Andrea \(RSC\)](#) [Board of Supervisors \(RSC\)](#) [Board of Supervisors \(RSC\)](#) [Board Mayor-London \(RSC\)](#) [info@rescueand.org](#) [Bernard Alon \(RSC\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:25:45 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Peter DiGiammarino
768 Funston; district 1

Peter DiGiammarino
https://url.lavanaclick.v2/____www.intelliven.com____YXAzOnNmZHQzOmE6bz0lNjFjZjY0NzFhYTYjMwZnNmNhNjdlYzQxYTZjZTl4YT02OjA0OTA6NzAwMzEwOGRINDA0NDgwM2Q0N2M4NWVmM2I3OWZjOTImY2FmMjEjZDAxNzIxNGESOTcwY2U0NzYwZGJlNTQ0Nj00IQ@intelliven

From: [Rikke Joergensen](#)
To: [Preston Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:25:57 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Preston,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

In the 20 years I have lived in the city, homelessness seems only to have gotten worse.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. After reading about it, I'm confident supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you,
Rikke Joergensen
244 Hermann Street, #4
SF, CA 94117

From: [Goldman, Grant](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:37:30 AM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Debojyoti Ghosh](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:40:51 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Ronen,

I'm a resident of District 9. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

--

Debojyoti Ghosh
debojyoti.ghosh@gmail.com
<http://debog.github.io/>

From: [Amy Lamboley](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Cc: [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:45:52 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Ronen,

I'm a resident of District 9. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All"

While permanent housing is obviously the best option, shelter that meets people where they are is much better than our current approach. Tiny houses, safe spaces to pitch a tent...all of these are imperfect but much better than constant harassment while sleeping on the street and rising tensions between unhoused and housed neighbors.

The current legislation to require the city to come up with and consider a plan to shelter our unhoused population is a small step in the right direction.

Please do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Let's improve the circumstances of our unhoused in whatever ways we can, as quickly as we can.

Thanks,
Amy Lamboley
55 Cortland Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Kathleen Hynes](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [StefaniStaff_ \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors_ \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 11:11:24 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani,

I'm a resident of District 2. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10e, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [jenifer twiford](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 11:13:29 AM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Jenifer

From: [Kathleen Hynes](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [StefaniStaff_ \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors_ \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 11:18:54 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani,

I'm a resident of District 2. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10e, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [MacGregor, Brian](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 11:33:23 AM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Brian MacGregor
Market Manager Northern California
Edrington

Disclaimer

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by Mimecast. Edrington is a private limited company registered in Scotland (Registered Number SC 36374) with its Registered Office at 100 Queen Street, Glasgow, G1 3DN. Please enjoy our brands responsibly.

From: [Kate Carson](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [StefaniStaff_ \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors_ \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 12:03:34 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani,

I'm a resident of District 2. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Laurie Dewan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 12:42:46 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Taylor Lapeyre](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 1:06:40 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Andrea Kopitz](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 1:07:00 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Nick Meyer](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [StefaniStaff_ \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff_ \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Board of Supervisors_ \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 1:29:20 PM

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

Hi Supervisor Preston and Staff,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

The city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan as a concrete, ethical step towards cleaning up San Francisco's streets.

Kind regards,
Nick Meyer

From: [Rita Nolan](#)
To: [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 1:43:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mar,

I'm a resident of District 4. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Jay Hinman](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 1:48:27 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Arvind Ramesh](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 1:49:15 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Preston,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

--

Arvind Ramesh

From: [Charles Lowey-Ball](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 2:22:52 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

I'm a resident of District 8. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Charles Lowey-Ball
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Greg Dingle](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 3:18:43 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Sent from my thumbs

From: [Dr. Sara Boyer](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 3:22:36 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Pauline Kahney](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 3:51:11 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

[Your Name]
[Your address or Supv District]
[OR your Position/Org Name]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Daniel Bowermaster](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 4:47:19 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Preston,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

Also, it is time we start to analyze the root causes of homeless. For example those without a financial safety net and lose their job and/or have a major medical issue are different than those addicted to drugs. What seems to be lacking is a discussion on how to help those addicted to drugs. Instead, we hide behind good intentions of "not wanting to label" anyone, but that is not an intellectually honest way to do root cause analysis. What % of homeless are addicted to drugs? Which drugs are they? How can we get them off of drugs while getting them into housing? It's no wonder the SROs are such terrible places to live.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Dan Bowermaster
505 Oak Street

From: [John R Manning](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 6:03:06 PM

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

Dear all of you Supervisors,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

John Manning
339 Frederick St
94117

From: [Maryann Dresner](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 6:08:01 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All." "A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach. Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you. [Your Name] [Your address or Supv District] [OR your Position/Org Name]

From: [Gustav Lindqvist](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 6:15:02 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Lev Lazinskiy](#)
To: [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 8:53:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Haney,

I'm a resident of District 6. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Lev Lazinskiy
m: 415.470.2142
e: lev@levlaz.org

	
---	---

From: rsn601@gmail.com
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@rescuesf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 8:54:33 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Robson Wong
1 Daniel Burnham Ct Apt 109
San Francisco, CA, 94109

From: [Clouds Rest](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 10:10:39 PM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

--

Karen Wong
San Francisco, CA
mobile (415) 992-2489

From: wjaeck@gmail.com
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@rescuesf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 6:25:50 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All". "A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach. Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Jaeck
District 8 resident

From: [Courtney Klinge](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 7:58:46 AM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Courtney Klinge
9 Fallon Place
94133

From: [Joe Gelman](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 10:05:32 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Preston,

I'm a resident of District 5. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Paul F](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 10:54:04 PM

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

Howdy,
I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan. Thank you.

Paul Foppe
Sunset resident

From: [Sebastian Gallese](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 8:38:43 AM

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.
Sebastian Gallese

From: [Sean Oliver](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Cc: [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 10:22:43 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Ronen,

I'm a resident of District 9. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you,

Sean Oliver

From: [Dr. James R. Forcier](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [StefaniStaff_ \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors_ \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 11:15:11 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani,

I'm a resident of District 2. I'm writing in support of Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

We need to end the homelessness crisis and we should use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

James Forcier

From: [Christian Wofford](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#)
Cc: [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [placeforall@growsf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 3:07:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Ronen,

I'm a resident of District 9. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

— Christian Wofford
19 Bennington St

From: [Lucy Junus](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Hilary.Ronen@sfgov.org](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place For All"
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 8:04:11 PM

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

From: Lucy Junus

RE: Inner Mission Neighbor Association urges you to support “A Place for All” - File # 220281

Dear Supervisors -

My organization Inner Mission Neighbor Association supports A Place for All legislation sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Mar, and Melgar. It creates a City policy to shelter all who will accept it. It also requires the City to develop an Implementation Plan with a budget so that our Supervisors and City officials can then devise a plan to fund it.

The solution for many who are experiencing homelessness is housing. However, the waiting line cannot be on our streets. We need enough interim shelter to enable those who want shelter to get off the streets.

Nearly 90% of a sample of San Francisco voters believe that homelessness and street behavior has gotten worse. And 74% rated interim shelter as a high priority to address it. ([2021 CityBeat Poll sponsored by Dignity Health.](#))

Please vote for “A Place for All” (File #220281) to provide those living on our streets with a safe and stable place to shelter while they await housing.

Lucy Junus

Inner Mission Neighbor Association

From: [Sammie Host](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 9:55:57 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Sammie Host
From District 8 Supervisor Mandelman
617 Sanchez Street

From: [Andrea Aiello](#)
To: [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Thornhill, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Mark Nagel](#); [Dave Karraker](#); [DPH - terrance](#); [Frank Tizedes](#); [Alex Lemberg](#); [Tina Aguirre](#); [Carolyn Kenady](#); [Alan Lau](#); [Billy Lemon](#); [Crispin Hollings](#); [Daniel P. Bergerac](#); [Desmond Morgan](#); [Helen McClure](#); [James Laufenberg](#); [Justine Shoemaker](#); [Leon Shannon](#); [Misha Langley](#); [Patrick Sahagun](#); [Castro Cares Leadership](#)
Subject: Castro Community Benefit District Support for A Place For All
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 11:29:45 AM
Attachments: [CastroCBD_SupportAPA_May2022.pdf](#)

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

Dear Chair Mar and Supervisor Stefani,
Please find the attached letters stating the Castro Community Benefit District's support for A Place for All. We believe this legislation is an important step in helping get unhoused individuals into safe and stable living situations. We urge you to please support this legislation.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss these issues further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

All My Best,
Andrea Aiello



Andrea Aiello Executive Director
Castro Community Benefit District
Cell: 415-500-1181
www.castrocbd.org
facebook.com/castrocbd

From: [Alan Burradell](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 8:38:21 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee.

Alan Burradell
Castro - District 8

From: [Tita Bell](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All"
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 9:20:16 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Tita Bell
District 8

From: [Claudia Volpi](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All"
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 9:51:45 PM

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

In the decade that I have lived in San Francisco I have witnessed the homeless situation reach unimaginable and unacceptable depths. In a city with so much wealth and voters who have said 'yes' repeatedly to more funding to address this problem with little to no success nor accountability - it is time for new approaches.

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing can no longer be on our streets. It's time for our City and you, our government officials, to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter. In my opinion, the City should also outlaw setting up residence on our city streets and create deterrents to having other cities and states dump their homeless on San Francisco streets. Set up a tracking mechanism and bill their home city or state back for the expenses we incur for caring for their homeless.

The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Claudia Santurio Volpi
D8 resident

Pardon any spelling errors. Sent on the go from my iPhone.

From: [James Kelly](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 1:04:04 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

James D. Kelly, II
4 Miley Street
SF, CA 94123

From: [Michaud Stott](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Vote no on "A Place for All" unless rewritten
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 3:43:54 PM

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

Vote no on "A Place for All" unless rewritten to not just focus on expanding and comparing costs of shelter alone but to include a comparison and expansion of prevention and housing.

Housing and keeping people housed not only solves homelessness, but it is key to freeing up shelter space.

In addition, I am concerned that because this legislation is unfunded, it could lead to cannibalizing working solutions such as housing and prevention. Lastly, Mandleman has made clear his intentions - he wants the system to have shelter beds to offer in order to remove people from public spaces. Any plan aiming to end unsheltered homelessness needs to move us towards ending homelessness, not just provide justification to criminalize unhoused people in public space through warehousing humans.

Criminalization and displacement don't end homelessness, affordable housing does.

Sincerely,

Elaine Michaud
studioms@pacbell.net

From: [Ryan Powell](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [RescueSF](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 4:23:55 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Ryan Powell
District 8

From: [Nora Roman](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: No to "A Place for All"
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 5:44:40 PM

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

Vote no on "A Place for All" unless rewritten to not just focus on expanding and comparing costs of shelter alone but to include a comparison and expansion of prevention and housing. Housing and keeping people housed not only solves homelessness, but it is key to freeing up shelter space. In addition, we are concerned that because this legislation is unfunded, it could lead to cannibalizing working solutions such as housing and prevention. Lastly, Mandleman has made clear his intentions - he wants the system to have shelter beds to offer in order to remove people from public spaces. Any plan aiming to end unsheltered homelessness needs to move us towards ending homelessness, not just provide justification to criminalize unhoused people in public space through warehousing humans. We need a thoughtful and data driven approach to homelessness and "A Place for All" as written gets us "A Place for Nobody".

*Nora Roman, RN
68 Arnold SF 94110*

From: [TashaAntonette Mancinares Griffin](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to " A Place for All"
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 5:47:17 PM

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

Vote no on "A Place for All" unless rewritten to not just focus on expanding and comparing costs of shelter alone but to include a comparison and expansion of prevention and housing. Housing and keeping people housed not only solves homelessness, but it is key to freeing up shelter space. In addition, we are concerned that because this legislation is unfunded, it could lead to cannibalizing working solutions such as housing and prevention. Lastly, Mandleman has made clear his intentions - he wants the system to have shelter beds to offer in order to remove people from public spaces. Any plan aiming to end unsheltered homelessness needs to move us towards ending homelessness, not just provide justification to criminalize unhoused people in public space through warehousing humans. We need a thoughtful and data driven approach to homelessness and "A Place for All" as written gets us "A Place for Nobody".

Warmly,

TashaAntonette (TDT) Griffin
TL Resident 94109

From: [Stephanie Carpenter](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:41:19 PM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Stephanie Carpenter
District 9

From: [Terry Watson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 3:50:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Peskin,

I'm a resident of District 3. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

From: [Brooke Sampson](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 7:08:53 AM

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281).

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee.

Regards,
Brooke Sampson
Resident of District 2, San Francisco
Advisory Board, Cow Hollow Association, Inc.

From: [jean bogiages](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@rescuesf.org](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I urge you to support "A Place for All" (File #220281)
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 11:02:55 AM

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

The solution for homelessness is housing, but the waiting line for housing cannot be on our streets. It's time for our City to provide adequate shelter to end our street sleeping crisis. I join with RescueSF in urging you to support "A Place for All."

"A Place for All," sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Haney, Stefani, Melgar, and Mar, establishes a City policy to provide adequate shelter for people living on our streets. It requires the City to develop an implementation plan that expands the number and types of shelter, including tents, cabins, navigation centers, and traditional shelter. The Board of Supervisors will have an opportunity to review the plan, costs, and funding sources before approving the final plan. This is a sensible approach.

Please pass "A Place for All" (File #220281) out of committee. Thank you.

Jean Bogiages
550 Utah Street, D10
Potrero Gateway Park Steering Committee, chair
MUNA SFSAFE, chair

From: [Joshua Zerkel](#)
To: [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); placeforall@growsf.org; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 11:52:08 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Haney,

I'm a resident of District 6. I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

--

Joshua Zerkel
Doin' it, doin' it, doin' it well

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 9 Letters Regarding JFK Drive and Closure of Streets
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 2:03:00 PM
Attachments: [9 Letters Regarding JFK Drive and closure of streets.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: [Dale Thompson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reopen JFK Drive
Date: Saturday, April 30, 2022 6:43:51 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I fully support bicyclist and pedestrian safety. That's why I am asking you to reopen JFK Drive to how it was before COVID. It is closed all Sundays and half of the Saturdays every year, with ample bike lanes and pedestrian walkways each day of the week. We need to balance equity AND safety!

Regards,
Dale Thompson

From: [Karl Mauzey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: JFK
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 7:56:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Ableism and gatekeeping have no place in San Francisco. The current closure of JFK Drive is unfortunately both of those things.

The time for "close first, ask questions later" is over. It is time to revert back to the compromise that was struck over a decade ago and restore access for all to Golden Gate Park.

Karl Mauzey

From: [Ross Hendrickson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please reopen JFK Drive
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 11:03:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support returning John F. Kennedy Drive to its pre-COVID conditions, with all roadways open to vehicle traffic and street closures on Sundays, holidays, and some Saturdays.

I haven't been able to enjoy Golden Gate Park with JFK Drive closed 24/7. Everyone should be able to access Golden Gate Park.

We need your voice on this issue!

Sincerely,
Ross Hendrickson

From: [Ed DIMICK](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: JFK
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 5:43:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Ableism and gatekeeping have no place in San Francisco. The current closure of JFK Drive is unfortunately both of those things.

The time for "close first, ask questions later" is over. It is time to revert back to the compromise that was struck over a decade ago and restore access for all to Golden Gate Park.

Ed DIMICK

From: [Hal Moseley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reopen JFK Drive
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 6:14:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I fully support bicyclist and pedestrian safety. That's why I am asking you to reopen JFK Drive to how it was before COVID. It is closed all Sundays and half of the Saturdays every year, with ample bike lanes and pedestrian walkways each day of the week. We need to balance equity AND safety!

Regards,
Hal Moseley

From: [Russell Carpenter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Closures of streets
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 12:12:05 AM

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

Greetings. I must protest the closings of specified streets to drivers within The City (note caps). Drivers pay taxes into The City tiller just as bicyclists do. It makes no sense for The Great Highway to be closed to drivers on the weekends. Bicyclists can access it and pedestrians have a walkway/promenade along Ocean Beach, as well as the beach itself, and also a trail at the eastern end of the Great Highway/western end of Golden Gate Park across the highway. Don't drivers have errands, recreation or other plans on the weekends as well as bicyclists?! Ditto for the closure of specified areas of Golden Gate Park to drivers. The only thing more amazing than these policies being implemented is that someone hasn't initiated a lawsuit. It is not fair that bicyclists can access these thoroughfares and fellow tax-paying drivers and local residents cannot. Why doesn't anyone on the Board have the gumption or cojones to stand up to the two-wheeled coalition? The bicyclists ignore stop signs and some even blow through red lights. Would the police allow drivers to block intersections a la Critical Mass? Of course not; that's probably why drivers cannot drive in parts of downtown now. If drivers ignored stop signs or red lights and were caught by police they would be cited. How can a group of people be granted such privilege, priority, or indemnity while their peers suffer? For an extended period of time even the Lower Great Highway was closed to vehicular traffic for several blocks, which is bizarre. It affected everyone living near Ocean Beach as residents had to drive several blocks east on Lincoln, and then backtrack after they were finally permitted to turn right (south), creating commuter nightmares and inconveniences to people who need the Great Highway or Lower Great Highway for commuting purposes, or shopping or whatever. Somewhere someone is shaking his or her head. Roller skaters or bicyclists can access Golden Gate Park or The Great Highway but fellow taxpayers with vehicles cannot? Obviously pedestrian traffic is a major concern, but many pedestrians have been struck by bicyclists as well as drivers. And, while admittedly picayune, those of us who also take public transportation have to wait while someone struggles to attach their bike to the front of a MUNI bus, causing more delays. I am not familiar with the process, but I presume each member of the Board took an oath to serve all the residents of this city, and not just factions. And other than the supervisors who kowtow to big developers and want to turn the city into a Manhattan, I commend the Board on 99% of their other efforts. I am curious to see if I receive any responses. This is not a rant; it is common sense. Dr. Russell Carpenter

From: [Russell Carpenter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Closures of streets
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 12:14:41 AM

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

P.S. By the way, are there any streets in The City which restrict bicyclists?

On Sunday, May 8, 2022, 12:11:37 AM PDT, Russell Carpenter <russellcarpenter@yahoo.com> wrote:

Greetings. I must protest the closings of specified streets to drivers within The City (note caps). Drivers pay taxes into The City tiller just as bicyclists do. It makes no sense for The Great Highway to be closed to drivers on the weekends. Bicyclists can access it and pedestrians have a walkway/promenade along Ocean Beach, as well as the beach itself, and also a trail at the eastern end of the Great Highway/western end of Golden Gate Park across the highway. Don't drivers have errands, recreation or other plans on the weekends as well as bicyclists?! Ditto for the closure of specified areas of Golden Gate Park to drivers. The only thing more amazing than these policies being implemented is that someone hasn't initiated a lawsuit. It is not fair that bicyclists can access these thoroughfares and fellow tax-paying drivers and local residents cannot. Why doesn't anyone on the Board have the gumption or cojones to stand up to the two-wheeled coalition? The bicyclists ignore stop signs and some even blow through red lights. Would the police allow drivers to block intersections a la Critical Mass? Of course not; that's probably why drivers cannot drive in parts of downtown now. If drivers ignored stop signs or red lights and were caught by police they would be cited. How can a group of people be granted such privilege, priority, or indemnity while their peers suffer? For an extended period of time even the Lower Great Highway was closed to vehicular traffic for several blocks, which is bizarre. It affected everyone living near Ocean Beach as residents had to drive several blocks east on Lincoln, and then backtrack after they were finally permitted to turn right (south), creating commuter nightmares and inconveniences to people who need the Great Highway or Lower Great Highway for commuting purposes, or shopping or whatever. Somewhere someone is shaking his or her head. Roller skaters or bicyclists can access Golden Gate Park or The Great Highway but fellow taxpayers with vehicles cannot? Obviously pedestrian traffic is a major concern, but many pedestrians have been struck by bicyclists as well as drivers. And, while admittedly picayune, those of us who also take public transportation have to wait while someone struggles to attach their bike to the front of a MUNI bus, causing more delays. I am not familiar with the process, but I presume each member of the Board took an oath to serve all the residents of this city, and not just factions. And other than the supervisors who kowtow to big developers and want to turn the city into a Manhattan, I commend the Board on 99% of their other efforts. I am curious to see if I receive any responses. This is not a rant; it is common sense. Dr. Russell Carpenter

From: [Lee Heidhues](#)
To: [Lee Heidhues](#)
Subject: Fwd: [New post] Victory Day May 7, 2022 — JFK Promenade signed into Law by SF Mayor Breed
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 8:08:54 PM

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lee's Perspective <donotreply@wordpress.com>
Date: Sun, May 8, 2022 at 8:02 PM
Subject: [New post] Victory Day May 7, 2022 — JFK Promenade signed into Law by SF Mayor Breed
To: <leeross@gmail.com>



Victory Day May 7, 2022 — JFK Promenade signed into Law by SF Mayor Breed



leeheidhues
May 8




Lee Heidhues = May 7, 2022

It was a joyful Saturday on JFK Promenade in San Francisco's historic Golden Gate Park, celebrating its 150th birthday.

A large crowd gathered on a breezy sunny windswept afternoon as Mayor London Breed signed into law legislation designating a 1.5 strip of land car free forever. There was music, roller skating, dragon dancers, people of all ages, City officials who soaked in this momentous victory.

It took decades of tireless advocacy. The People prevailed and put San Francisco on the map as a leader in listening to the desires of people who want an oasis free of cars.

Following is a photo montage which conveys the victory better than words.



JFK Promenade on Bill signing day



Mayor Breed addresses the crowd telling The City that JFK Promenade is receiving praise and favorable reviews worldwide.



Umbrella under the sun on JFK Promenade.



Recreation and Parks Director Phil Ginsburg and David Miles, Undisputed King of Skate and tireless 40 year advocate for JFK Promenade.



Skating in tandem near JFK Promenade.



Bikes Bikes Bikes.



Young San Franciscan takes in the action.



Skating in celebration with a bubble wand.



Lion Dancers entertain the crowd.



The AIDs Quilt



Mayor Breed presents the signing pen to a young San Francisco resident.



Trees Not Cars! - says it all



'Granny Loves Car Free JFK' at the de Young Museum observation tower after JFK Promenade victory celebration.

Like

[Unsubscribe](#) to no longer receive posts from Lee's Perspective.

Change your email settings at [manage subscriptions](#).

Trouble clicking? Copy and paste this URL into your browser:
<http://leesperspective.com/2022/05/08/victory-day-may-7-2022-jfk-promenade-signed-into-law-by-sf-mayor-breed/>

 Powered by WordPress.com



--
**In Solidarity,
Lee**

From: [JCharmain Giuliani](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please reopen JFK Drive
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 12:31:22 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support returning John F. Kennedy Drive to its pre-COVID conditions, with all roadways open to vehicle traffic and street closures on Sundays, holidays, and some Saturdays.

I haven't been able to enjoy Golden Gate Park with JFK Drive closed 24/7. Everyone should be able to access Golden Gate Park.

We need your voice on this issue!

Sincerely,
JCharmain Giuliani

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 4 Letters Regarding File #220307
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:08:00 AM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding File #220307.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

File #220307 - Hearing on the use of taxpayer-funded communications, media, and press offices, as well as their costs, policies, and procedures around conveying accurate information about public safety; and requesting the Mayor's Office and Police Department to report.

Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: [John Crew](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [J.Gabriel Yanez](#); [Benedicto, Kevin M.](#); [James Byrne](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [Samuel Sinyangwe](#)
Subject: SFPD Propaganda -- Item #6, GAO Committee Meeting of May 5, 2022 (File #220307)
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 9:07:38 AM

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

Supervisors,

The SFPD is an agency that routinely claims to be committed to transparency. But transparency isn't a slogan. Transparency is a state defined by a maximum degree of candor and a minimum degree of spin and obfuscation.

Candor requires freely volunteering and releasing factual information even when -- especially when -- that information might temporarily tend to put the agency in a less positive light. Candor requires avoiding unnecessarily selective releases of information in the hope of shaping public perceptions rather than trusting the public to form their own conclusions by providing ***all*** the relevant information. And, candor requires a deep and consistent commitment to factual accuracy and a willingness to promptly correct mistakes when they occur.

Law enforcement agencies that consistently require candor in their communications and media operations are agencies that recognize that the long-term need to develop and maintain the trust of the public, press and other parts of government is always more important than any short-term embarrassment that might result from the timely release of factual information perceived to be negative.

That's the degree of transparency that's required of law enforcement agencies to be effective in serving and being accountable to the public. And, unfortunately, it's this candor-based transparency that SFPD has, in recent times, far too frequently actively avoided in its communications efforts.

Official police communications consistently designed to prioritize an internally-preferred narrative about an event, controversy or issue over candor and full transparency with the press and public will be fairly and accurately understood to be ***propaganda***. If the goal of being less than candid.. of being misleading or inaccurate.. of selectively releasing or withholding information.. is to influence coverage so that it might shape and skew public opinion in certain ways.. by definition, ***that's propaganda***. And if certain misleading or inaccurate messages are repeated over and over, that's a well-recognized and often effective ***propaganda technique***.

THE ILLEGITIMACY AND CORROSIVENESS OF POLICE PROPAGANDA

The SFPD has branded itself as a "safety with respect" agency. But it's fundamentally disrespectful for the SFPD to so frequently and actively mislead the public. The public mistrust that results makes safety far more difficult to achieve. The [SFPD's Statement of Values](#) includes an aspirational goal to "maintain the highest levels of integrity and professionalism in all actions." The SFPD's consistently less than candid and fully transparent communications efforts are falling well short of that standard.

For the last two years, the SFPD's Director of Strategic Communications has been someone with an extensive background in political and campaign communications and who touts on his [Linkedin page](#) that the *Examiner* called him a "powerhouse consultant" with deep political connections and a particular ideological reputation. I respect political consultants and have relied on their advice and help in the few issue-based electoral campaigns I've helped lead. But most of my 35 years of experience both locally and nationally has been as a police practices expert for the ACLU and now as a local activist retiree. I have never before come across a police department that has put a "powerhouse (political) consultant" or a political communications specialist in charge of all of its official communications. To the best of my recollection, whenever the SFPD has employed a civilian in this or any other media relations capacity in the past, they have always been former journalists trained and rooted in the primacy of factual accuracy -- former reporters who've been on the other side of the police-media relationship. They've not been former "spin doctors" for politicians and campaigns.

Strategic **political** communications should be entirely different in nature and emphasis than strategic **law enforcement** communications. The former is inherently and legitimately political. The latter must be scrupulously **apolitical**. Rule-of-law policing in a democratic society must steer clear of any political agenda. Communications for a politician -- for an elected official or for their campaign -- are understood both by the media and by most consumers of the news to be at least partly about the political interests of that politician. Matters of public interest **are** being addressed and there is still a need to be reasonably accurate but a certain amount of political spin and occasional strategic lack of candor and full transparency is "baked in," generally recognized and accepted.

In California we do not elect municipal police chiefs and the very legitimacy of municipal police departments depends on them acting and being perceived as acting in a non-political fashion. The strategic communications for a police department should serve only **institutional** goals but those should **never** be political in nature.

Police departments have no legitimate political goals beyond effectively serving the public and improving public safety. The **SFPOA** can and does have political goals it pursues through its various communications strategies and products. But, the **SFPD** must never pursue political goals.

In fact, the institutional goals of a police department in a democratic society do not exist independently of the public they serve and, at all times, must be established, overseen and periodically modified by the public's representatives. So-called "police powers" -- the power to detain, search and arrest, the power to use force, injure and

kill -- are not powers that **belong** to the police. They are powers **delegated** to the police by the public to be used on its behalf only under the specific conditions set by the appointed and elected civilian bodies who oversee and control the police. In San Francisco, our charter has long-required a particularly strong form of civilian control of the SFPD with a civilian Police Commission appointed by our elected representatives with significant managerial responsibilities over the SFPD and the independent power to fire a chief of police for any reason. And, of course, the SFPD is also accountable to the elected Mayor and subject to the legislative, oversight and budgetary powers of the Board of Supervisors. In other words, the only legitimate institutional goals of the SFPD are those set or supported by the Police Commission and that respect the democratic primacy of executive and legislative branches.

That charter-mandated structure and context in which the SFPD and Chief of Police operate are very different than exists for city departments not directly controlled or overseen by commissions but that are instead run by independently-elected officials. The City Attorney's and District Attorney's Offices are independent agencies run by officials who must stand for election and re-election, with institutional goals set by those politicians. The communications strategies in support of their institutional goals will be aligned with the political interests and political visions of the elected office-holder. But the Chief of Police is not an elected official and the vision and institutional goals for the SFPD -- and any communications strategies that support them -- are always subject to the oversight and consent of the appointed Police Commission, a wholly non-political (in the electoral sense) body that the voters 20 years ago made even more independent and less beholden to any individual politician by giving the Board of Supervisors the power to approve or reject mayoral appointees and to directly appoint three of the commissioners.

KEY QUESTIONS

As you consider the various examples of the SFPD's lack of candor and full transparency obfuscations, inaccuracies and crass attempts at spin and image management detailed below and others that may be discussed during the hearing, ask yourselves two sets of questions about the SFPD's communications strategies --

1. Whose interests are they designed to further, promote or defend? What is the goal behind the messaging? Is it an illegitimate **political** goal rather than a legitimately institutional one?
2. If a communication strategy just or primarily serves the narrow interests and goals of the SFPD -- independent from or in conflict with the role of the Police Commission or the broader public interest -- why would **that** be considered to be an appropriate use of taxpayers funding? What happens to the credibility, effectiveness and perceived legitimacy of a law enforcement agency when its elaborate and expensive communications strategies and various products appear to be political and propagandistic?

In recent months, the Police Commission has begun to ask a few questions about the timing and content of some of the SFPD's press releases and about the SFPD's

approach to media relations. But the SFPD has not consulted the Commission about its communications strategies to any significant degree. At times, the Police Commission itself has been targeted by SFPD messaging and communications approaches that seemed designed to undermine or minimize their role and to politically pressure them into not exercising their authority over the Chief and SFPD.

This was particularly apparent in the SFPD's messaging surrounding the [extraordinary controversy](#) sparked by the Chief's sudden, unilateral attempt to cancel the MOU requiring and facilitating independent investigations by the District Attorney's Office into the most severe and consequential police uses of force -- an MOU whose creation the Police Commission had overseen and that had taken years of discussion, negotiation and public consideration to finalize and ultimately approve. The nature and degree of the highly-political [messaging](#) by the SFPD -- labelling concerns articulated by all or nearly all of the Police Commissioners "unreasonable" and the product of "alarmist polemics" -- in support of their ultimately unsuccessful effort to win Commission and sufficient broader political support to bring an end to MOU-protected DA investigations into SFPD conduct was unprecedented in at least the last 40 years. In fact, I can think of no other commission-overseen City department whose public communications are so out of synch or in direct conflict with the role and goals of their commissions. Can you? With that in mind, here's a third set of questions to consider:

3. If those types of communications strategies are inappropriate and do not occur in any other City departments overseen by appointed commissions, why should they be tolerated when the SFPD engages in them and supported by significant public expenditures?

SELECTED EXAMPLES OF S.F.P.D. PROPAGANDA

1. SFPD Claim -- The SFPD has been "hailed by the New York Times as a police department as a major city department where police reform has worked."

This is false.

The *New York Times* did no such thing. Yet, this falsehood continues to be: included as part of the "about the SFPD" blurb at the bottom of every Department press release; is featured prominently on the SFPD's website's "police reform" section touted on the homepage; Is promoted on SFPD-produced videos the department has used to encourage members of the public to [lobby the Board of Supervisors](#) (at. 1:11 mark) in support of their budget requests; and, routinely used to [create a false impression](#) (on homepage and at 3:53 mark of video) about the scope and impact of the reform process while positioning the SFPD as allegedly a nationally-recognized "role model on reform" generally rather than only on certain selected policies.

Yet, ***no New York Times editorial, column or reported story makes that claim about SFPD.*** It stems ***entirely*** from a headline placed on *New York Times* [morning](#)

[news summary](#) for June 5, 2020 -- 11 days after the murder of George Floyd and with massive protests continuing across the country. That morning summary newsletter contained only an abbreviated, overview description of the state of police reform at that point. The actual subheadline for that Friday morning *New York Times* newsletter was "And what else you need to know today" but the screenshot or photograph routinely used by SFPD in videos and in various public presentations includes only the main headline. ***It has apparently been altered by SFPD communications staff to remove the subheadline that would betray the actual context of what's being shown and to make it appear as though it's an actual New York Times reported story rather than an emailed morning news summary*** which, in fact, briefly summarized many topics that day and ***was not about the SFPD's overall reform efforts at all!***

That morning news summary relied entirely on linked stories ***from other publications*** to make the limited point that certain policy reforms belatedly enacted in a number of major cities -- usually after avoidable police killings and significant protests and public pressure not just in San Francisco -- had begun to help reduce the number of police shootings in those jurisdictions. Relying on and quoting an ABC News [Five Thirty Eight story](#) by nationally-recognized police reform data scientist and activist Sam Sinyangwe, founder of the Mapping Police Violence and Police Scorecard projects (and a key architect of Campaign Zero and the 8 Can't Wait / #8CantWait campaign), the summary mentions San Francisco along with Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Phoenix as examples of cities where these particular policy changes had been made. ***None were described as agencies "where police reform has worked." None were singled out as national models for police reform overall -- not San Francisco and certainly not other deeply- and historically-flawed police departments in Philadelphia, Chicago and Baltimore.*** In other words, if that *New York Times* morning news summary can be accurately cited for anything it's only for the very limited proposition that San Francisco was one of several major American cities whose police departments, under great public pressure, finally enacted certain "best practices" deadly force policy reforms that predictably helped drive down shootings.

Neither the New York Times itself nor the linked primary source material authored by Mr. Sinyangwe ever hailed SFPD or any other of the named agencies as places "where police reform works" overall much less held them up as national models for anything other than the need to pressure agencies to finally enact certain best practices policy reforms long-promoted by groups like the Police Executives Research Forum that have long been known to help to reduce the frequency of police shootings. In fact, when Mr. Sinyangwe ***has*** singled out the SFPD, it's been because the Department continues to produce very extreme, outlier levels of racial disparities in arrests, stops, searches, shootings and uses of force -- notwithstanding all their various claims of progress on police reform overall. If SFPD was candid in its public communications and wanted to accurately represent the actual content and source behind their *New York Times* claim, they would include images of the headline for Mr. Sinyangwe's subsequent February 2021 *Five Thirty Eight* piece, because, in fact , ***SFPD remains among "The Police Departments with the Biggest Racial Disparities in Arrests and Killings"***. In that piece, Mr.

Sinyangwe singled out San Francisco as one of four major cities with --

".... some of the largest disparities in policing outcomes between Black and white residents. In these cities, Black residents were policed at high rates while white residents were policed at relatively low rates. Police *arrested* Black people at several times the rate of white people, even for offenses like drug possession which have been found to be [committed at similar rates by Black and white communities](#). And police in these cities also killed Black people at substantially higher rates than white people, even after accounting for racial differences in arrest rates."

In San Francisco's case, these damning disparities have not eased five years after the voluntary reform process started during the Obama administration. As Mr. Sinyangwe emphasizes in an updated statement prepared yesterday in advance today's GAO Committee hearing--

"According to the [most recent report](#) by SFPD, in Q3 2021 San Francisco police arrested Black people at 9x higher rate and used force against Black people at 12x higher rate than white people per population. Latino communities in San Francisco experienced 3-4x higher rates of arrest and police use of force than white people. ***Despite attempts by SFPD to claim the limited reforms they've implemented to date are working, San Francisco continues to have among the worst policing outcomes in the nation,*** with more [extreme racial disparities](#) in policing and [higher use of force rates](#) than most other major cities. ***The data demonstrates that these efforts have not been sufficient to end the longstanding practice of violent and discriminatory policing in San Francisco.***"

(Emphasis added.)

The SFPD has repeatedly been informed it is misrepresenting both the *New York Times* morning news summary and, in turn, Mr. Sinyangwe's actual conclusions about SFPD. They are aware of Mr. Sinyangwe's work as they regularly [tout](#) (at 04:45 mark of video) the fact that the SFPD has already enacted the policy reforms called for in the "8 Can't Wait" (#8CantWait) campaign Mr. Sinyangwe helped design and lead (even though some SFPD officers too frequently continue to openly violate or ignore those reformed policies without consequence). ***Making claims that have been shown to be factually false is a form of propaganda. Repeating those falsehoods*** - over and over to shape public opinion - is a tried and true ***propaganda technique***. ***If there is a single Biggest Lie in the SFPD's communications strategy, it's that their overall reform efforts have been "hailed by the New York Times."***

2. SFPD Claim -- "Uses of force by San Francisco police officers have declined significantly" and "have dropped steadily and substantially"

These are deeply misleading and wildly exaggerated claims carefully presented and depicted with graphs cynically designed to justify sweeping conclusions unsupported

by the actual data and ***directly inconsistent with the SFPD's own prior explanations of use of force data trends.***

First, in its [videos](#) (at 04:05) and other public communications, the SFPD always presents graphic representations of use of force data trends that are careful to start with the 2016 data. Why? Because 2016 was a unique, complete outlier year with uses of force far higher than they'd ever been or ever will be again because of a critical and important change in what was logged and counted as a use of force. ***By starting with the data from 2016 -- and omitting the data from earlier years -- the SFPD is able to graphically depict what appears to be sharp, across the board drops in uses of force. That's not what's actually happened. SFPD knows it -- and used to properly acknowledge and explain it -- but not any longer, at least not in their public-facing communications materials.***

The [USDOJ COPS report](#) confirms (at pg. 30) that reported uses of force were far lower in 2014 and 2015 and suddenly skyrocketed up in 2016. ***If the 2014 and 2015 data was included in the SFPD's public relations graphs it would depict, roughly-speaking, a bell-shaped curve where uses of force went up in 2016 and then started to come down in subsequent years to levels that are roughly comparable to 2014 and 2015 levels.*** Instead, by omitting the 2014 and 2015 data, the SFPD's graph depicts only a downward sloping decline starting from the year 2016 while hiding the longer term trend and failing to contextualize the 2016 data.

Why did SFPD's reported uses of force skyrocket in 2016? Because that's the year SFPD finally joined many other major city police departments in requiring officers to log the drawing and pointing of a firearm as a use of force -- because it most definitely ***is*** experienced as a serious use of force by members of the public who have an officer pointing a gun at them and because any reasonably-managed police department needs to track and understand how often and in what circumstances officers may be inappropriately and needlessly pointing their firearms at people.

SFPD had never done that before. The first year of data after this reform showed and the press coverage reflected that SFPD had been drawing and [pointing their guns at people with alarming frequency](#) and in situations where it was clearly not justified. The reported use of force data suddenly skyrocketed. At the time, SFPD was very proactive and careful to always publicly explain that this did not represent an actual increase in uses of force but instead was attributable only to this major change in how uses of force were reported and counted. Now that it serves their public relations purposes, they pretend 2016 is an appropriate base year to use for data comparisons and never explain that it was -- and always will be -- a uniquely high data point for SFPD uses of force.

Why did reported uses of force start to decline in 2017? First, because the revised SFPD Use of Force policy first went into effect in December 2016 and contained new, detailed and more restrictive standards on when officers could draw, exhibit and point their firearms. The press coverage over how frequently officers were pointing their guns created pressure on SFPD management to more carefully manage the problem. And, over time -- year by year -- and consistent with the data trends shown by other major police departments in the years after adopting this same reform, the a

laudable "slow down and think" effect was triggered (no pun intended) by requiring officers to report the pointing of a firearm as a use of force. Officers themselves began to realize they were pointing their guns too frequently and in circumstances that were unnecessary when they may have had difficulty explaining what they did so in the required use of force reports. The deterrent effect of the reporting requirement began to kick in and within a few years guns were being pointed far less frequently.

This was an important reform that SFPD should take and get credit for finally adopting it -- (even though they were more of a follower among big city law enforcement agencies in doing so rather than a leader). Along with other things -- such as the new mandatory de-escalation requirement, a new state law narrowing the standard for when police officers can lawfully use deadly force, and eventually the election of a DA who had promised during his campaign he would hold SFPD officers to that law and file criminal charges against officers when the evidence demanded it (and who has kept that promise) -- that reform played a major role in sharply reducing the number of SFPD shootings in recent years. That's great but ***it's no excuse for using the data wholly attributable to that "pointing a firearm" reform to mislead the public with claims that uses of force generally have declined. They have not.***

In a broader 50-page [report for the Police Commission covering data through 2019](#) presented in 2020, ***the SFPD candidly and clearly explained that --***

"In 2016, Pointing of a Firearm became a reportable Use of Force. This created a substantial increase in the total number of reportable Use of Force incidents. The chart and graph show that ***non-firearm Use of Force incidents have remained constant over time. Incidents involving pointing of a firearm have steadily decreased***"

(At pg. 48, emphasis added.)

And, discussing the 2019 data specifically - "Remove the 'Pointing of a Firearm' as a reportable UOF and there was only ... ***a 2.7% decrease compared to 2016***" in reported uses of force.

(At pg. 49, emphasis added.)

The SFPD's use of force data graphs used in its public-facing communications products now show further declines in 2020 and 2021 and, by implication, try to attribute these declines to the alleged success of the reform process. That's utter nonsense. It's common knowledge that nearly all criminal justice data has been deeply skewed by the effect of the pandemic. For significant parts of both of those years, there were far fewer people out in public, far fewer contacts reported by SFPD with members of the public and far fewer circumstances where uses of force might occur. Yet, ***SFPD cynically fails to acknowledge the obvious effects of the pandemic in their various communications products addressing use of force data trends.*** (SFPD did the same thing -- ignored the obvious pandemic effect -- in its [slides](#) presented to the Board of Supervisors on March 22nd of this year reviewing the progress of the reform process by falsely attributing sharp declines in stops in

2020 and 2021 to "Bias Reform Outcomes" rather than to the pandemic, even though the racial disparities remained just as extreme regardless. See slide. #5.)

This crass manipulation and de-contextualization of use of force data for public relations purposes -- the failure to be as candid with the public now about non-firearms related use force data trends as they were with the Police Commission in 2020 ("remained constant" or, if there have been any declines at all they've been only by a few percentage points) -- ***is hardly "transparent" and falls far short of acting in accordance with the SFPD's values requiring "high levels of integrity and professionalism."*** ***It's rank propaganda designed and being spread to mislead and serves no legitimate institutional purpose.***

3. SFPD Claim -- "In October 2016, the USDOJ COPS Office -- for Community Oriented Police Services -- released the most comprehensive assessment of the San Francisco Police Department in City history."

This is, at best, extremely misleading.

This claim made at the start of the SFPD's promotional [video](#) (at 00:46) about the current reform process tries to frame this now six-year long effort as ***the first time San Franciscans have been promised comprehensive reform of the SFPD. It is not.*** In fact, the 2016 USDOJ COPS review and report occurred just eight years after a strikingly similar process was used by the Police Executives Research Forum (PERF) to conduct a thorough assessment of the SFPD. Frustrated with various high-profile scandals involving SFPD, Mayor Newsom contracted with PERF to perform the review that led to a 353-page [Organizational Assessment of the San Francisco Police Department](#) report being released in December 2008 containing more than 200 recommendations addressing a wide variety of serious problems. ***Many of the problems that led Mayor Lee and others to request assistance from the USDOJ COPS office in 2016 were directly attributable to SFPD's failure to implement some of the most important recommendations in the 2008 PERF report.***

For example, even though PERF called on SFPD in **2008** to ban shooting at moving vehicles as other big city police agencies had already done and yet, notwithstanding avoidable losses of life and injuries in the intervening years, the Police Commission did not issue that ban -- (over the SFPOA's strenuous objections and with subsequent years of expensive SFPOA litigation funded by San Francisco rank and file police officers unsuccessfully seeking to overturn this quite common "best practice" reform) - until **December 2016**, two months after the USDOJ COPS report was completed.

For example, PERF called on SFPD to actually.. finally... fully implement the critically-important Early Intervention System (EIS) first created in 1994 (!) and comprehensively revised in a 2007 [Department General Order](#) (DGO) . This basic, widely-implemented tool of modern police management allows agencies to track which officers are using force, are generating complaints or lawsuits or are engaged in other common markers of possibly problematic policing more frequently than their

similarly-situated peers so that non-disciplinary interventions can be tried before small performance issues become much more serious. Yet, because of an internal SFPD culture that resists the very notion that outlier levels of uses of force or complaints might be indicative of problematic behavior deserving of management attention, EIS has **still** not been fully implemented.

Mayor Newsom promised in **early 2006** to ["run roughshod"](#) over the SFPD to ensure the system was implemented by the end of that year. Almost three years later, the **2008 PERF report** called on the SFPD to "take steps to promptly implement the EIS System" and track all the required factors (pages 270-277), including a key and widely-recognized marker of officers possibly engaging in racial profiling or acts of brutality -- arrests for Penal Code Section 148, resisting or obstructing police officers. **Seven years later**, with the SFPD **still** failing to identify officers possibly misusing this charge, the *San Francisco Chronicle* used public records to expose that the SFPD was [targeting African Americans with PC 148 arrests](#) at extremely high and disparate rates. **In 2016**, the [USDOJ COPS report](#) (at pages 121-130) bluntly concluded that, at long last, "EIS needs to be an organizational priority" and "(a)t present, SFPD does not have a cohesive organizational approach to EIS." Yet, **by June 2020**, Mayor Breed channelled her predecessor Mayor Newsom's promise from **12 years earlier** by pledging to strengthen and finally, fully implement EIS in her ["Roadmap for New \(sic\) Police Reforms"](#) as part of her strategy to address bias and strengthen accountability. When asked about SFPD's persistent and extreme racial enforcement disparities during a full Board hearing on the status of the SFPD reform effort **on March 22nd of this year**, Chief Scott expressed hope that, once finally and fully implemented possibly before **2023**, that EIS system would help address the SFPD's racially skewed enforcement practices. He did not explain why or how it's reasonable for the public to accept, at best, a **delay of 14 years** (and counting) in finally implementing this critical bias-reducing, violence-reducing, misconduct-reducing reform emphasized in two separate comprehensive reviews of the SFPD, promised by two separate mayors, long-required by Police Commission policy and yet still not delivered.

The very long history of the SFPD failing to implement long-called for important reforms, like EIS, has been fully [documented](#) for the SFPD and Police Commission. It's not a secret that PERF called for EIS to be prioritized and implemented in 2008 only for USDOJ COPS to need to do the same in 2016. Nor is it a secret that Mayor Breed's 2020 promise simply echoes a promise unkept by SFPD that was made by her predecessor 14 years prior. **For the SFPD promotional video touting their alleged commitment to reform to imply this is the very first time reform this comprehensive has been tried for SFPD is simply not true.** Maybe that sort of "loose with the facts" spin is considered acceptable in political campaigns but it should be thoroughly **unacceptable** in the official communications produced and promoted by the SFPD.

4. SFPD Claim -- "SFPD won praise from the California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board (or RIPA) for being one the few agencies statewide to address bias by proxy in its policies."

This is true but also a very misleading, selective characterization of that RIPA Board report (at 04:30 of SFPD [video](#)).

The SFPD was willing to support the Police Commission enacting a policy designed to prevent its officers from being used as indirect agents -- proxies -- for the biases of members of the public but ***SFPD has persistently refused to take the steps recommended by the RIPA Board in that very same report that would address the possible presence of expressions explicit biases on the part of SFPD officers themselves -- biases that may be playing a role in exacerbating the SFPD's extreme racial disparities..*** That very same [RIPA report](#) released in January 2021 cited the repeated rounds of scandals involving overtly racist, homophobic and misogynistic texts being freely sent ***by SFPD officers*** to one another (suggesting this had been a fairly open and acceptable practice within the department) in calling on all agencies statewide to conduct audits of their members's use of social media for signs of explicit bias --

"These examples of explicit biases among law enforcement agencies -- both nationwide and in this state -- suggest that the problem is far more widespread than most people might believe. Critically, these examples trigger a deeper concern about affiliations with white supremacist and extremist groups.... These affiliations have a real world impact on the communities officers are tasked with serving and protecting.... While the exact scale of explicit racism in law enforcement agencies is difficult to measure, there are numerous examples to suggest a significant problem that could negatively impact officers' interactions with the public. Indeed, these examples raise concerns about "[w]ho might be sitting in jail because what looked like an objective stop, what looked like a clean interaction, may actually have been driven by bigotry."

(Page 26-27.) Notwithstanding its own documented problem of explicit bias within the ranks... the RIPA Board's status as the legally-mandated body within the California Department of Justice with significant designated representation from law enforcement management and labor organizations charged with helping the state's police agencies address racial disparities through carefully-considered and thoroughly-considered expert recommendations... the repeated calls from community members to conduct the RIPA Board's recommended social media explicit bias audit... and a [Police Commission hearing](#) that, in part, highlighted the RIPA Board recommendation, the SFPD has persistently and inexplicably refused to conduct this explicit bias social audit. Perhaps as a result of failing to send the message internally that rooting out expressions of explicit bias would be a priority, the SFPD was recently embarrassed by yet another, preventable [explicit bias on social media scandal](#). Other agencies have acted on this important RIPA Board recommendation. Results were released just last week from an audit of selected California law enforcement agencies conducted by the state legislature's Joint Legislative Audit Committee that strongly suggested "[bias, far-right sympathies among California law enforcement \(was\) going unchecked](#)."

And yet **still**, 16-months after the RIPA Board report called on agencies to try to root out explicit bias with this sort of audit -- in the same report featured in the SFPD's promotional video -- the SFPD has failed to conduct or to even publicly consider conducting that audit.. an audit other agencies that are far more proactive about dealing with explicit bias have already done. Trying to create an impression with slickly-produced video images and words that is inconsistent with the larger actions and inaction of an agency is a form of propaganda. Maybe it's an acceptable communications strategy for a campaign commercial on behalf of a candidate for office seeking to emphasize the positive while hiding the flaws but what legitimate institutional goal of the SFPD is served by trying to mislead the public in this manner?

5. SFPD Claim -- The allegedly lenient policies of District Attorney Boudin are responsible for sharp reductions in the average time-in-custody of individuals arrested by SFPD.

This is a lie.

In a remarkable [memo](#) prepared by the SFPD's Director of Strategic Communications and sent to seven local and national media outlets on December 30, 2021, the SFPD linked the reduced post-arrest time-in-custody averages for "Tenderloin drug dealing repeat offenders" to the tenure of DA Boudin (at pg. 5 and 6). The memo includes a stark graph showing the average time-in-custody for these arrestees being 18 days prior to Boudin taking office and 5.5 days after he took office. ***But, the memo and graph fail to mention -- at all -- that for the bulk of the time period reflected in these averages after DA Boudin took office the jail was operating under the emergency public health necessity created by the covid pandemic leading the entirety of the San Francisco's criminal justice system -- from the courts, to the Sheriff's Department to the DA's Office -- to agree that as few individuals could remain in custody at the jail as possible and was reasonably safe.*** To the best of my knowledge, ***the SFPD never publicly disagreed with the obvious public health necessity requiring the new limits on whether and how long SFPD's arrestees should and could remain in jail during the worst parts of the pandemic.*** Doubling-down on this cynical misinformation, the SFPD's Director of Strategic Communications [tweeted](#) out to the public the misleading memo almost three months later allowing supporters of the attempted recall of the DA to excerpt and circulate widely the misleading graphic depiction of "time-in-custody" averages pre- and post-Boudin.

There is no non-political, appropriate, legitimate, institutional purpose in a law enforcement agency so fundamentally misrepresenting the impact of an elected official's tenure. Not when they're running for re-election. Not when they're seeking higher office. Not when they are facing a recall vote ***Not ever.*** Maybe political "hits" against opposing candidates are considered acceptable practice by communications consultants during election campaigns. They should never be designed and carried out like this by the communications staff for a police agency.

CONCLUSION

A police department that repeatedly fails to be candid and fully transparent with the public and other parts of City government... that repeatedly creates and uses communications products that contain falsehoods, misrepresentations, an apparently altered image, selective disclosures and wild exaggerations... that promotes propaganda to create the false impression that its reform efforts have had greater scope and impact and won greater acclaim than they actually have...is a police department that is not serious about reforming itself and not truly committed to engaging in more just and effective public safety strategies.

In turn, a City government that is aware that its police department is engaging in these deeply misleading and trust-destroying communication strategies that serve no legitimate public interest and yet allow them to continue and, in fact, subsidize them with significant public expenditures cannot be considered to be truly committed to either comprehensive police reform or to more racially-equitable policing.

Thank you for this important hearing and for carefully considering the implications of what you learn -- and then for taking the steps necessary to at least reduce if not prevent the SFPD's creating and promotion of propaganda.

John Crew
(415) 793-4146

cc. John Carroll, Assistant Clerk for the GAO Committee
Members, San Francisco Police Commission
William Scott, Chief of Police
Mr. Sam Sinyangwe

From: [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Nick Monti](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hernandez, Melissa G \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public comment on item 220307
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:30:12 AM

Good morning Nick Monti,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
Office of the Clerk of the Board | San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick Monti <nickmax123@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2022 9:52 AM
To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public comment on item 220307

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

Hello,

I live in District 17 and am commenting on agenda item 220307 - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety.

The community should NOT use taxpayer money to fund propaganda for cops.

There is a clear distrust of the SFPD within the community that cannot be fixed by brainwashing people into trusting the SFPD, who have continually proven to be disinterested in the safety of San Franciscans.

From illegally destroying property (tents) to murdering San Franciscans like Alex Nieto, the SFPD should not use taxpayer money to launder their sins with propaganda aimed primarily at gentrifiers.

Nick Monti - District 17

From: [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)
To: [anne richards](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hernandez, Melissa G \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:30:32 AM

Good morning Anne Richards,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
Office of the Clerk of the Board | San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: anne richards <drwrchrds@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2022 9:27 AM

To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>

Cc: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]

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

My name is Anne Richards and I live in Duboce Triangle. I do not want public funds to be used to whitewash the violent history and purpose of the San Francisco police force. The police are incentivized to manipulate narratives around “crime” to make themselves seem necessary, and justify the harm they perpetrate in our community every day. For an organization that purports to keep the community safe, we should be asking: why do they need a PR department to convince people of this? Thank you.

Best,

Anne (She/They)

From: [Andrew Richards](#)
To: [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hernandez, Melissa G \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:32:07 AM

thank you!

Best,

Anne (She/They)

From: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:30:31 AM
To: anne richards <drwrchrds@gmail.com>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]

Good morning Anne Richards,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
Office of the Clerk of the Board | San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: anne richards <drwrchrds@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2022 9:27 AM

To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>

Cc: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]

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

My name is Anne Richards and I live in Duboce Triangle. I do not want public funds to be used to whitewash the violent history and purpose of the San Francisco police force. The police are incentivized to manipulate narratives around “crime” to make themselves seem necessary, and justify the harm they perpetrate in our community every day. For an organization that purports to keep the community safe, we should be asking: why do they need a PR department to convince people of this? Thank you.

Best,

Anne (She/They)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [McHugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: GAO050522_210198 || RE: May 5 GAO, Item 7. 210198 [Hearing - Status of the City's Electric Vehicle Fleet and Current,Infrastructure Plans to Charge Future Fleet],Sponsor: Melgar
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:41:00 AM

Arthur Khoo
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) 554-7708 | (415) 554-5163
arthur.khoo@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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 9:37 AM
To: paul@pw-sc.com; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mullan, Andrew (BOS) <andrew.mullan@sfgov.org>; Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: GAO050522_210198 || RE: May 5 GAO, Item 7. 210198 [Hearing - Status of the City's Electric Vehicle Fleet and Current,Infrastructure Plans to Charge Future Fleet],Sponsor: Melgar

Good morning Paul Werner,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
San Francisco Board of Supervisors | Office of the Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102 Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Werner <paul@pw-sc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 6:58 PM
To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>
Cc: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <megan.imperial@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mullan, Andrew (BOS) <andrew.mullan@sfgov.org>
Subject: May 5 GAO, Item 7. 210198 [Hearing - Status of the City's Electric Vehicle Fleet and Current,Infrastructure Plans to Charge Future Fleet],Sponsor: Melgar

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

Dear Supervisors:

I would like to thank Supervisor Melgar and the Government Audit and Oversight Committee for holding this hearing on San Francisco's progress on Fleet Electrification.

Converting the vehicle fleet away from carbon based fuels - be they gasoline, diesel, or methane - is essential if San Francisco is going meet the urgent schedule for reducing GHG emissions. And it essential for public health, as the air quality impacts are significant cause of premature deaths, childhood asthma and damaged child development. It is important to recognize that the so-called renewable fuels are not clean nor are they carbon neutral nor are they sustainable at scale. They are not a safe bridge fuel, but a fuelish equivalent of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge.

In addition to the excellent questions Supervisor Melgar submitted, I believe that there needs to be some additional questions about what San Francisco City departments and enterprise agencies are doing by way of collaboration to:

- 1) reduce costs and implementation time.
- 2) for emergency services vehicles ensuring a level of interoperability required to support the mutual aid expectations, as well as strategies to provide energy to vehicles in the field.

With respect to item 1: A recent NY Times article highlights some challenges that New York City is facing, especially with respect to emergency vehicles.
(<https://url.avanan.click/v/2/>____<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/05/nyregion/nyc-electric-vehicle-evs.html>____YXAzOnNmZHQyOml6b3o1MzRlMTQyYWRlMG50GU4N2VlZGMwYTlmYzAxMDgzZTo2OjU1OGYyYTY5OGYyZmZmZWY1NjgwYjNjMWI2YmQ0ZGNIjYlZGQyODJlMWQ0MDpwOkY).

This is an area where collaboration between cities could help manufacturers better understand requirements, reducing wasted engineering efforts, reducing development time and reducing costs. If there was agreement on performance standards for the various EVs it would help send clear signals to manufacturers. These EVs must reliably and cost effectively meet a city's performance needs. This is not the case with the private car. This strategy of collaborating in defining performance requirements was pioneered in the Semiconductor industry over 30 years ago with the formation of SEMI Sematech. It helped manage costs and speed development cycles.

As we electrify, it is important to recognize that we are changing systems - and that offers opportunities to redesign existing systems for better performance. Each agency independently replicating what they did with internal combustion vehicles ignores these opportunities - and we cannot afford to do so.

Sincerely,
Paul Werner

--
Paul Werner
2309 California St
San Francisco, CA 94115

paul@pw-sc.com

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Recommendations for inclusion in Redistricting Task Force final report
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 1:15:00 PM
Attachments: [2022 05 06 - Letter of Recommendations - for redistricting final report from ALC CACC LWVSF.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the League of Women Voters of San Francisco regarding the Redistricting Task Force.

Sincerely,

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

From: Alison Goh <president@lwvsf.org>
Sent: Friday, May 6, 2022 11:51 AM
To: REG - Redistricting Taskforce <rdtf@sfgov.org>
Cc: Julia Marks <juliam@advancingjustice-alc.org>; alozano@commoncause.org; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Arntz, John (REG) <john.arntz@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; Commission, Elections (REG) <elections.commission@sfgov.org>; Pelham, Leeann (ETH) <leeann.pelham@sfgov.org>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>; Engagement, Civic (ADM) <civic.engagement@sfgov.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Recommendations for inclusion in Redistricting Task Force final report

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

Dear Redistricting Task Force members,

Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus, California Common Cause, and the League of Women Voters of San Francisco write to share some of the many opportunities for improving the local redistricting process in San Francisco.

Attached is a letter with our recommendations based on lessons learned during the city's most recent process and best practices used successfully in other jurisdictions.

We respectfully request that the Redistricting Task Force include these recommendations in its final report for the benefit of future redistricting bodies and the people of San Francisco.

Thank you for your attention on this matter, hearing our concerns, and the opportunity to provide recommendations to maintain the integrity of our democracy and ensure that San Franciscans are able to actively participate.

We are available to the members of this Redistricting Task Force and future redistricting bodies, city officials and offices, and others who would like to discuss our recommendations.

Sincerely,

Alison Goh

Alison Goh
President
president@lwvsf.org
pronouns: she/her

League of Women Voters of San Francisco

582 Market Street, Suite 615, San Francisco, CA 94104

415-989-8683 ▪ [Facebook](#) ▪ [Twitter](#)

Empowering voters. Defending democracy. Learn more at lwvsf.org.



May 6, 2022

VIA EMAIL to rdtf@sfgov.org

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

RE: Recommendations for inclusion in Redistricting Task Force final report

Dear Redistricting Task Force members,

Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus (ALC), California Common Cause (CACC), and the League of Women Voters of San Francisco (LWVSF) write to share some of the many opportunities for improving the local redistricting process in San Francisco. Our recommendations are not only based on lessons learned during the city's most recent process, but also reflect best practices used successfully in other jurisdictions. We respectfully request that the Redistricting Task Force include these recommendations in its final report for the benefit of future redistricting bodies and the people of San Francisco.

We strongly encourage the City and County of San Francisco to make every effort to improve all parts of the redistricting process, including how it is convened, the length of the process, mapping criteria and timeline, equitable participation, budget, information accessibility, staff and consultant support, public outreach and engagement, and records retention and reporting.

ALC, CACC, and LWVSF provide these recommendations to help future redistricting bodies carry out a fair, equitable, transparent, and accessible local redistricting process. Many of these recommendations were made in the letters our organizations submitted to the Task Force during its process or in letters to other city bodies before the Task Force

was convened. These are initial recommendations, and ALC, CACC, and LWVSF anticipate providing additional best practices and recommendations in the future.

Our recommendations:

- 1. Allow sufficient time for a fair, equitable, transparent, and accessible redistricting process.** San Francisco's local redistricting process should take place over a substantially longer period of time than it did this cycle. The San Francisco Redistricting Task Force held its first meeting approximately seven months before its map deadline. In contrast, similarly-sized Bay Area cities started much earlier, providing significantly more time to complete their local redistricting processes than was allotted in San Francisco. Oakland's Redistricting Commission held its first meeting more than 14 months before its map deadline.¹ San Jose's Redistricting Advisory Commission began convening 11 months ahead of its map deadline.² Starting the redistricting process earlier in San Francisco would provide the necessary time for all steps in the process, including member applications and selection, training, community outreach and education, public input and feedback, and mapping. Based on best practices from other jurisdictions we have monitored, we recommend that San Francisco's redistricting body convenes at least 12 months before the final map deadline.
- 2. Create an accessible and equitable redistricting body application process to support the appointment of a diverse and inclusive membership.** All San Francisco residents should be provided the same opportunity to apply to serve so that the membership of the redistricting body can reflect the diversity of the San Francisco community. Therefore, information about the redistricting body's application timeline, selection process, the application itself, and all related documents and forms should be available both online and physically. All appointing bodies should follow the same, uniform best practices around transparency, public input, accessibility, and outreach. Appropriate administrative, financial, and community outreach resources should be allocated for promoting the application opportunity to all San Franciscans. Attention should be

¹The Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission's first meeting was held on October 14, 2020 with a deadline of December 31, 2021. City of Oakland Redistricting Commission, Past Meetings, oaklandca.gov/boards-commissions/redistricting-commission/meetings or on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504223245/https://www.oaklandca.gov/boards-commissions/redistricting-commission/meetings.

² The San Jose Redistricting Advisory Commission's first meeting was held on February 22, 2021 with a city deadline of January 11, 2022. See City of San Jose Redistricting Advisory Commission, 2020 Redistricting Commission Report and Recommendations, November 18, 2021, sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/79870/637729314509500000 or on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504223346/https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/79870/637729314509500000.

given to doing outreach to the city's various communities of interest about the application opportunity and to reaching San Franciscans of diverse racial groups, ethnicities, cultures, languages, ages, genders, sexual orientations, socioeconomic statuses, citizenship statuses, and other factors. For this redistricting process, the Elections Commission received 33 applications and the Board of Supervisors received eight. It remains unknown to the public how many applications were received by the Mayor. In comparison, the county of Los Angeles received 741 applications for its redistricting commission and the city of San Diego's redistricting commission had over 100 applications.³ More effort should be made by all appointing bodies to promote the opportunity to apply.

3. **Establish minimum standard qualifications for all redistricting body members.** We recommend qualifications including but not limited to a residency requirement as well as limits on political conflicts of interest such as restrictions on recently running for locally elected office, or having contributed, within a minimum time frame prior to application, a certain dollar amount to a candidate for locally elected office. Such disclosures should be made at the application stage.⁴ Redistricting body members should also demonstrate knowledge of and appreciation for the diverse demographics, neighborhoods, and geography of San Francisco, as well as a high standard of personal integrity, civic engagement, and willingness to listen to extensive community input. These and other qualifications should be maintained throughout service.
4. **Support equity in participation in the redistricting body by offering a fair stipend to members.** The absence of financial compensation is, all too often, a major barrier to equitable participation on volunteer commissions and other bodies. It can especially dissuade those who are low-income and/or young from applying to serve due to the prohibitively high costs of commuting and missing work or lack of flexibility in their employment schedules. The city should provide members with a modest but meaningful stipend to facilitate more inclusive and representative membership on the redistricting body. In addition, the city should cover any reasonable expenses that members directly

³ Los Angeles County Citizens Redistricting Commission, *Commissioner Selection Process*, March 25, 2021. redistricting.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CRC-Selection-Process-210127-FINAL-rev-2.pdf and on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504201234/https://redistricting.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CRC-Selection-Process-210127-FINAL-rev-2.pdf; County of San Diego Independent Redistricting Commission, *Meet the Commissioners*, sandiego.gov/redistricting-commission/commissioners and on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504203859/https://www.sandiego.gov/redistricting-commission/commissioners.

⁴ Financial disclosure requirements should be consistently and equitably applied to all applicants. In this process, the Board of Supervisors' applicants had to submit a Statement of Economic Interest, also known as the Form 700, with their application, while the Mayor's and Election Commission's appointees had to submit Form 700 after being appointed.

incur as a result of their participation in meetings, such as meals, parking, and transit. These stipends and expenses should be paid to members regularly during service, not held until the end. The California Citizens Redistricting Commission (CCRC) offered members modest daily stipends and expense reimbursement for their work on state redistricting, which could be a useful model for San Francisco.⁵ Service on a redistricting body is difficult, tiring, and important labor that should be compensated.

5. Establish a transparent budget encompassing all aspects of the redistricting process.

At no point was a total budget for the redistricting process released to the public, and the Task Force seemed to rely on city departments and agencies allocating funds toward the Task Force's needs on an ad hoc basis. A budget should be created that sufficiently meets all necessary expenses of the city's redistricting process, with opportunity for public input into the budget. The budget should be built on the actual expenditures of the previous redistricting process, with funds added to address shortcomings identified in the Task Force's final report. Additional funding should be provided to obtain datasets and analysis that can assist the redistricting body, provide fair stipends and expense reimbursement to members, and take advantage of new tools and techniques used for mapping, communications, and community engagement that will undoubtedly emerge in the years between redistricting processes. The budget should also include sufficient funding for language interpreters, and consultants for mapping, community outreach, communications, and collecting and analyzing public input to the redistricting body. We also recommend that the city provide modest grants and stipends to nonpartisan community based organizations, such as those that work on Census outreach, to assist with community education and outreach for local redistricting.

6. Provide sufficient resources for robust language support. The city must appropriately fund its legally-required interpretation and translation services. We appreciate the language access improvements that were made during the course of the 2021–2022 redistricting process, but in the future, the city must ensure that resources for language support are available from the very beginning of the process. Providing for linguistic inclusion is a legal requirement under both the FAIR MAPS Act and the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance.⁶ These requirements include providing interpretation of meetings on request, of the full meeting in addition to incoming public comments, as well as written translations of key information. The redistricting body should translate its outreach materials and advertise prominently that language access services are available.

⁵ For its 2021–2022 redistricting process, members of the CCRC receive \$300 for each day they are engaged in commission business and are eligible for reimbursement of expenses. Cal. Gov. Code § 8253.5.

⁶ Cal. Elec. Code § 21628(b), (g); San Francisco Ordinance 27-15.

7. **Publish a detailed and specific timeline, including key milestones and deadlines, in a timely, public, and conspicuous manner.** A public timeline with specific milestones and deadlines for redistricting must be established much earlier in the redistricting process. Such a timeline is more than a meeting schedule—it sets benchmarks for the redistricting body and alerts the public to when and how people can engage in the process. At minimum, the timeline should include: 1) dates for a robust training schedule for the redistricting body itself, 2) events to educate the public about redistricting, 3) dates for community of interest hearings, 4) the date the first draft map will be released, and 5) key dates during the map revision and finalization process. This timeline should be available on the redistricting body’s website and elsewhere, including presented to the public during each meeting and posted in places accessible to people who lack reliable access to the internet.
8. **Implement a training curriculum.** By not receiving any substantive training, the Task Force was often missing the context it needed to make important decisions in a consistent, clear, and transparent way. There were times during this redistricting process when it appeared that not all members possessed the requisite understanding of the Task Force’s responsibilities and mapping requirements under local, state, and federal laws. Best practices for maximizing public engagement and creating a fair, accessible, inclusive, and transparent redistricting process were overlooked or implemented late in the process. We echo our and other organizations’ recommendations from the September 16, 2021 joint letter⁷ to the Task Force that members should plan and receive a comprehensive set of trainings. At a minimum those trainings should cover the Brown Act, the Sunshine Ordinance and records retention, government ethics rules, the Voting Rights Act, Census data, and redistricting criteria, including communities of interest and relevant sections of the California Elections Code. Other useful training topics include geography and history of San Francisco, redistricting software and tools, public outreach and engagement, communications and media relations, language access, disability access, race and equity, and engaging historically excluded, underserved, and underrepresented communities. Additionally, receiving training from individuals who previously served on redistricting commissions or task forces can be helpful. Other California

⁷ Joint letter of recommendations to the San Francisco Redistricting Task Force from American Indian Cultural District, Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus, League of Women Voters of San Francisco, San Francisco Rising, SEIU Local 1021, and Southeast Asian Community Center, September 16, 2021, drive.google.com/file/d/1taBDc8OHRfAdqbnU1fZfeXXJD-Wh3JNz/ and on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504221547/https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/59053b06-508e-4a73-9320-f497b0c97d53/downloads/2021%2009%2016%20-%20Letter%20of%20recommendations%20for%20San.pdf.

redistricting bodies had comprehensive training curricula, including the commissions in San Diego County and the City of Long Beach, as well as the CCRC.⁸

9. **Allow sufficient time for robust discussion of map variations and better engage the public by creating and posting draft maps earlier.** The redistricting body should begin drafting maps earlier in its process. This Task Force shared its first map visualization at its meeting on March 14, 2022, only a month before its deadline. We appreciate that the Task Force held many hearings focused on communities of interest, but the Task Force did not leave itself enough time for full exploration of mapping options. Starting to draft maps earlier in the process has numerous benefits. Public engagement typically increases after draft maps are posted, and both the redistricting body and members of the public have more time to come up with creative solutions and explore a range of map possibilities. In cities like San Francisco, with many communities of interest to balance, having more time to find solutions can lead to better outcomes. Notably, other redistricting bodies gave themselves more than twice as much time for their map revisions.⁹
10. **Allow the redistricting body to have authority in the hiring and management of consultants, vendors, and contractors.** The redistricting body should be able to shape the scope of work of consultants, set standards for performance, and negotiate changes in scope as needed. The redistricting body should publicly publish and allow for public comment on any Request for Information (RFI) or Request for Proposal (RFP), vetting and hiring decisions, and related documents concerning consultants, vendors, or contractors supporting the redistricting body.
11. **Establish ranked mapping criteria.** During this redistricting process, there was significant confusion among the public and Task Force members about what criteria to prioritize when mapping. We recommend that the redistricting body use clear, ranked criteria to facilitate decision-making and ensure that the appropriate considerations shape the maps. The FAIR MAPS Act, the state redistricting process, and numerous

⁸ Long Beach Redistricting Commission, Training Schedule longbeach.gov/globalassets/redistricting/media-library/documents/reports/draft-training-plan and on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504204415/https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/redistricting/media-library/documents/reports/draft-training-plan; County of San Diego Independent Redistricting Commission, Training Continuum sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/redistricting/redistricting-training.html and on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504204529/https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/redistricting/redistricting-training.html; California Citizens Redistricting Commission, Commissioner Education Panels wedrawthelinesca.org/commissioner_education_panels and on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at web.archive.org/web/20220504204638/https://www.wedrawthelinesca.org/commissioner_education_panels.

⁹ Oakland's commission posted its first draft map more than two and a half months before its deadline. San Jose's commission posted its first draft map three months before the city's deadline.

local jurisdictions with their own charter requirements use detailed ranked criteria.¹⁰ Compliance with the U.S. Constitution, the Californian Constitution, and the federal Voting Rights Act are always required. After that, respect for communities of interest and neighborhoods is the next highest-ranked criterion. Other considerations, such as compactness and following natural or artificial boundaries, should be lower ranked. In addition to setting out ranked criteria, members should discuss their approach to line drawing, including how they will balance competing communities of interest and weigh public comment.

12. Document the rationale of the mapping decisions in each visualization and draft map.

The public should be able to understand the thought process that led the redistricting body to draw district lines in certain ways. With every released draft map the redistricting body should describe the decisions made, explain how it applied the ranked criteria, and identify which communities of interest were affected. This information should be documented and accessible, so that members of the public who cannot attend the meetings understand the process. The information should also be made available to the public before the next mapping meeting so people can provide public comments that can be more informed.

13. Resume in-person outreach and in-district hearings, but maintain an option for remote participation. This redistricting cycle was heavily impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, which clearly hindered efforts to engage communities across San Francisco. Barring any public health emergencies, the redistricting body should resume in-person outreach activities and in-district meetings. Meetings should be held in-person at familiar, accessible community spaces that rotate between districts. However, the restricting body should continue allowing for remote participation via phone and the internet as well.

¹⁰ See Cal. Elections Code § 21621(c) (establishing ranked criteria for redistricting in charter cities) (“The council shall adopt district boundaries using the following criteria as set forth in the following order of priority: (1) To the extent practicable, council districts shall be geographically contiguous...(2) To the extent practicable, the geographic integrity of any local neighborhood or local community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division. A ‘community of interest’ is a population that shares common social or economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates. (3) Council district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents. To the extent practicable, council districts shall be bounded by natural and artificial barriers, by streets, or by the boundaries of the city. (4) To the extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria in this subdivision, council districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness in a manner that nearby areas of population are not bypassed in favor of more distant populations.”); Cal. Elections Code § 21500 (ranked criteria for redistricting in counties). *See also* Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 2(d) (ranked criteria for Senate, Assembly, Congressional, and State Board of Equalization districts); Oakland, Cal., City Charter, Art. II, § 220(D); Long Beach, Cal., City Charter, Art. XXV, § 2506.

14. Require the retention, reporting, and disclosure of all government records related to redistricting, including personal communications by individual redistricting body members. Transparency and accountability engender public trust in government, and retention, reporting, and disclosure of government records is an essential part of that transparency and accountability. Rules need to be strengthened to ensure that all personal communications pertaining to redistricting are preserved. Any community of interest testimony or map feedback shared with individual members should be properly posted to the public and shared with the other members. Tools that do not retain communications records or where such records disappear by design should not be used by members for the business of the redistricting body.

Thank you for your attention on this matter, hearing our concerns, and the opportunity to provide recommendations to maintain the integrity of our democracy and ensure that San Franciscans are able to actively participate. We also wish to thank the Redistricting Task Force members once again for their service.

We are available to the members of this Redistricting Task Force and future redistricting bodies, city officials and offices, and others who would like to discuss our recommendations.

Sincerely,

Julia Marks
Voting Rights Program Manager & Attorney
Asian Americans Advancing Justice
– Asian Law Caucus
juliam@advancingjustice-alc.org

Alesandra Lozano
Program Manager, Voting Rights
& Redistricting
California Common Cause
alozano@commoncause.org

Alison Goh
President
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
president@lwvsf.org

CC: Mayor London Breed
Members, Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk, Board of Supervisors
John Arntz, Director, Department of Elections
David Chiu, City Attorney
Members, Elections Commission
LeeAnn Pelham, Executive Director, Ethics Commission
Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs
Members, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\); Somera, Alisa \(BOS\); Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\); Ng, Wilson \(BOS\); Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: CMD Q3 FY 21-22 Report
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 4:53:00 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[CMD Q3FY21-22 LBE Participation Report - final.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the Local Business Enterprise Participation Quarterly Report for Q3 FY 21-22, provided by the Office of the City Administrator pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 14B.15 (A).

Sincerely,

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

From: Fretty, Rochelle (ADM) <rochelle.fretty@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, May 6, 2022 3:37 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Asenloo, Romulus (ADM) <romulus.asenloo@sfgov.org>; Jablonski, Peter (ADM) <peter.jablonski@sfgov.org>; Mikes, Kornel (ADM) <kornel.mikes@sfgov.org>
Subject: CMD Q3 FY 21-22 Report

Hello,

Attached are the cover letter and CMD Q3 FY 21-22 report.

Kind Regards,

Rochelle Fretty, Clerk



Contract Monitoring Division (CMD)

1155 Market Street | 4th Floor | San Francisco | CA | 94103

Direct 415-581-2314 | Main 415-581-2310

Rochelle.Fretty@sfgov.org

Visit us at sfgov.org/cmd

City & County of San Francisco

London N. Breed, Mayor



Office of the City Administrator

Carmen Chu, City Administrator

Romulus Asenloo, Director,

Contract Monitoring Division

May 6, 2022

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Pursuant to Chapter 14B.15 (A) of the San Francisco Administrative Code, please find the Local Business Enterprise ("LBE") Participation Quarterly Report for Q3 FY 21-22 extracted from the Peoplesoft B/I module. The LBE Participation Report documents the LBE contract award statistics on work Citywide.

Thank you for your continued support of CMD and the LBE Program. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 581-2320 or romulus.asenloo@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Romulus Asenloo".

Romulus Asenloo

Contract Monitoring Division

Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION*
 - A. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF CHAPTER 14B*
 - B. FINANCIAL & PROCUREMENT SYSTEM (“FSP”)*
- II. BREAKDOWN OF LBE CERTIFIED FIRMS*
- III. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE IMPLEMENTING CHAPTER 14B*
 - A. DEPARTMENTAL PARTICIPATION OF LBEs*
 - B. LBE PARTICIPATION OF CERTIFIED FIRMS BROKEN DOWN BY CONTRACT VALUE*
 - C. MBE/WBE/OBE PARTICIPATION BROKEN DOWN BY INDUSTRY*
- IV. CONCLUSION*

I. INTRODUCTION

A. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF CHAPTER 14B.

The Director of the Contract Monitoring Division (“CMD”) is required to report departmental performance and progress in effectuating the requirements of the LOCAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE UTILIZATION AND NON-DISCRIMINATION IN CONTRACTING Ordinance (“LBE Program”) on a quarterly basis.

Per Chapter 14B.15(A), CMD shall issue quarterly written reports for the prior fiscal quarter to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The report documents overall Contract Awarding Authorities' progress toward achieving the goals of this Chapter, including, among other things, overall Contract Awarding Authorities' LBE participation by industry, and based upon MBEs (by ethnicity), WBEs and OBEs.

B. FINANCIAL & PROCUREMENT SYSTEM (“FSP”)


FSP provides the CMD and the Controller’s Office, contracting data about vendors, both prime and subcontractors who were awarded contracts and received City dollars. On July 1, 2017, the System became available for departmental use.

For this quarterly report, the data set consists of all contracting information departments have entered into the System for Quarter 3, FY 21-22 through FSPs Business Intelligence Module.¹

II. BREAKDOWN OF LBE CERTIFIED FIRMS

At the conclusion of Q3 FY21-22, the number of certified Local Business Enterprises (i.e. micro-LBEs, Small-LBEs and SBA-LBEs) in the program is 1,159.² Below is a breakdown of all 1,071 micro and small-LBEs (by Ethnicity³ and Gender (self-reported))

LBE Type	Count	%
African American	101	9%
Arab American	15	1%
Asian American	172	16%
Iranian American	22	2%
Latino American	114	11%
Native American	1	0%
MBE Total	425	40%
WBE	261	24%
OBE	433	40%
Total LBEs (micro/sml)	1071	100%



¹ Q3 data was combined as departments and CMD focused on making changes to Chapter 14B.

² In addition to SF-headquartered LBEs, Chapter 14B also certifies eligible firms that reside in certain zip codes along the Hetch Hetchy Water System Program area (WSIP) and allowed to participate in LBE Program-covered WSIP regional projects.

³ Data for MBE, WBE and OBE total 1119, however 48 are double counted due to claiming both WBE and MBE.

III. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 14B

A. LBE PARTICIPATION OF CERTIFIED FIRMS AS PRIME AND SUBCONTRACTORS

Breakdown of LBE participation of certified firms as prime and subcontractors on all contracts. For more details, see Appendix 1.

Contract Type Description	Number of Contracts	Percent of Total	Amount Awarded	LBE Amount Awarded	LBE %
Construction Contracts	19	12.8%	\$ 70,531,201	\$ 16,822,715	23.9%
Professional Services - Chapter 6	12	8.1%	\$ 33,866,270	\$ 14,357,608	42.4%
Professional Services - Chapter 21	59	40%	\$ 84,282,430	\$ 438,165	0.5%
Purchasing Contract	27	18%	\$ 83,015,500	\$ 10,000	0.0%
Purchasing Contract - Term Contract	32	21.5%	\$ 92,383,656	\$ 4,200,000	4.5%
General Services					
Grand Total	149	100.0%	\$ 364,079,057	\$ 35,828,488	9.8%

B. LBE PARTICIPATION OF CERTIFIED FIRMS BROKEN DOWN BY CONTRACT VALUE

During this reporting period, of the 149 contracts awarded, LBEs had the greatest ability to participate and win contracts valued between \$1M and \$5M. This equates to approximately \$25M in dollars awarded to LBEs at the Prime and subcontractor levels.

Contract Amount	Prime or Sub	LBE Status	Amount Awarded	Percent of Cont Amount Total
< \$1MM	Prime	LBE	\$713,460	0.2%
	Prime	Non-LBE	\$17,448,145	4.8%
	Sub	LBE	\$64,809	0.0%
	Sub	Non-LBE	\$988,402	0.3%
< \$1MM Total			\$19,214,816	5.3%
\$1MM - \$5MM	Prime	LBE	\$13,630,000	3.7%
	Prime	Non-LBE	\$59,443,291	16.3%
	Sub	LBE	\$10,570,209	2.9%
	Sub	Non-LBE	\$13,360,581	3.7%
\$1MM - \$5MM Total			\$97,004,081	26.6%
\$5MM - \$10MM	Prime	LBE		
	Prime	Non-LBE	\$88,944,882	24.4%
	Sub	LBE	\$967,000	0.3%
	Sub	Non-LBE	\$6,047,644	1.7%
\$5MM - \$10MM Total			\$95,959,526	26.4%
> \$10MM	Prime	LBE	\$9,208,010	2.5%
	Prime	Non-LBE	\$140,000,000	38.5%
	Sub	LBE	\$675,000	0.2%
	Sub	Non-LBE	\$2,017,625	0.6%
> \$10MM Total			\$151,900,635	41.7%
Grand Total			\$364,079,058	100.0%

C. LBE PARTICIPATION OF CERTIFIED FIRMS BROKEN DOWN BY CONTRACT VALUE

Based upon the data entered into FSP by all departments, following is a breakdown of participation of all LBEs broken down by MBE/WBE/OBE during Q3 FY21-22:

Goals	Construction	A & E	Prof. Services-Ch21	Purchasing	Commodities	GS
MBE	11.8%	16.7%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
WBE	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
OBE	5.9%	8.3%	1.8%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	17.7%	33.3%	7.2%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%

IV. CONCLUSION

With the exception of LBE participation in Construction, Architectural and Engineering contracts, CMD concludes that the current data illustrates that MBEs, WBEs continue to be under-utilized on both the prime and sub-level in all of the above identified industries. Of great concern, is the Departments' underutilization of LBEs owned by members of disadvantaged communities in the following industries: Non-A/E Professional Services, Purchasing, Commodities and General Services.

CMD further concludes that all departments need to maintain their commitment in utilizing micro-LBEs and letting more micro-LBE set aside contracts, as practicable, – especially those contracts/projects that are in or benefit the City's most disadvantaged communities⁴ through the use of more micro-LBE set asides.

CMD also wishes to acknowledge the work of both CON and Departments' continuing efforts to ensure that City staff, contractors/subcontractors are entering all required contracting data accurately in a timely manner.

⁴ Disadvantaged Neighborhoods defined as areas in San Francisco identified as HUB Zones and/or qualifying New Market Tax Credit Areas.

Appendix 1
Q3 FY21-22 LBE Participation
By Ethnicity and Gender

Owner Type	Ethnicity/Race	Amount Awarded	Percent of Total
MBE	African American	\$276,915	0.1%
	Arab American		
	Asian American	\$2,983,306	0.8%
	Iranian	\$1,715,000	0.5%
	Latino	\$9,244,304	2.5%
	Mexican		
	Native American		
	Other	\$1,710,000	0.5%
MBE Total		\$15,929,525	4.4%
OBE Total		\$14,343,515	3.9%
WBE Total		\$3,795,184	1.0%
LBE Total		\$34,068,225	9.4%
Non-LBE Total		\$330,010,833	90.6%
Grand Total		\$364,079,058	100.0%

¹ Contract LBE amount total on page 3 is \$1.76M more than the LBE total reflected in this appendix per FSB data. Grand totals match. \$1.76M is included in non-LBE total in this appendix.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Greystar owner of Fillmore Center
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 4:59:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Antrina Crawford regarding The Fillmore Center.

Sincerely,

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

From: Oshun Ede Crawford <shunnisings@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 6, 2022 1:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: Greystar owner of Fillmore Center

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

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Begin forwarded message:

On Friday, May 6, 2022, 1:30 PM, Oshun Ede Crawford <shunnisings@yahoo.com> wrote:

A wrecking ball should be used to demolish these towers of filth. Hello The Fillmore center owned by Greystar has a terrible habit of taking from the poor . They ask for a 500 holding fee then don't hold it or take it off the market then A week before you're due to MOVE IN they start that:It was your credit meanwhile they rent to addicts on government assistance I am appalled by their treatment .Misleading it's why so many are homeless and shuffling toward the Tenderloin they ask for everything except your blood then at the last minute they do a credit check what was the application fee for? And normally credit checks are don't FIRST not last .The staff are not knowledgeable

and seem to spend more time out front enjoying street festivities while ignoring the phone during business hours so should I have called at NIGHT? now I have to start all over again looking for affordable housing in SF and I have no where else to go I've used all my funds and new places are now asking for holding fees as I now have to wait for Greystar CORPORATE office to mail me my \$500 holding fee used to NOT hold any unit. I applied in March 28th why would they run my credit May 5th a week before they told me I would be moving in so I waited since March to May for a unit which was said to be 502 and vacated at the time then I find out that the unit has been ready since May 2, 2022 and the unit was no longer 502 but 808 . Of course with NO communication from the people (Fillmore center) holding my money! They are a disaster to the planet and make the entire Fillmore look bad! They pick and choose WHO they want to rent to and yes one's skin tone DOES in fact matter .Their concern should be with maintenance and upkeep of the property it's very raggedy in some places , super duper ghetto on certain sides with dirty waterfalls masked as fountains I was born and raised right there in Fillmore and can remember when that was nothing dirt with a cyclone fence around it my grandmother and mother are both from SF born at SF General with all of our children born at Mt.Zion We have been in the city and county all our lives and I never thought I would see the day where they would allow a company to erect a business that shades and misleads other San Franciscans I wished to live in Marcus Garvey or MLK a simple 3br where I grew up in a townhouse so I can go to work and create my product and play my guitar that's it I don't want to March, argue a point, complain or deal with foolishness and dishonest people I just wanted to live in SF and I ASSUMED the Fillmore Center would have been a great fit for me but of course as of yesterday at 3pm I was turned down and I honestly wanted to be housed by Mothers Day .I guess having a perfect background(which I know mine is because I was just hired by SFO) and excellent rental history with no evictions or frictions with landlord/neighbors or having a non existent criminal record means NOTHING I guess they would rather a serial killer with OUTSTANDING credit. Sadly with all the money they have and the properties they own they are still allowed to deny the Ellis Act and the children and grand children of the displaced back in the late 70s or was it early 80s ? I would know I lived in Marcus Garvey with my family my grandmother is over 80 and still lives there right to this day Steiner -Ellis st. Greystar and Fillmore center are train wrecks hiding behind the beauty of my city well not literally MY city but I was born here; however we don't need their hypocrisy , colorism or uppity attitude when they are not even located in the BEST part of the city at least be near Alamo square or somewhere near twin peaks with that attitude maybe they would get a tad bit more respect they need to be reprimanded and restructured their policies are backward and I should NOT be homeless in this city! Someone with authority need to ask Luis Ascencio from Fillmore Center WHY his communication was limited, disconnected and dysfunctional and what was the REAL reason why they waited to do credit check 5 days before the I was suppose to move in and HOW did the unit go from #502 to suddenly #808 oh yes and why was holding fee requested and WHY they can't cut me a check right now as there are other thieves like them waiting to take that money and soon as possible. I can't afford to give anyone else a holding fee or an application fee and BABY it's cold outside ! No shelter space and I can't be homeless with a voucher and I don't

want to be sent to the bay view or anywhere where the neighborhood is infested with mental illness a heavy presence of addicts or homeless tents I'm a human being and I deserve more. If there is anyone that can help me please do expeditiously thank you
Antrina Crawford
(415)940-0430

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: CLF reports for the BOS
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 1:26:00 PM
Attachments: [CLF 6mo report Jul-Dec 2021 Final.pdf](#)
[CLF Annual Plan FY22-23 Final.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached the Community Living Fund 6 month report and the Community Living Fund Annual Plan FY 22-23, provided by the Department of Disability and Aging Services.

Sincerely,

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

From: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 4:43 PM
To: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>
Cc: Durbeej, Ravi (HSA) <ravi.durbeej@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: CLF reports for the BOS

Please find attached a report for distribution to members of the BOS and possible to communication page. Thanks.

Victor Young
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
phone 415-554-7723 | fax 415-554-5163
victor.young@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Durbeej, Ravi (HSA) <ravi.durbeej@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 11:14 AM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Subject: CLF reports for the BOS

Good afternoon Victor,

This is Ravi, the Secretary of the DAS Commission, I've attached the reports for the Community Living Fund 6 month report and the Community Living Fund Annual Plan FY 22-23 that were presented at yesterday's DAS Commission meeting. Could you please forward these reports to the members of the Board of Supervisors and please feel free to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Thanks Victor appreciate it,

Ravi Durbeej

He/Him/His

Executive Assistant to Kelly Dearman
Disability and Aging Services Commission Secretary
DAS Advisory Council Commission Secretary

O: (415) 355-3509

C: (415) 307-0609

Office Address:

1650 Mission St. 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA. 94103

www.SFHSA.org



SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
**Department of Disability
and Aging Services**

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 4, 2022

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

THROUGH: Disability and Aging Services Commission

FROM: Kelly Dearman, Executive Director, Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS)
Michael Zaugg, Director, Office of Community Partnerships

SUBJECT: Community Living Fund (CLF), Program for Case Management and Purchase of Goods and Services, Six-Month Report (July-December 2021)

OVERVIEW

The San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 10.100-12, created the Community Living Fund (CLF) to support aging in place and community placement alternatives for individuals who may otherwise require care within an institution. This report fulfills the Administrative Code requirement that the Department of Disability and Aging Services report to the Board of Supervisors every six months detailing the level of services provided and costs incurred in connection with the duties and services associated with this fund.

The CLF Program provides for home- and community-based services, or a combination of goods and services, that will help individuals who are currently or at risk of being institutionalized, to continue living independently in their homes or to return to community living. This program, using a two-pronged approach of coordinated case management and purchased services, provides the needed resources not available through any other mechanism, to vulnerable older adults and adults with disabilities.

The CLF Six-Month Report provides an overview of trends. The attached data tables and charts show key program trends for each six-month period, along with project-to-date figures where appropriate.

KEY FINDINGS

Referrals & Service Levels

- ❖ The CLF Program received a total of 80 new referrals; a slightly higher volume of referrals than in the prior period, but lower than broader trends over the history of the program. Approximately 59% of individuals referred were eligible, and 100% were approved to receive services.
- ❖ A total of 282 participants were served with most (198) receiving intensive case management through the Institute on Aging (IOA). Although consistent with the

prior period, these service levels are nearly 20% lower than IOA enrollment trends over the past two years; more so over the lifetime of the program. Of the total served, 101 participants also received services from Brilliant Corners through the Scattered Site Housing and Rental Subsidy program.¹

Demographics

Trends in CLF referrals are relatively consistent with slight shifts over time:

- ❖ About three-quarters (75%) of referred individuals were older adults aged 60 and up, a significant increase when compared to overall program trends to date. In 2011 and 2012, individuals referred were more equally split between older adults and younger adults with disabilities (aged 18-59), but older adults typically represent the majority of referrals.
- ❖ Trends in the ethnic profile of new referrals remain generally consistent with prior periods with some changes. Referrals for White individuals remained steady, making up the largest group of referrals by ethnicity (35%). Referrals for African-Americans declined slightly to about a fifth (21%) of those referred, while referrals for Asian/Pacific Islander individuals increased to a fifth (19%). Referrals for Latino individuals declined compared to recent periods – making up about one in ten (11%). Referrals for those identifying as an Other race returned to prior levels (4%), but referrals for those with Unknown race increased significantly, jumping to 10% in the current period from approximately 1-2% of historical referrals.
- ❖ Referrals for English-speaking individuals remain the most common, making up 80% of referrals in the current reporting period. The second most common primary language remains Spanish (6%), and referrals for Tagalog speakers jumped significantly in this period to 6% of referrals. Approximately 11% speak Asian/Pacific Islander languages, an increase compared to prior periods driven largely by the increase in representation of those who speak Tagalog as their primary language.
- ❖ Males represented approximately half (46%) of referrals this period, a return to prior levels. Less than one percent of those referred identified as transgender or gender non-conforming.
- ❖ Referred individuals most commonly identify as heterosexual (68% of all referrals; 87% of referrals with a documented response to the sexual orientation question). Four percent of all referrals were for persons identifying as gay/lesbian/same-sex loving. Nearly a quarter (23%) of referrals were missing sexual orientation data in their application for CLF services – a return to the levels in prior periods.

¹ This program was integrated into the data portion of the CLF Six Month Report in December 2018. Historic data was populated back to the July – December 2017 period based on when the program data was fully transitioned into a DAS-managed data system.

- ❖ The most frequent zip code for referred individuals in this period was 94103 (24% of referrals), which includes the South of Market neighborhood. Other common areas were the 94109 (Polk/Russian Hill/Nob Hill) and 94112 (Outer Mission/Excelsior/Ingleside) zip codes, which accounted for 10% of referrals and 9% of referrals, respectively.
- ❖ Referrals from Laguna Honda Hospital represent 20% of all referrals. This is consistent with recent periods but remains lower than trends over the entire program history. Between 2010 and 2016, 35% of referrals on average came from Laguna Honda Hospital. This likely reflects broader trends in the Laguna Honda Hospital client population and availability of appropriate housing to support safe discharge and stability in the community. Many Laguna Honda Hospital residents need permanent supportive housing but there is a waitlist for this type of housing.

Service Requests

- ❖ There was a return to prior levels in self-reported service needs across all categories in this period after a significant dip in the last period. The most common services requested remain consistent with prior periods: the most commonly requested services at intake include case management (62%), in-home support (57%), and housing-related services (47%).

Program Costs

The six-month period ending in December 2021 shows a net decrease of \$347,987 in CLF program costs over the prior six-month period, with decreased costs in all categories, including internal and partner salaries, purchase of services, and the Scattered Site Housing program operated by Brilliant Corners.

- ❖ Total monthly program costs per client² averaged \$2,295 per month in the latest six-month period, an decrease of \$215 per month over the prior six-month period. Excluding costs for home care and rental subsidies, average monthly purchase of service costs for CLF participants who received any purchased services was \$82 per month in the latest reporting period, a decrease of \$17 per client from the previous six-month period.

Performance Measures

DAS is committed to measuring the impact of its investments in community services. The measures below are used to evaluate the performance of the CLF program in meeting its goal to support successful community living for those discharged from institution or at imminent risk of institutionalization.

² This calculation = [Grand Total of CLF expenditures (from Section 3-1)]/[All Active Cases (from Section 1-1)]/6.

- ❖ Percent of participants with one or fewer unplanned (“acute”) hospital admissions within a six-month period (excludes “banked” participants). *Goal: 85%.*
With **90%** of participants having one or fewer unplanned admissions, the CLF program exceeded the performance measure target. DAS will continue to monitor this measure and evaluate the goal threshold.
- ❖ Percent of care plan problems resolved, on average, after one year of enrollment in the CLF Program (excludes “banked” participants). *Goal: 80%*
On average, 59% of service plan items were marked as resolved or transferred. This performance, relative to prior periods, reflects adoption of a revised, more streamlined service plan tool in IOA’s database. Challenges in this performance area during the reporting period include the lengthy timeframe needed to address some care plan interventions and the lower enrollment levels which allow a slimmer margin for underperformance. CLF will continue to develop strategies to address care plan completion, including enhanced oversight and staff training on documentation.

Systemic changes / Trends affecting CLF


- ❖ As of April 2022, there are 24 referrals awaiting assignment. On average, these individuals have been waiting for 14 days. Approximately 80% are waiting for intensive case management; the others have been referred for a purchase of service (and have separate community case management). This waitlist is shorter than the waitlist in the prior period – and most notably, individuals have been waiting for a significantly shorter amount of time to be enrolled compared to prior periods. In a reversal of historic trends, individuals waiting for purchases of service have spent *less* time waiting on average than those waiting for intensive case management services (an average of 8 days waiting compared to 16 days waiting).
- ❖ During this reporting period, there were no CLF participants transitioned into Scattered Site Housing units managed by Brilliant Corners. Discharges from Laguna Honda Hospital were put on hold for participants referred to the CLF program due to the ongoing pandemic. Moreover, many of those referred to the Scattered Site Housing program required ADA accessible units which are not readily available and tend to take some time to acquire. The CLF program facilitates monthly Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) meetings hosted at IOA to review prospective referrals from Laguna Honda Hospital, or those in the community who are at imminent risk of institutionalization, for clinical appropriateness of independent community living. CLF-eligible individuals who have no appropriate housing alternatives and meet Scattered Site Housing criteria are considered for these units.
- ❖ The CLF program continued to implement improvements in outreach to increase access to the API and LGBTQ+ communities. Through a partnership with Self-Help for the Elderly, a new bilingual staff member joined the team maximizing the utilization of a dedicated caseload that can provide language capacity and cultural responsive services to the API population. The program also participated in the Asian and Pacific Islander Community Partnership meetings to learn more about

how CLF can support the needs of this community. In addition, CLF started attending the LGBTQ+ Community Partnership meetings to increase outreach and develop partnerships with other community organizations serving LGBTQ+ individuals. The program coordinated outreach and training services with Openhouse and increased in-service presentations and marketing materials.

- ❖ During this reporting period, the CLF program continued to follow the guidelines provided by the Department of Public Health and CDC, as well as IOA Covid-19 protocols, in order to offer a safe environment to program participants and staff. To curtail the spread of the Omicron variant of COVID-19, during the month of December, the program decreased in-person visits unless services were essential to support the participants. All face-to-face services were reestablished in March 2022 and additional Personal Protective Equipment were provided to staff following the protocol of IOA leadership and the Pandemic Planning & Protocols committee. CLF worked closely with participants, agency partners, and the community to monitor the impact of the pandemic in its operations and ensure access to its services.
- ❖ Since March 2020, the CLF program's Rapid Transitions Team has been collaborating with In-Home Supportive Services, Adult Protective Services, Homebridge, and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to assist individuals transitioning from Laguna Honda Hospital and Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital to Shelter-in-Place (SIP) hotel sites throughout the city. Even as the pandemic start to slow down and individuals at SIP hotel sites are being transitioned to more long-term placements, the Rapid Transitions Team continue to support the stabilization and care coordination of the participants. The team engages in a bi-monthly meeting to help coordinate support for those experiencing housing vulnerability and other needs during the pandemic. To date, the Rapid Transitions Team has received 57 referrals to support access to social services, medical care, and stable housing.
- ❖ CLF continues to support the DAS Public Guardian (PG) Office through the PG Housing Fund by providing housing subsidies and move-related cost assistance to individuals conserved by the PG who also meet CLF eligibility criteria. CLF helps these participants remain stable in licensed Assisted Living Facilities (ALF), supportive housing, or other similar types of housing. During this reporting period, CLF continued to support six (6) participants through the fund. The program expects to see an increase in referrals in the next reporting period as court services slowly start to resume.
- ❖ In September, CLF reestablished utilization of the California Community Transition (CCT) program to leverage Medi-Cal funds to increase its capacity to serve more participants. Since its rollout, four (4) participants' enrollment applications were submitted to the California Department of Health Care Services. In the next months, the program expects to see an increase in the number of participants enrolled in CCT as CLF continues to support community transitions.


Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

**Community Living Fund
Cumulative Referrals and Clients
Program to Date**




Notes: Referrals are all referrals to the primary CLF program, operated by the Institute on Aging (IOA). Referrals are counted by month of referral. Clients served include those served by the IOA, as well as those receiving transitional care through NCPHS and emergency meals through Meals on Wheels. Clients served are counted based on program contact date.

**Number of CLF Clients Served by IOA Declines;
Clients Served by Brilliant Corners Remains Steady**




Community Living Fund Six-Month Report


CLF Referrals by Age
Trends Remain Steady with Some Flux in % Age 65-74 and % Age 18-59



CLF Referrals by Ethnicity
Decrease in % African American and Latino; Increase in Unknown




CLF Referrals by Language
% English Speakers Remains Predominant




Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

CLF Referrals by Zip Code




Self-Reported Need for Services at Referral Case Management & In-Home Support Remain Among the Most Frequent Requests




Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Expenditures at CLF return to 2019 levels; high Home Care and Assisted Living costs continue to drive spending






Average Monthly Purchase of Service (POS) Cost Per Client for CLF Clients with Any Purchases:
Rates higher than prior years due to increase in Home Care and Assisted Living; spending in other areas continues to decline




Note: Purchases in this chart represent those from the Institute on Aging sub-program of CLF.

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report



Community Living Fund Six-Month Report



Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Enrollment and Referral Trends

Active Caseload	Jun-19		Dec-19		Jun-20		Dec-20		Jun-21		Dec-21	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Active Cases*	343		340		350		344		281		282	
Change from Prior 6 Months	(27)	-7.3%	(3)	-0.9%	10	2.9%	(6)	-1.7%	(63)	-18.3%	1	0.4%
Change from Previous Year	(45)	-11.6%	(30)	-8.1%	(20)	-5.8%	4	1.2%	(69)	-19.7%	(62)	-18.0%
Change from 2 Years	27	8.5%	(37)	-9.8%	(38)	-9.8%	(26)	-7.0%	(62)	-18.1%	(58)	-17.1%
Program Enrollment												
CLF at Institute on Aging	256	75%	257	76%	257	73%	248	72%	197	70%	198	70%
with any service purchases	138	54%	143	56%	159	62%	122	49%	102	52%	90	45%
with no purchases	118	46%	114	44%	98	38%	126	51%	95	48%	108	55%
Scattered Site Housing (Brilliant Corners)	100	29%	101	30%	104	30%	97	28%	104	37%	101	36%
Program to Date												
All CLF Enrollment*	4,133		4,193		4,247		4,278		4,296		4,343	
CLF at Institute on Aging Enrollment	1,989	48%	2,048	49%	2,106	50%	2,135	50%	2,154	50%	2,198	51%
with any service purchases	1,434	72%	1,482	72%	1,538	73%	1,559	73%	1,582	73%	1,596	73%
Average monthly \$/client (all clients, all \$)	\$ 2,012		\$ 2,050		\$ 2,033		\$ 1,970		\$ 2,510		\$ 2,295	
Average monthly purchase of service \$/client for CLF IOA purchase clients	\$ 2,362		\$ 2,327		\$ 2,347		\$ 2,718		\$ 2,645		\$ 2,897	
Average monthly purchase of service \$/client for CLF IOA purchase clients, excluding home care, housing subsidies	\$ 339		\$ 186		\$ 200		\$ 167		\$ 99		\$ 82	

*Includes clients enrolled with Institute on Aging, Brilliant Corners (beginning Dec-2017), Homecoming (through June-2015), and Emergency Meals (through Dec-2015).

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Referrals	Jun-19		Dec-19		Jun-20		Dec-20		Jun-21		Dec-21	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
New Referrals**	158		184		183		125		68		80	
Change from previous six months	47	42%	26	16%	(1)	-1%	(58)	-32%	(57)	-46%	12	18%
Change from previous year	(14)	-8%	73	66%	25	16%	(59)	-32%	(115)	-63%	(45)	-36%
Status After Initial Screening												
Eligible:	117	74%	148	80%	133	73%	74	59%	33	49%	47	59%
Approved to Receive Service	103	88%	117	79%	78	59%	33	45%	16	48%	47	100%
Wait List	11	9%	24	16%	47	35%	38	51%	10	30%	0	0%
Pending Final Review	3	3%	7	5%	8	6%	3	4%	7	21%	0	0%
Ineligible	15	9%	15	8%	13	7%	9	7%	10	15%	21	26%
Withdrew Application	14	9%	11	6%	32	17%	28	22%	10	15%	12	15%
Pending Initial Determination	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	14	11%	16	24%	0	0%
Program to Date												
Total Referrals	4,744		4,928		5,111		5,236		5,304		5,384	
Eligible Referrals	3,456	73%	3,604	73%	3,737	73%	3,811	73%	3,844	72%	3,891	72%
Ineligible Referrals	599	13%	614	12%	627	12%	636	12%	646	12%	667	12%

** New Referrals include all referrals received by the DAS Intake and Screening Unit for CLF services at IOA in the six-month period.

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Referral Demographics

Age (in years)	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
18-59	34%	33%	37%	37%	33%	27%	35%	38%	22%	34%	25%
60-64	18%	12%	8%	18%	14%	15%	18%	16%	13%	15%	10%
65-74	21%	24%	25%	17%	23%	28%	21%	26%	36%	25%	40%
75-84	15%	21%	18%	17%	23%	18%	15%	10%	16%	15%	16%
85+	11%	9%	11%	12%	8%	11%	11%	10%	14%	12%	9%
Unknown	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%

Ethnicity	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
White	43%	40%	41%	34%	38%	41%	39%	39%	40%	35%	35%
African American	25%	21%	28%	23%	31%	21%	32%	25%	24%	26%	21%
Latino	17%	12%	17%	22%	15%	20%	17%	14%	20%	18%	11%
Chinese	3%	9%	4%	9%	6%	9%	5%	8%	5%	6%	9%
Filipino	1%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	5%
Other API	5%	9%	3%	6%	1%	4%	4%	4%	2%	4%	5%
Other	3%	4%	2%	3%	5%	2%	2%	4%	4%	9%	4%
Unknown	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	4%	2%	0%	10%

Language	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
English	86%	75%	76%	69%	80%	72%	72%	78%	76%	79%	80%
Spanish	8%	8%	15%	13%	7%	10%	13%	9%	14%	12%	6%
Cantonese	1%	6%	2%	9%	5%	9%	6%	6%	2%	1%	5%
Mandarin	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Russian	0%	2%	0%	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	0%	0%
Tagalog	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	0%	6%
Vietnamese	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Other	3%	6%	3%	0%	0%	4%	6%	4%	3%	6%	3%

Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Gender	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
Male	55%	53%	56%	59%	55%	50%	54%	63%	58%	71%	46%
Female	45%	47%	43%	40%	40%	49%	43%	36%	42%	28%	54%
Transgender MtF	0%	0%	0%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Transgender FtM	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Other (Genderqueer, Not listed)	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Incomplete/Missing data	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sexual Orientation	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
Heterosexual	50%	55%	69%	69%	65%	68%	68%	64%	69%	72%	68%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender-Loving	5%	6%	7%	9%	7%	8%	5%	7%	5%	9%	4%
Bisexual	3%	0%	2%	1%	5%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%
All Other (Questioning/Unsure, Not Listed)	1%	3%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Declined to State	1%	1%	3%	3%	2%	1%	5%	4%	6%	7%	5%
Incomplete/Missing data/Not asked	41%	33%	17%	17%	20%	22%	18%	23%	20%	12%	23%
Zipcode	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
94102 Hayes Valley/Tenderloin	16%	12%	17%	12%	16%	14%	10%	15%	9%	21%	1%
94103 South of Market	9%	9%	11%	9%	14%	4%	6%	8%	9%	7%	24%
94109 Polk/Russian Hill/Nob Hill	10%	7%	8%	10%	9%	6%	13%	5%	12%	12%	10%
94110 Inner Mission/Bernal Heights	8%	10%	7%	5%	5%	9%	5%	8%	6%	4%	6%
94112 Outer Mission/Excelsior/Ingleside	3%	4%	7%	6%	4%	4%	4%	5%	6%	6%	9%
94115 Western Addition	5%	6%	5%	4%	9%	6%	5%	2%	6%	1%	5%
94116 Parkside/Forest Hill	9%	7%	10%	11%	9%	14%	7%	8%	8%	12%	6%
94117 Haight/Western Addition/Fillmore	1%	3%	3%	2%	5%	1%	1%	3%	0%	4%	5%
94118 Inner Richmond/Presidio/Laurel	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%
94122 Sunset	2%	4%	2%	2%	4%	5%	3%	7%	1%	3%	3%
94124 Bayview/Hunters Point	4%	4%	4%	6%	7%	3%	6%	4%	7%	4%	6%
94133 North Beach Telegraph Hill	1%	4%	0%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%
94134 Visitacion Valley	3%	4%	3%	5%	4%	3%	2%	4%	6%	3%	3%
Unknown/Other	26%	19%	16%	24%	11%	31%	35%	27%	28%	17%	20%
Referral Source = Laguna Honda Hospital/TCM	26%	18%	20%	22%	25%	21%	18%	13%	14%	21%	20%

Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Services Needed at Intake (Self-Reported)	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
Case Management	74%	75%	77%	74%	68%	67%	67%	72%	85%	54%	62%
In-Home Support	61%	64%	74%	62%	60%	57%	57%	64%	77%	47%	57%
Housing-related services	33%	38%	45%	39%	46%	44%	49%	60%	59%	41%	47%
Money Management	40%	34%	42%	37%	30%	39%	36%	41%	50%	30%	32%
Assistive Devices	30%	34%	41%	45%	35%	44%	37%	43%	54%	28%	42%
Mental health/Substance Abuse Services	36%	39%	43%	30%	40%	39%	39%	50%	49%	24%	32%
Day Programs	23%	26%	33%	23%	32%	29%	24%	34%	31%	11%	23%
Food	39%	37%	49%	34%	42%	37%	38%	49%	28%	28%	34%
Caregiver Support	24%	25%	25%	20%	20%	25%	24%	20%	31%	24%	20%
Home repairs/Modifications	15%	23%	29%	37%	28%	28%	33%	22%	43%	19%	30%
Other Services	16%	23%	20%	23%	25%	27%	28%	35%	39%	19%	17%

Program Performance Measurement

Active Performance Measures	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
Percent of CLF clients with 1 or less acute hospital admissions in six month period	89%	89%	96%	92%	93%	91%	90%	94%	91%	93%	90%
Percent of care plan problems resolved on average after first year of enrollment in CLF	73%	75%	63%	65%	72%	*	*	*	51%	75%	59%

*Data unavailable due to database system updates

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Expenditures and Budget

Expenditures	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Project to Date
IOA Contract				
Purchase of Service *	\$ 1,136,573	\$ 976,582	\$ 909,056	\$ 20,834,828
Case Management	\$ 874,148	\$ 814,542	\$ 763,550	\$ 18,387,041
Capital & Equipment	\$ -	\$ 47,700	\$ -	\$ 285,570
Operations	\$ 281,939	\$ 317,617	\$ 253,223	\$ 5,871,829
Indirect	\$ 172,057	\$ 166,196	\$ 153,393	\$ 3,166,870
Housing and Disability Advocacy Program (HSH Work Order)	\$ 38,516	\$ -		\$ 295,888
CCT Reimbursement	\$ (363)	\$ -		\$ (1,603,959)
SF Health Plan Reimbursement for CBAS	\$ -	\$ -		\$ (976,840)
CBAS Assessments for SF Health Plan	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 676,042
Historical Expenditures within IOA Contract****	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 483,568
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$ 2,502,870	\$ 2,322,637	\$ 2,079,222	\$ 49,500,059
DPH Work Orders				
RTZ – DCIP	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 1,292,000
DAS Internal (Salaries & Fringe)	\$ 226,079	\$ 241,435	\$ 200,737	\$ 5,965,103
Homecoming Services Network & Research (SFSC)				\$ 274,575
Emergency Meals (Meals on Wheels)				\$ 807,029
MSO Consultant (Meals on Wheels)				\$ 199,711
Case Management Training Institute (FSA)				\$ 679,906
Scattered Site Housing (Brilliant Corners)	\$ 1,254,329	\$ 1,584,829	\$ 1,518,455	\$ 13,867,427
Shanti / PAWS (Pets are Wonderful Support)	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 37,500	\$ 365,000
Historical Expenditures within CLF Program****				\$ 1,447,669
Grand Total	\$ 4,066,278	\$ 4,231,901	\$ 3,883,914	\$ 77,650,840
				Project to Date
	FY2021	FY2122		Date
Total CLF Fund Budget***	\$ 8,838,557	\$ 8,870,151		\$ 87,364,413
% DAS Internal of Total CLF Fund**	5%	2%		7%
* This figure does not match the figure in Section 4 of this report because this figure reflects the date of invoice to HSA, while the other reflects the date of service to the client.				
** According to the CLF's establishing ordinance, "In no event shall the cost of department staffing associated with the duties and services associated with this fund exceed 15% [...] of the total amount of the fund." When the most recent six-month period falls in July-December, total funds available are pro-rated to reflect half of the total annual fund.				
*** FY14/15 Budget includes \$200K of one-time addback funding for Management Services Organizations project that will be spent outside of CLF, which will not be included in the cost per client.				
**** Historical Expenditures from December 2014 and previously.				

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Purchased Items and Services

CLF @ IOA Purchased Services	Dec-19		Jun-20		Dec-20		Jun-21		Dec-21		Project-to-Date	
	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	UDC
Grand Total	\$1,105,931	143	\$1,242,026	156	\$1,248,393	127	\$1,068,897	103	\$1,056,302	90	\$22,218,164	1,596
Home Care	\$419,991	42	\$473,156	52	\$533,803	40	\$453,568	33	\$405,246	26	\$8,812,906	377
Assisted Living (RCFE/B&C)	\$542,104	30	\$600,145	30	\$585,915	27	\$524,384	22	\$571,256	22	\$8,902,148	101
Scattered Site Housing											\$209,372	4
Rental Assistance (General)	\$53,727	18	\$60,170	16	\$51,256	16	\$51,299	14	\$49,956	13	\$1,382,323	432
Non-Medical Home Equipment	\$15,130	32	\$13,853	39	\$11,584	30	\$21,242	37	\$7,930	14	\$707,608	864
Housing-Related	\$56,923	9	\$70,463	18	\$48,245	12	\$5,994	3	\$13,340	7	\$914,961	387
Assistive Devices	\$5,926	31	\$12,986	29	\$9,359	22	\$7,254	19	\$3,251	14	\$588,514	665
Adult Day Programs											\$110,375	20
Communication/Translation	\$7,289	27	\$4,491	23	\$3,457	18	\$3,880	14	\$4,956	16	\$171,351	432
Respite											\$48,686	10
Health Care	\$30	1					\$25	1	\$0	1	\$92,534	101
Other Special Needs	\$856	4	\$359	2	\$4,111	3	\$785	1			\$44,207	106
Counseling	\$3,100	11	\$4,140	12							\$126,476	204
Professional Care Assistance											\$20,418	15
Habilitation											\$22,788	10
Transportation	\$727	14	\$2,194	12	\$663	12	\$386	10	\$287	6	\$36,760	201
Legal Assistance	\$90	1	\$70	1			\$65	1	\$80	1	\$10,429	28
Others	\$39	1					\$16	2			\$16,309	55

Note: Historical figures may change slightly from report to report. "Other" services have historically included purchases such as employment, recreation, education, food, social reassurance, caregiver training, clothing, furniture, and other one-time purchases. In June 2016, the Medical Services category was incorporated into Health Care. In December 2016, the Scattered Site Housing category was added to track spending of the FY 15/16 CLF growth (prior to this time, CLF funded a very limited number of ongoing SSH patches).

Note: CLF must contract year-round with a non-profit housing agency to reserve these units and ensure options are available when clients discharge from SNFs. Therefore, the total purchase amount listed may not be an accurate reflection of average cost per client served.

Client counts reflect unique clients with any transaction of that type.

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Enrolled Client Demographics

Age (in years)	Jun-16	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
18-59	40%	38%	37%	39%	37%	39%	37%	35%	34%	30%	26%	26%
60-64	15%	16%	15%	11%	13%	16%	17%	16%	15%	15%	15%	15%
65-74	23%	22%	21%	23%	22%	16%	18%	24%	26%	28%	30%	35%
75-84	13%	15%	17%	15%	14%	16%	15%	12%	13%	15%	19%	17%
85+	9%	9%	11%	12%	14%	13%	13%	12%	12%	13%	10%	12%
Ethnicity	Jun-16	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
White	35%	37%	38%	36%	37%	34%	35%	34%	39%	37%	37%	35%
African American	24%	23%	23%	25%	23%	22%	26%	26%	26%	27%	25%	26%
Latino	13%	13%	13%	14%	13%	15%	16%	16%	13%	13%	18%	18%
Chinese	6%	6%	7%	8%	8%	9%	8%	8%	9%	10%	6%	5%
Filipino	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Other API	2%	3%	5%	3%	6%	8%	5%	5%	4%	3%	4%	5%
Other	10%	9%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%
Unknown	8%	9%	10%	10%	8%	8%	7%	6%	6%	5%	9%	11%
Language	Jun-16	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
English	79%	80%	79%	76%	77%	77%	79%	78%	79%	78%	77%	76%
Spanish	11%	10%	10%	12%	10%	10%	10%	10%	9%	11%	13%	14%
Cantonese	4%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%	4%	3%
Mandarin	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Russian	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Tagalog	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%
Vietnamese	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Other	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	3%	5%	4%
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Gender	Jun-16	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
Male	60%	59%	54%	55%	59%	59%	54%	51%	53%	54%	55%	58%
Female	39%	38%	41%	44%	40%	40%	45%	48%	47%	46%	43%	41%
Transgender MtF	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Transgender FtM	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
All Other (Genderqueer, Not listed)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Incomplete/Missing data	0%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Sexual Orientation	Jun-16	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
Heterosexual	82%	78%	79%	78%	78%	79%	79%	80%	81%	83%	80%	81%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender-Loving	11%	10%	10%	11%	12%	12%	12%	11%	10%	9%	11%	10%
Bisexual	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	4%	2%	3%	2%
All Other (Questioning/Unsure, Not Listed)	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Declined to State	5%	5%	3%	5%	5%	5%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%
Incomplete/Missing data/Not asked	0%	2%	3%	3%	3%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%
Zip Code	Jun-16	Dec-16	Jun-17	Dec-17	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jun-19	Dec-19	Jun-20	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21
94102 Hayes Valley/Tenderloin	19%	18%	17%	16%	15%	12%	13%	14%	18%	17%	18%	16%
94103 South of Market	7%	7%	7%	6%	7%	8%	10%	8%	8%	6%	6%	7%
94109 Polk/Russian Hill/Nob Hill	9%	11%	10%	7%	6%	8%	9%	10%	11%	10%	10%	8%
94110 Inner Mission/Bernal Heights	10%	9%	6%	6%	4%	6%	4%	4%	5%	6%	5%	4%
94112 Outer Mission/Excelsior/Ingleside	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	6%	6%	5%
94115 Western Addition	8%	9%	8%	7%	8%	8%	7%	5%	4%	6%	10%	11%
94116 Parkside/Forest Hill	6%	7%	8%	5%	4%	4%	3%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%
94117 Haight/Western Addition/Fillmore	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	4%	3%
94118 Inner Richmond/Presidio/Laurel	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%
94122 Sunset	4%	5%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%
94124 Bayview/Hunters Point	4%	6%	5%	5%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	4%	5%	7%
94133 North Beach Telegraph Hill	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
94134 Visitacion Valley	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	4%	5%
Unknown/Other	19%	19%	22%	35%	39%	37%	39%	37%	27%	26%	22%	23%
Referral Source = Laguna Honda Hospital/TCM	46%	41%	31%	28%	27%	25%	29%	28%	25%	25%	28%	25%

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 4, 2022

TO: Disability and Aging Services Commission

FROM: Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS)
Kelly Dearman, Executive Director
Michael Zaugg, Director of Office of Community Partnerships

SUBJECT: **Community Living Fund (CLF) Program for Case Management and Purchase of Goods and Services - Annual Plan for July 2022 to June 2023**

Section 10.100-12 of the San Francisco Administrative Code created the Community Living Fund (CLF) to fund aging in place and community placement alternatives for individuals who may otherwise require care within an institution. The Administrative Code requires that the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) prepare a CLF Annual Plan that will be submitted to the Disability and Aging Services Commission after a public hearing process, which will have input from the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC). Attached is the CLF Annual Plan for FY 22/23, which has been prepared by DAS for the continuing implementation of the CLF Program.

The Director of Office of Community Partnerships at DAS, Michael Zaugg, continues to actively develop and maintain relationships with key stakeholders at the Department of Public Health and other City agencies, including:

- ❖ Dr. Grant Colfax, Director of Public Health;
- ❖ Michael Phillips, Chief Executive Officer, Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH) and Rehabilitation Center;
- ❖ Irin Blanco, Assistant Hospital Administrator-Clinical Services, LHH;
- ❖ Janet Gillen, Director of Social Services, LHH;
- ❖ Dr. Wilmie Hathaway, Medical Director, LHH;
- ❖ Luis Calderon, Director of Placement, Targeted Case Management;
- ❖ Edwin Batongbacal, Director of Adult and Older Adult Services, Community Behavioral Health Services;
- ❖ Salvador Menjivar, Director of Housing, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing;
- ❖ Roland Pickens, Director, San Francisco Health Network

COMMUNITY LIVING FUND ANNUAL PLAN FY 2022/2023

PROGRAM PURPOSE, TARGET POPULATION, AND ELIGIBILITY	3
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	3
Overview	3
Program Access and Service Delivery	3
ANTICIPATED BUDGET AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS.....	4
ACCOUNTABILITY: REPORTING, EVALUATION, AND COMMUNITY INPUT	6
Data Collection & Reporting	6
Consumer Input	7
TIMELINE.....	7
ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES	8
APPENDIX A: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	9
APPENDIX B: CLF CONTRACTORS	10

PROGRAM PURPOSE, TARGET POPULATION, AND ELIGIBILITY

The CLF Program reduces unnecessary institutionalization by providing older adults and younger adults with disabilities or significant medical conditions with options for where and how they receive assistance, care, and support. No individual willing and able to live in the community need be institutionalized because of a lack of community-based long-term care and supportive services.

The CLF Program serves adults whose incomes are up to 300% of the federal poverty level and unable to live safely in the community without existing supports and funding sources (for detailed eligibility criteria, see Appendix A). The target population includes two primary sub-populations: (1) Patients of Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH), Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG), and other San Francisco skilled nursing facilities (SNFs) who are ready for discharge and are willing and able to live in the community; and (2) Individuals who are at imminent risk for nursing home or institutional placement, but are willing and able to remain living in the community with appropriate supports.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The basic structure of the CLF Program remains unchanged from FY 21/22, as follows.

Overview

The CLF Program provides the resources and services necessary to sustain community living when those services are not available through any other mechanism. Most CLF participants receive case management and/or purchased goods and services from the CLF lead contractor, the Institute on Aging (IOA), and its subcontractors.

Program Access and Service Delivery

Prospective participants are screened by the DAS Intake and Screening Unit for program eligibility and offered referrals for alternative resources when they are available. For example, if participants need emergency meals, they are referred on to Meals on Wheels for expedited services. Participants who meet initial CLF eligibility criteria are referred on to IOA for a final review. Participants are accepted for service or placed on the wait list, depending on their emergent needs and program capacity at that time. When the referral is accepted, the IOA CLF Director will determine which care manager is best able to serve the needs of the individual, which will be based on language, culture and/or service needs (see Appendix B for a summary of partner agencies and their specialties).

The CLF Care Manager then contacts the participant, confirms the participant's desire to enroll in the program, completes a formal application, and conducts an in-home or in-hospital assessment. The initial assessment is the tool with which the CLF Care Manager, the participant and family, or other informal support systems, determine what is needed in order for the participant to live safely

in the community. A plan to address those needs is also developed. If the participant is already working with another community care manager, the CLF Care Manager will coordinate the home assessment with him/her. The entire assessment process should be completed within one month.

CLF Care Managers make referrals to other services and follow-up on those referrals to be sure the participant receives the services required. When there are no alternative resources available to provide identified goods or services, the CLF Care Manager purchases the necessary items or services, with approval from the CLF Clinical Supervisor.

Once services are in place, the CLF Care Manager monitors the situation by maintaining regular contact with the participant and/or family and primary community care manager, if there is one. CLF Care Managers see participants as often as necessary to ensure they are receiving the services they need to remain living safely in the community. Participants are expected to have a minimum of one home visit per month. For individuals who are discharged from Laguna Honda Hospital and other San Francisco skilled nursing facilities (SNFs), CLF Care Managers have weekly face-to-face contact for the first month post-discharge, then every other week for the next two months, and then monthly thereafter. Should new problems arise, they are incorporated into the existing service plan and addressed.

The CLF Program continues with ongoing efforts to address the challenges of participants with substance abuse and mental health needs. Every CLF Care Manager participates in psychologist-facilitated care conferences twice a month. These include an in-depth case review, follow-up on progress from previous case recommendations, and skill building training. CLF Care Managers continue to make notable progress in connecting participants to mental health treatment.

In addition to the traditional CLF model of intensive case management with purchase of goods and services, there are many participants who already have a community care manager but are in need of tangible goods or other services to remain stably housed in the community. The CLF Care Coordinator role, which is a purchasing care manager at Catholic Charities, can assist these participants who have a purchase-only need. With a caseload size of about 30-40 participants, the CLF Care Coordinator completes a modified assessment for expedited enrollment which allow participants who meet CLF eligibility and are enrolled in other case management to access the purchase of goods and services more efficiently. This flexibility allows CLF to serve more participants and have a more extensive community reach to prevent premature institutionalization.

ANTICIPATED BUDGET AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Going into FY 22/23, CLF expenditures have continued to be stable. The plans for this upcoming year include:

- The Integrated Housing Model continues into FY 22/23 and will facilitate care coordination for CLF referrals who meet criteria for Scattered Site Housing (SSH) through a contract with Brilliant Corners. IOA hosts a monthly multi-disciplinary team meeting that includes BC, DAS, and LHH to discuss referrals of participants and their transition needs. A robust pipeline is essential for effective and efficient transitioning of individuals from LHH and other SNFs to the community. Access to the SSH slots are only available after CLF approval and are based on participant needs and placement appropriateness. The SSH units

continue to add flexibility to the CLF housing portfolio in transitioning individuals who would have otherwise not been able to return to the community due to lack of appropriate housing options.

- CLF continues to support the contract with Shanti Project-PAWS (Pets are Wonderful Support) Animal Bonding Services for Isolated LGBTQ+ Older Adults and Adults with Disabilities. For many, pets are considered family members, and individuals will often delay or forego their own needs in order to meet their pets' needs. CLF helps increase the Shanti Project-PAWS capacity to assist low-income and frail individuals who meet CLF criteria by funding the purchases of tangible goods and services such as pet food, pet supplies, medication, and pet health services. Previous outcomes from FY 20/21 included self-reports of positive health impacts and affirmation that the CLF-funded goods and services have reduced participants' risk for hospitalization (79%) and prevented isolation (92%). While FY 21/22 outcomes are not yet available, CLF anticipates continuing support in FY 22/23.
- The CLF Program continues to partner with the DAS Public Guardian (PG) Office to support the PG Housing Fund which provides individuals conserved by the PG, who also meet CLF eligibility criteria, with housing subsidies and assistance with move-related costs to licensed Assisted Living Facilities (ALF), supportive housing, or other similar types of housing. Due to insufficient financial resources and declining health, many individuals under PG conservatorship are marginally housed for prolonged periods of time while waiting for appropriate housing options. The PG Housing Fund through CLF is used to support their safety and housing stability. Approximately 5-10 individuals are being served annually by this partnership.
- CLF is committed to offer responsive and inclusive services to the diverse community of San Francisco. The program will continue to implement outreach initiatives to access the Asian and Pacific Islander and the LGBTQ+ communities by participating in community partnerships, coordinating training services, and providing in-service presentations to local organizations. The program will also continue its focus on professional development opportunities that support and promote cultural humility and competencies of CLF staff in the services offered to the community.
- During FY 21/22, the CLF program continued to engage in temporary policy changes in its operations to respond to the needs of the community during the Coronavirus pandemic. The program offered a hybrid model of services practicing remote and in-person care according to the needs of the participants and following guidelines from the Department of Public Health (SFPDH) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The program allowed for remote communication technologies that are HIPPA compliant and supplied staff in the field with enhanced Personal Protective Equipment for essential visits. This approach will continue through FY 22/23, as necessary.
- When the COVID-19 pandemic started in March 2020, CLF collaborated with SFPDH Transitions Care Coordination and Placement, In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), and Homebridge to assist individuals transitioning from Laguna Honda Hospital and Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital to Shelter-in-Place (SIP) hotel sites throughout the city. The

CLF Rapid Transitions Team was formed to provide a modified fast-tracked process for assessment and enrollment of participants and provide care coordination and purchase of goods to meet urgent needs. As the pandemic start to slow down and individuals at SIP hotel sites are being transitioned to more long-term placements, the CLF Rapid Transitions Team continue to support their stabilization and coordination of care. This effort will continue through FY 22/23 until the CLF Rapid Transitions Team is no longer needed as a response to the pandemic.

- CLF continues to be a core partner of the San Francisco Aging and Disability Resource Connection (ADRC) and has a representative that serves on the ADRC advisory committee. The goal of the ADRC is to develop long-term support infrastructure to increase consumer access to home and community-based long-term services and supports and to divert persons with disabilities and older adults from unnecessary institutionalization. The ADRC brings together key stakeholders in an effort to streamline community-based services for older adults and people with disabilities, educate the public about the rich array of services available to support community-based living and aging in place, and provide human service organizations with an avenue through which knowledge, resources, and opportunities can be shared.
- During FY 21/22, CLF reestablished the utilization of the California Community Transitions (CCT) program to leverage supplemental funding through Medi-Cal and expand CLF's ability to support a larger number of participants in the community. As of September 2021, the CLF program has been collaborating with the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) in the review of enrollment processes and policy updates to support CCT enrollment of Medi-Cal beneficiaries that can transition from facilities to community settings. Since then, four (4) applications have been submitted to DHCS. Going into FY 22/23, CLF expects to see an increase in the number of participants enrolled in CCT as the program implements CCT's processes in the CLF assessment.

ACCOUNTABILITY: REPORTING, EVALUATION, AND COMMUNITY INPUT

Plans for reporting and evaluation of the CLF Program are detailed below.

Data Collection & Reporting

DAS is committed to measuring the impact of its investments in community services. The CLF Program consistently meets and exceeds its goals to support successful community living for those discharged or at imminent risk of institutionalization. In FY 15/16, DAS shifted the focus of CLF on the measures below:

- ❖ Percent of participants with one or fewer admissions to an acute care hospital within a six-month period. Target: 85%.

The CLF Program is anticipated to continue to exceed this performance measure target of participants having one or fewer unplanned admissions.

- ❖ Percent of care plan problems resolved, on average, after one year of enrollment in the CLF Program (excludes participants with ongoing purchases). Target: 80%.

The CLF Program will continue to make progress towards this performance measure target in FY 22/23. This measure reflects the complexity of the population served as CLF participants tend to have high personal and safety needs to live safely in the community. For many, care plan interventions take time to develop and resolve. However, while a subset of participants will always have less than 100% of their care plan problems resolved due to ongoing care needs, the program will continue to ensure care plan items are updated throughout enrollment through ongoing supervision, training, and oversight on database utilization.

CLF has been meeting the city ordinance that requires collection of sexual orientation and gender identity data effective July 2017. IOA has adopted DAS' standardized demographic indicators and the reporting of sexual orientation and gender identity.

Consumer Input

The CLF Advisory Council first met in January 2009 and continues to meet quarterly. The Council is comprised of representatives from consumers, partner agencies, and community representatives. The Advisory Council reviews the consumer satisfaction surveys, waiting list statistics, program changes and other issues which may affect service delivery.

IOA obtains consumer input through the Satisfaction Survey for CLF participants. On an annual basis, participants who are enrolled in the CLF Program are asked to complete a satisfaction survey that covers satisfaction with general services, social worker satisfaction, service impact, and overall satisfaction with the entire CLF Program. In 2021, 91% of participants reported that the CLF Program helped them maintain or improve their quality of life with 87% having recommended the program to others. For 2022, the Satisfaction Survey will be administered in April/May 2022 and results from the responses will be available in the next public reporting.

TIMELINE

The DAS Office of Community Partnerships and IOA will review monthly reports of service utilization and referral trends, as described in the reporting section above. The following table highlights other important dates for public reporting.

Timeline of Public Reporting – FY 2022/2023	
Quarter 1: July – September 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>August:</i> Prepare Six-Month Report on CLF activities from January through June 2022.
Quarter 2: October – December 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>October:</i> Submit Six-Month Report to Disability and Aging Services Commission for review and forward to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office, LTCCC, and DPH.

Quarter 3: January – March 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>February:</i> Prepare Six-Month Report on CLF activities from July through December 2022. ▪ <i>March:</i> Prepare FY 23/24 CLF Annual Plan draft, seeking input from the LTCCC and DPH.
Quarter 4: April – June 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>April:</i> Submit Six-Month Report and FY 23/24 CLF Annual Plan to Disability and Aging Services Commission for review and forward to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office, LTCCC, and DPH.

ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES

At the conclusion of FY 21/22, it is estimated that the CLF Program will have spent a total of \$81.53 million since the program's inception. For FY 22/23, the CLF Program is projecting a total of \$9.05 million in expenditures.

IOA Contract	\$ 4,684,015
Brilliant Corners Contract	\$ 3,123,830
DAS Internal Staff Positions	\$ 684,545
PG Housing Fund	\$ 352,795
RTZ Contract	\$ 96,000
Shanti Project/PAWS	\$ 75,000
Unprogrammed Funds	\$ 42,149
TOTAL	\$ 9,058,334

APPENDIX A: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

To receive services under the CLF Program, participants must meet all of the following criteria:

1. Be 18 years or older.
2. Be a resident of San Francisco.
3. Be willing and able to live in the community with appropriate supports.
4. Have income of no more than 300% of federal poverty level for a single adult: \$40,770 plus savings/assets of no more than \$6,000 (excluding assets allowed under Medi-Cal). Reflects the 2022 Federal Poverty guideline of \$ 13,590 for individuals.
5. Have a demonstrated need for a service and/or resource that will serve to prevent institutionalization or will enable community living.
6. Be institutionalized or be deemed at assessment to be at imminent risk of being institutionalized. In order to be considered “at imminent risk”, an individual must have, at a minimum, one of the following:
 - a. A functional impairment in a minimum of two Activities of Daily Living (ADL): eating, dressing, transfer, bathing, toileting, and grooming; or
 - b. A medical condition to the extent requiring the level of care that would be provided in a nursing facility; or
 - c. Inability to manage one’s own affairs due to emotional and/or cognitive impairment; and a functional impairment in a minimum of 3 Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL): taking medications, stair climbing, mobility, housework, laundry, shopping, meal preparation, transportation, telephone usage and money management.

Specific conditions or situations such as substance abuse or chronic mental illness shall not be a deterrent to services if the eligibility criteria are met.

APPENDIX B: CLF CONTRACTORS

Agency	Specialty	Average Caseload per Care Manager
Institute on Aging	Program and case management supervision, 11 city-wide intensive Care Managers	15–22 intensive
IOA Subcontractors:		
Catholic Charities CYO	1 Care Manager	15-22 intensive
	1 Care Coordinator	30-40 cases
Conard House	1 Money Management Care Manager	40-50 cases
Self Help for the Elderly	1 Care Manager/Social Worker	15-22 intensive

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: California Fish and Game Commission Meeting of May 19, 2022
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:38:00 AM
Attachments: [California Fish and Game Commission.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hello,

Attached please find notices from the California Fish and Game Commission regarding their May 19, 2022 meeting.

Regards,

Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: [California Fish and Game Commission](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: California Fish and Game Commission revised meeting agenda - May 19, 2022
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 11:45:02 AM

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



**California
Fish and Game Commission**
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Greetings,

The May 19, 2022 Commission meeting agenda has been revised to amend one of the teleconference participation locations. The revised agenda for this meeting is available at <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=200469&inline>.

Members of the public are welcome to participate in-person at one of several meeting locations. The meeting will be live-streamed for listening purposes only. Please refer to the agenda for details and important meeting information.

Sincerely,

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
California Fish and Game Commission



Not yet signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign up

Facebook



Twitter



LinkedIn



California Fish and Game Commission | We've moved!, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

[Unsubscribe board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by fgc@fgc.ca.gov powered by



Try email marketing for free today!



From: [California Fish and Game Commission](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Notice of Location of May 19, 2022 Hearing
Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 3:06:29 PM

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



**California
Fish and Game Commission**
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Greetings,

At the time the notices for the following rulemaking items were published, the location of the May 19, 2022 Commission meeting had not yet been determined. A notice of location of the May 19, 2022 meeting is available at <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=202006&inline>.

This notice relates to the following regulatory actions:

- adoption hearing for Klamath River Basin sport fishing (<https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2022-New-and-Proposed#kt>),
- adoption hearing for Central Valley sport fishing (<https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2022-New-and-Proposed#cv>),
- discussion hearing for issuance of permits for contests offering prizes for the taking of game fish (<https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2022-New-and-Proposed#GFC>), and
- discussion hearing for allowed and prohibited uses for state marine recreational management areas (<https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2022-New-and-Proposed#SMRMA>).

Please refer to the original notices for additional information.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
Analyst
California Fish and Game Commission



Not yet signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign up

Facebook



Twitter



LinkedIn



California Fish and Game Commission | We've moved!, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

[Unsubscribe board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by fgc@fgc.ca.gov powered by



Try email marketing for free today!



From: [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#); [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding Hearing on Sidewalk Repair: File #'s 220385 and 220388
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:02:00 AM
Attachments: [Hearing on Sidewalk Repairs - File #'s 220385 and 220388.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: [Diana Wheatley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Notice of Public Hearing 4233 Lincoln Way, SF 94122
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 2:23:41 PM

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

Hello,

We received a notice of public hearing in the mail regarding the sidewalk repair that took place at the end of 2019.

We vaguely remember receiving a letter pertaining to the cost of the repair shortly after the project was completed, and when the big life altering event accrued in 2020 we never heard any further updates or received a bill.

Furthermore, it seems as though most of our neighborhood didn't have the side walk repair done, by the city or their privately hired contractors. I can attest no one on our block has their sidewalk repaired.

This brings me to a few questions

1. Is the neighborhood sidewalk rehabilitation that was imposed on us in late 2019 still ongoing in the sunset? This was an expense we didn't anticipate but weren't left with much choice at the time.
2. Is there a possibility of having this cost waived or reduced?
3. Is there a payment plan option we can look into without incurring additional charges or penalties?

As a family with full time jobs and 2 small children we would really appreciate getting this matter resolved ahead of time instead of appearing at the hearing.

We appreciate your feedback and looking forward to your response.

Best,

Diana and William Wheatley
4233 Lincoln Way
San Francisco CA9 4122

From: [Raymond Yun](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: hearing for repair sidewalk
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 6:01:43 AM

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

Dear angela Calvillo

I received a hearing notice letter on 05-07-2022 regarding for repairing sidewalk.
I am living at condo which is over 150 units (we are all individual property owners)
we have a association and properties manager & office.
I am one of association members
I think this is not my own responsible for fixing it.
Should fix by association.

my address is
875 la playa street #171
san francisco ca 94121
Block#1692
Lot#009

my association office is;
3450 third street suite #1-a
san francisco ca 94124
415-401-2000(off.)
415-401-2043(manager)

thank you for attention,

P.S.; I always get city official letters because I am living at first unit of the properties.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 4 Letters Regarding File #220307
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:08:00 AM
Attachments: [4 Letters Regarding File #220307.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

File #220307 - Hearing on the use of taxpayer-funded communications, media, and press offices, as well as their costs, policies, and procedures around conveying accurate information about public safety; and requesting the Mayor's Office and Police Department to report.

Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: [John Crew](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [J.Gabriel Yanez](#); [Benedicto, Kevin M.](#); [James Byrne](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [Samuel Sinyangwe](#)
Subject: SFPD Propaganda -- Item #6, GAO Committee Meeting of May 5, 2022 (File #220307)
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 9:07:38 AM

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

Supervisors,

The SFPD is an agency that routinely claims to be committed to transparency. But transparency isn't a slogan. Transparency is a state defined by a maximum degree of candor and a minimum degree of spin and obfuscation.

Candor requires freely volunteering and releasing factual information even when -- especially when -- that information might temporarily tend to put the agency in a less positive light. Candor requires avoiding unnecessarily selective releases of information in the hope of shaping public perceptions rather than trusting the public to form their own conclusions by providing ***all*** the relevant information. And, candor requires a deep and consistent commitment to factual accuracy and a willingness to promptly correct mistakes when they occur.

Law enforcement agencies that consistently require candor in their communications and media operations are agencies that recognize that the long-term need to develop and maintain the trust of the public, press and other parts of government is always more important than any short-term embarrassment that might result from the timely release of factual information perceived to be negative.

That's the degree of transparency that's required of law enforcement agencies to be effective in serving and being accountable to the public. And, unfortunately, it's this candor-based transparency that SFPD has, in recent times, far too frequently actively avoided in its communications efforts.

Official police communications consistently designed to prioritize an internally-preferred narrative about an event, controversy or issue over candor and full transparency with the press and public will be fairly and accurately understood to be ***propaganda***. If the goal of being less than candid.. of being misleading or inaccurate.. of selectively releasing or withholding information.. is to influence coverage so that it might shape and skew public opinion in certain ways.. by definition, ***that's propaganda***. And if certain misleading or inaccurate messages are repeated over and over, that's a well-recognized and often effective ***propaganda technique***.

THE ILLEGITIMACY AND CORROSIVENESS OF POLICE PROPAGANDA

The SFPD has branded itself as a "safety with respect" agency. But it's fundamentally disrespectful for the SFPD to so frequently and actively mislead the public. The public mistrust that results makes safety far more difficult to achieve. The [SFPD's Statement of Values](#) includes an aspirational goal to "maintain the highest levels of integrity and professionalism in all actions." The SFPD's consistently less than candid and fully transparent communications efforts are falling well short of that standard.

For the last two years, the SFPD's Director of Strategic Communications has been someone with an extensive background in political and campaign communications and who touts on his [Linkedin page](#) that the *Examiner* called him a "powerhouse consultant" with deep political connections and a particular ideological reputation. I respect political consultants and have relied on their advice and help in the few issue-based electoral campaigns I've helped lead. But most of my 35 years of experience both locally and nationally has been as a police practices expert for the ACLU and now as a local activist retiree. I have never before come across a police department that has put a "powerhouse (political) consultant" or a political communications specialist in charge of all of its official communications. To the best of my recollection, whenever the SFPD has employed a civilian in this or any other media relations capacity in the past, they have always been former journalists trained and rooted in the primacy of factual accuracy -- former reporters who've been on the other side of the police-media relationship. They've not been former "spin doctors" for politicians and campaigns.

Strategic **political** communications should be entirely different in nature and emphasis than strategic **law enforcement** communications. The former is inherently and legitimately political. The latter must be scrupulously **apolitical**. Rule-of-law policing in a democratic society must steer clear of any political agenda. Communications for a politician -- for an elected official or for their campaign -- are understood both by the media and by most consumers of the news to be at least partly about the political interests of that politician. Matters of public interest **are** being addressed and there is still a need to be reasonably accurate but a certain amount of political spin and occasional strategic lack of candor and full transparency is "baked in," generally recognized and accepted.

In California we do not elect municipal police chiefs and the very legitimacy of municipal police departments depends on them acting and being perceived as acting in a non-political fashion. The strategic communications for a police department should serve only **institutional** goals but those should **never** be political in nature.

Police departments have no legitimate political goals beyond effectively serving the public and improving public safety. The **SFPOA** can and does have political goals it pursues through its various communications strategies and products. But, the **SFPD** must never pursue political goals.

In fact, the institutional goals of a police department in a democratic society do not exist independently of the public they serve and, at all times, must be established, overseen and periodically modified by the public's representatives. So-called "police powers" -- the power to detain, search and arrest, the power to use force, injure and

kill -- are not powers that **belong** to the police. They are powers **delegated** to the police by the public to be used on its behalf only under the specific conditions set by the appointed and elected civilian bodies who oversee and control the police. In San Francisco, our charter has long-required a particularly strong form of civilian control of the SFPD with a civilian Police Commission appointed by our elected representatives with significant managerial responsibilities over the SFPD and the independent power to fire a chief of police for any reason. And, of course, the SFPD is also accountable to the elected Mayor and subject to the legislative, oversight and budgetary powers of the Board of Supervisors. In other words, the only legitimate institutional goals of the SFPD are those set or supported by the Police Commission and that respect the democratic primacy of executive and legislative branches.

That charter-mandated structure and context in which the SFPD and Chief of Police operate are very different than exists for city departments not directly controlled or overseen by commissions but that are instead run by independently-elected officials. The City Attorney's and District Attorney's Offices are independent agencies run by officials who must stand for election and re-election, with institutional goals set by those politicians. The communications strategies in support of their institutional goals will be aligned with the political interests and political visions of the elected office-holder. But the Chief of Police is not an elected official and the vision and institutional goals for the SFPD -- and any communications strategies that support them -- are always subject to the oversight and consent of the appointed Police Commission, a wholly non-political (in the electoral sense) body that the voters 20 years ago made even more independent and less beholden to any individual politician by giving the Board of Supervisors the power to approve or reject mayoral appointees and to directly appoint three of the commissioners.

KEY QUESTIONS

As you consider the various examples of the SFPD's lack of candor and full transparency obfuscations, inaccuracies and crass attempts at spin and image management detailed below and others that may be discussed during the hearing, ask yourselves two sets of questions about the SFPD's communications strategies --

1. Whose interests are they designed to further, promote or defend? What is the goal behind the messaging? Is it an illegitimate **political** goal rather than a legitimately institutional one?
2. If a communication strategy just or primarily serves the narrow interests and goals of the SFPD -- independent from or in conflict with the role of the Police Commission or the broader public interest -- why would **that** be considered to be an appropriate use of taxpayers funding? What happens to the credibility, effectiveness and perceived legitimacy of a law enforcement agency when its elaborate and expensive communications strategies and various products appear to be political and propagandistic?

In recent months, the Police Commission has begun to ask a few questions about the timing and content of some of the SFPD's press releases and about the SFPD's

approach to media relations. But the SFPD has not consulted the Commission about its communications strategies to any significant degree. At times, the Police Commission itself has been targeted by SFPD messaging and communications approaches that seemed designed to undermine or minimize their role and to politically pressure them into not exercising their authority over the Chief and SFPD.

This was particularly apparent in the SFPD's messaging surrounding the [extraordinary controversy](#) sparked by the Chief's sudden, unilateral attempt to cancel the MOU requiring and facilitating independent investigations by the District Attorney's Office into the most severe and consequential police uses of force -- an MOU whose creation the Police Commission had overseen and that had taken years of discussion, negotiation and public consideration to finalize and ultimately approve. The nature and degree of the highly-political [messaging](#) by the SFPD -- labelling concerns articulated by all or nearly all of the Police Commissioners "unreasonable" and the product of "alarmist polemics" -- in support of their ultimately unsuccessful effort to win Commission and sufficient broader political support to bring an end to MOU-protected DA investigations into SFPD conduct was unprecedented in at least the last 40 years. In fact, I can think of no other commission-overseen City department whose public communications are so out of synch or in direct conflict with the role and goals of their commissions. Can you? With that in mind, here's a third set of questions to consider:

3. If those types of communications strategies are inappropriate and do not occur in any other City departments overseen by appointed commissions, why should they be tolerated when the SFPD engages in them and supported by significant public expenditures?

SELECTED EXAMPLES OF S.F.P.D. PROPAGANDA

1. SFPD Claim -- *The SFPD has been "hailed by the New York Times as a police department as a major city department where police reform has worked."*

This is false.

The *New York Times* did no such thing. Yet, this falsehood continues to be: included as part of the "about the SFPD" blurb at the bottom of every Department press release; is featured prominently on the SFPD's website's "police reform" section touted on the homepage; Is promoted on SFPD-produced videos the department has used to encourage members of the public to [lobby the Board of Supervisors](#) (at. 1:11 mark) in support of their budget requests; and, routinely used to [create a false impression](#) (on homepage and at 3:53 mark of video) about the scope and impact of the reform process while positioning the SFPD as allegedly a nationally-recognized "role model on reform" generally rather than only on certain selected policies.

Yet, **no New York Times editorial, column or reported story makes that claim about SFPD.** It stems ***entirely*** from a headline placed on *New York Times* [morning](#)

[news summary](#) for June 5, 2020 -- 11 days after the murder of George Floyd and with massive protests continuing across the country. That morning summary newsletter contained only an abbreviated, overview description of the state of police reform at that point. The actual subheadline for that Friday morning *New York Times* newsletter was "And what else you need to know today" but the screenshot or photograph routinely used by SFPD in videos and in various public presentations includes only the main headline. ***It has apparently been altered by SFPD communications staff to remove the subheadline that would betray the actual context of what's being shown and to make it appear as though it's an actual New York Times reported story rather than an emailed morning news summary*** which, in fact, briefly summarized many topics that day and ***was not about the SFPD's overall reform efforts at all!***

That morning news summary relied entirely on linked stories ***from other publications*** to make the limited point that certain policy reforms belatedly enacted in a number of major cities -- usually after avoidable police killings and significant protests and public pressure not just in San Francisco -- had begun to help reduce the number of police shootings in those jurisdictions. Relying on and quoting an ABC News [Five Thirty Eight story](#) by nationally-recognized police reform data scientist and activist Sam Sinyangwe, founder of the Mapping Police Violence and Police Scorecard projects (and a key architect of Campaign Zero and the 8 Can't Wait / #8CantWait campaign), the summary mentions San Francisco along with Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Phoenix as examples of cities where these particular policy changes had been made. ***None were described as agencies "where police reform has worked." None were singled out as national models for police reform overall -- not San Francisco and certainly not other deeply- and historically-flawed police departments in Philadelphia, Chicago and Baltimore.*** In other words, if that *New York Times* morning news summary can be accurately cited for anything it's only for the very limited proposition that San Francisco was one of several major American cities whose police departments, under great public pressure, finally enacted certain "best practices" deadly force policy reforms that predictably helped drive down shootings.

Neither the New York Times itself nor the linked primary source material authored by Mr. Sinyangwe ever hailed SFPD or any other of the named agencies as places "where police reform works" overall much less held them up as national models for anything other than the need to pressure agencies to finally enact certain best practices policy reforms long-promoted by groups like the Police Executives Research Forum that have long been known to help to reduce the frequency of police shootings. In fact, when Mr. Sinyangwe ***has*** singled out the SFPD, it's been because the Department continues to produce very extreme, outlier levels of racial disparities in arrests, stops, searches, shootings and uses of force -- notwithstanding all their various claims of progress on police reform overall. If SFPD was candid in its public communications and wanted to accurately represent the actual content and source behind their *New York Times* claim, they would include images of the headline for Mr. Sinyangwe's subsequent February 2021 *Five Thirty Eight* piece, because, in fact , ***SFPD remains among "The Police Departments with the Biggest Racial Disparities in Arrests and Killings"***. In that piece, Mr.

Sinyangwe singled out San Francisco as one of four major cities with --

".... some of the largest disparities in policing outcomes between Black and white residents. In these cities, Black residents were policed at high rates while white residents were policed at relatively low rates. Police *arrested* Black people at several times the rate of white people, even for offenses like drug possession which have been found to be [committed at similar rates by Black and white communities](#). And police in these cities also killed Black people at substantially higher rates than white people, even after accounting for racial differences in arrest rates."

In San Francisco's case, these damning disparities have not eased five years after the voluntary reform process started during the Obama administration. As Mr. Sinyangwe emphasizes in an updated statement prepared yesterday in advance today's GAO Committee hearing--

"According to the [most recent report](#) by SFPD, in Q3 2021 San Francisco police arrested Black people at 9x higher rate and used force against Black people at 12x higher rate than white people per population. Latino communities in San Francisco experienced 3-4x higher rates of arrest and police use of force than white people. ***Despite attempts by SFPD to claim the limited reforms they've implemented to date are working, San Francisco continues to have among the worst policing outcomes in the nation,*** with more [extreme racial disparities](#) in policing and [higher use of force rates](#) than most other major cities. ***The data demonstrates that these efforts have not been sufficient to end the longstanding practice of violent and discriminatory policing in San Francisco.***"

(Emphasis added.)

The SFPD has repeatedly been informed it is misrepresenting both the *New York Times* morning news summary and, in turn, Mr. Sinyangwe's actual conclusions about SFPD. They are aware of Mr. Sinyangwe's work as they regularly [tout](#) (at 04:45 mark of video) the fact that the SFPD has already enacted the policy reforms called for in the "8 Can't Wait" (#8CantWait) campaign Mr. Sinyangwe helped design and lead (even though some SFPD officers too frequently continue to openly violate or ignore those reformed policies without consequence). ***Making claims that have been shown to be factually false is a form of propaganda. Repeating those falsehoods*** - over and over to shape public opinion - is a tried and true ***propaganda technique***. ***If there is a single Biggest Lie in the SFPD's communications strategy, it's that their overall reform efforts have been "hailed by the New York Times."***

2. SFPD Claim -- "Uses of force by San Francisco police officers have declined significantly" and "have dropped steadily and substantially"

These are deeply misleading and wildly exaggerated claims carefully presented and depicted with graphs cynically designed to justify sweeping conclusions unsupported

by the actual data and ***directly inconsistent with the SFPD's own prior explanations of use of force data trends.***

First, in its [videos](#) (at 04:05) and other public communications, the SFPD always presents graphic representations of use of force data trends that are careful to start with the 2016 data. Why? Because 2016 was a unique, complete outlier year with uses of force far higher than they'd ever been or ever will be again because of a critical and important change in what was logged and counted as a use of force. ***By starting with the data from 2016 -- and omitting the data from earlier years -- the SFPD is able to graphically depict what appears to be sharp, across the board drops in uses of force. That's not what's actually happened. SFPD knows it -- and used to properly acknowledge and explain it -- but not any longer, at least not in their public-facing communications materials.***

The [USDOJ COPS report](#) confirms (at pg. 30) that reported uses of force were far lower in 2014 and 2015 and suddenly skyrocketed up in 2016. ***If the 2014 and 2015 data was included in the SFPD's public relations graphs it would depict, roughly-speaking, a bell-shaped curve where uses of force went up in 2016 and then started to come down in subsequent years to levels that are roughly comparable to 2014 and 2015 levels.*** Instead, by omitting the 2014 and 2015 data, the SFPD's graph depicts only a downward sloping decline starting from the year 2016 while hiding the longer term trend and failing to contextualize the 2016 data.

Why did SFPD's reported uses of force skyrocket in 2016? Because that's the year SFPD finally joined many other major city police departments in requiring officers to log the drawing and pointing of a firearm as a use of force -- because it most definitely ***is*** experienced as a serious use of force by members of the public who have an officer pointing a gun at them and because any reasonably-managed police department needs to track and understand how often and in what circumstances officers may be inappropriately and needlessly pointing their firearms at people.

SFPD had never done that before. The first year of data after this reform showed and the press coverage reflected that SFPD had been drawing and [pointing their guns at people with alarming frequency](#) and in situations where it was clearly not justified. The reported use of force data suddenly skyrocketed. At the time, SFPD was very proactive and careful to always publicly explain that this did not represent an actual increase in uses of force but instead was attributable only to this major change in how uses of force were reported and counted. Now that it serves their public relations purposes, they pretend 2016 is an appropriate base year to use for data comparisons and never explain that it was -- and always will be -- a uniquely high data point for SFPD uses of force.

Why did reported uses of force start to decline in 2017? First, because the revised SFPD Use of Force policy first went into effect in December 2016 and contained new, detailed and more restrictive standards on when officers could draw, exhibit and point their firearms. The press coverage over how frequently officers were pointing their guns created pressure on SFPD management to more carefully manage the problem. And, over time -- year by year -- and consistent with the data trends shown by other major police departments in the years after adopting this same reform, the a

laudable "slow down and think" effect was triggered (no pun intended) by requiring officers to report the pointing of a firearm as a use of force. Officers themselves began to realize they were pointing their guns too frequently and in circumstances that were unnecessary when they may have had difficulty explaining what they did so in the required use of force reports. The deterrent effect of the reporting requirement began to kick in and within a few years guns were being pointed far less frequently.

This was an important reform that SFPD should take and get credit for finally adopting it -- (even though they were more of a follower among big city law enforcement agencies in doing so rather than a leader). Along with other things -- such as the new mandatory de-escalation requirement, a new state law narrowing the standard for when police officers can lawfully use deadly force, and eventually the election of a DA who had promised during his campaign he would hold SFPD officers to that law and file criminal charges against officers when the evidence demanded it (and who has kept that promise) -- that reform played a major role in sharply reducing the number of SFPD shootings in recent years. That's great but ***it's no excuse for using the data wholly attributable to that "pointing a firearm" reform to mislead the public with claims that uses of force generally have declined. They have not.***

In a broader 50-page [report for the Police Commission covering data through 2019](#) presented in 2020, ***the SFPD candidly and clearly explained that --***

"In 2016, Pointing of a Firearm became a reportable Use of Force. This created a substantial increase in the total number of reportable Use of Force incidents. The chart and graph show that ***non-firearm Use of Force incidents have remained constant over time. Incidents involving pointing of a firearm have steadily decreased***"

(At pg. 48, emphasis added.)

And, discussing the 2019 data specifically - "Remove the 'Pointing of a Firearm' as a reportable UOF and there was only ... ***a 2.7% decrease compared to 2016***" in reported uses of force.

(At pg. 49, emphasis added.)

The SFPD's use of force data graphs used in its public-facing communications products now show further declines in 2020 and 2021 and, by implication, try to attribute these declines to the alleged success of the reform process. That's utter nonsense. It's common knowledge that nearly all criminal justice data has been deeply skewed by the effect of the pandemic. For significant parts of both of those years, there were far fewer people out in public, far fewer contacts reported by SFPD with members of the public and far fewer circumstances where uses of force might occur. Yet, ***SFPD cynically fails to acknowledge the obvious effects of the pandemic in their various communications products addressing use of force data trends.*** (SFPD did the same thing -- ignored the obvious pandemic effect -- in its [slides](#) presented to the Board of Supervisors on March 22nd of this year reviewing the progress of the reform process by falsely attributing sharp declines in stops in

2020 and 2021 to "Bias Reform Outcomes" rather than to the pandemic, even though the racial disparities remained just as extreme regardless. See slide. #5.)

This crass manipulation and de-contextualization of use of force data for public relations purposes -- the failure to be as candid with the public now about non-firearms related use force data trends as they were with the Police Commission in 2020 ("remained constant" or, if there have been any declines at all they've been only by a few percentage points) -- ***is hardly "transparent" and falls far short of acting in accordance with the SFPD's values requiring "high levels of integrity and professionalism."*** ***It's rank propaganda designed and being spread to mislead and serves no legitimate institutional purpose.***

3. SFPD Claim -- "In October 2016, the USDOJ COPS Office -- for Community Oriented Police Services -- released the most comprehensive assessment of the San Francisco Police Department in City history."

This is, at best, extremely misleading.

This claim made at the start of the SFPD's promotional [video](#) (at 00:46) about the current reform process tries to frame this now six-year long effort as ***the first time San Franciscans have been promised comprehensive reform of the SFPD. It is not.*** In fact, the 2016 USDOJ COPS review and report occurred just eight years after a strikingly similar process was used by the Police Executives Research Forum (PERF) to conduct a thorough assessment of the SFPD. Frustrated with various high-profile scandals involving SFPD, Mayor Newsom contracted with PERF to perform the review that led to a 353-page [Organizational Assessment of the San Francisco Police Department](#) report being released in December 2008 containing more than 200 recommendations addressing a wide variety of serious problems. ***Many of the problems that led Mayor Lee and others to request assistance from the USDOJ COPS office in 2016 were directly attributable to SFPD's failure to implement some of the most important recommendations in the 2008 PERF report.***

For example, even though PERF called on SFPD in **2008** to ban shooting at moving vehicles as other big city police agencies had already done and yet, notwithstanding avoidable losses of life and injuries in the intervening years, the Police Commission did not issue that ban -- (over the SFPOA's strenuous objections and with subsequent years of expensive SFPOA litigation funded by San Francisco rank and file police officers unsuccessfully seeking to overturn this quite common "best practice" reform) - until **December 2016**, two months after the USDOJ COPS report was completed.

For example, PERF called on SFPD to actually.. finally... fully implement the critically-important Early Intervention System (EIS) first created in 1994 (!) and comprehensively revised in a 2007 [Department General Order](#) (DGO) . This basic, widely-implemented tool of modern police management allows agencies to track which officers are using force, are generating complaints or lawsuits or are engaged in other common markers of possibly problematic policing more frequently than their

similarly-situated peers so that non-disciplinary interventions can be tried before small performance issues become much more serious. Yet, because of an internal SFPD culture that resists the very notion that outlier levels of uses of force or complaints might be indicative of problematic behavior deserving of management attention, EIS has **still** not been fully implemented.

Mayor Newsom promised in **early 2006** to ["run roughshod"](#) over the SFPD to ensure the system was implemented by the end of that year. Almost three years later, the **2008 PERF report** called on the SFPD to "take steps to promptly implement the EIS System" and track all the required factors (pages 270-277), including a key and widely-recognized marker of officers possibly engaging in racial profiling or acts of brutality -- arrests for Penal Code Section 148, resisting or obstructing police officers. **Seven years later**, with the SFPD **still** failing to identify officers possibly misusing this charge, the *San Francisco Chronicle* used public records to expose that the SFPD was [targeting African Americans with PC 148 arrests](#) at extremely high and disparate rates. **In 2016**, the [USDOJ COPS report](#) (at pages 121-130) bluntly concluded that, at long last, "EIS needs to be an organizational priority" and "(a)t present, SFPD does not have a cohesive organizational approach to EIS." Yet, **by June 2020**, Mayor Breed channelled her predecessor Mayor Newsom's promise from **12 years earlier** by pledging to strengthen and finally, fully implement EIS in her ["Roadmap for New \(sic\) Police Reforms"](#) as part of her strategy to address bias and strengthen accountability. When asked about SFPD's persistent and extreme racial enforcement disparities during a full Board hearing on the status of the SFPD reform effort **on March 22nd of this year**, Chief Scott expressed hope that, once finally and fully implemented possibly before **2023**, that EIS system would help address the SFPD's racially skewed enforcement practices. He did not explain why or how it's reasonable for the public to accept, at best, a **delay of 14 years** (and counting) in finally implementing this critical bias-reducing, violence-reducing, misconduct-reducing reform emphasized in two separate comprehensive reviews of the SFPD, promised by two separate mayors, long-required by Police Commission policy and yet still not delivered.

The very long history of the SFPD failing to implement long-called for important reforms, like EIS, has been fully [documented](#) for the SFPD and Police Commission. It's not a secret that PERF called for EIS to be prioritized and implemented in 2008 only for USDOJ COPS to need to do the same in 2016. Nor is it a secret that Mayor Breed's 2020 promise simply echoes a promise unkept by SFPD that was made by her predecessor 14 years prior. **For the SFPD promotional video touting their alleged commitment to reform to imply this is the very first time reform this comprehensive has been tried for SFPD is simply not true.** Maybe that sort of "loose with the facts" spin is considered acceptable in political campaigns but it should be thoroughly **unacceptable** in the official communications produced and promoted by the SFPD.

4. SFPD Claim -- "SFPD won praise from the California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board (or RIPA) for being one the few agencies statewide to address bias by proxy in its policies."

This is true but also a very misleading, selective characterization of that RIPA Board report (at 04:30 of SFPD [video](#)).

The SFPD was willing to support the Police Commission enacting a policy designed to prevent its officers from being used as indirect agents -- proxies -- for the biases of members of the public but ***SFPD has persistently refused to take the steps recommended by the RIPA Board in that very same report that would address the possible presence of expressions explicit biases on the part of SFPD officers themselves -- biases that may be playing a role in exacerbating the SFPD's extreme racial disparities..*** That very same [RIPA report](#) released in January 2021 cited the repeated rounds of scandals involving overtly racist, homophobic and misogynistic texts being freely sent ***by SFPD officers*** to one another (suggesting this had been a fairly open and acceptable practice within the department) in calling on all agencies statewide to conduct audits of their members's use of social media for signs of explicit bias --

"These examples of explicit biases among law enforcement agencies -- both nationwide and in this state -- suggest that the problem is far more widespread than most people might believe. Critically, these examples trigger a deeper concern about affiliations with white supremacist and extremist groups.... These affiliations have a real world impact on the communities officers are tasked with serving and protecting.... While the exact scale of explicit racism in law enforcement agencies is difficult to measure, there are numerous examples to suggest a significant problem that could negatively impact officers' interactions with the public. Indeed, these examples raise concerns about "[w]ho might be sitting in jail because what looked like an objective stop, what looked like a clean interaction, may actually have been driven by bigotry."

(Page 26-27.) Notwithstanding its own documented problem of explicit bias within the ranks... the RIPA Board's status as the legally-mandated body within the California Department of Justice with significant designated representation from law enforcement management and labor organizations charged with helping the state's police agencies address racial disparities through carefully-considered and thoroughly-considered expert recommendations... the repeated calls from community members to conduct the RIPA Board's recommended social media explicit bias audit... and a [Police Commission hearing](#) that, in part, highlighted the RIPA Board recommendation, the SFPD has persistently and inexplicably refused to conduct this explicit bias social audit. Perhaps as a result of failing to send the message internally that rooting out expressions of explicit bias would be a priority, the SFPD was recently embarrassed by yet another, preventable [explicit bias on social media scandal](#). Other agencies have acted on this important RIPA Board recommendation. Results were released just last week from an audit of selected California law enforcement agencies conducted by the state legislature's Joint Legislative Audit Committee that strongly suggested "[bias, far-right sympathies among California law enforcement \(was\) going unchecked](#)."

And yet **still**, 16-months after the RIPA Board report called on agencies to try to root out explicit bias with this sort of audit -- in the same report featured in the SFPD's promotional video -- the SFPD has failed to conduct or to even publicly consider conducting that audit.. an audit other agencies that are far more proactive about dealing with explicit bias have already done. Trying to create an impression with slickly-produced video images and words that is inconsistent with the larger actions and inaction of an agency is a form of propaganda. Maybe it's an acceptable communications strategy for a campaign commercial on behalf of a candidate for office seeking to emphasize the positive while hiding the flaws but what legitimate institutional goal of the SFPD is served by trying to mislead the public in this manner?

5. SFPD Claim -- The allegedly lenient policies of District Attorney Boudin are responsible for sharp reductions in the average time-in-custody of individuals arrested by SFPD.

This is a lie.

In a remarkable [memo](#) prepared by the SFPD's Director of Strategic Communications and sent to seven local and national media outlets on December 30, 2021, the SFPD linked the reduced post-arrest time-in-custody averages for "Tenderloin drug dealing repeat offenders" to the tenure of DA Boudin (at pg. 5 and 6). The memo includes a stark graph showing the average time-in-custody for these arrestees being 18 days prior to Boudin taking office and 5.5 days after he took office. ***But, the memo and graph fail to mention -- at all -- that for the bulk of the time period reflected in these averages after DA Boudin took office the jail was operating under the emergency public health necessity created by the covid pandemic leading the entirety of the San Francisco's criminal justice system -- from the courts, to the Sheriff's Department to the DA's Office -- to agree that as few individuals could remain in custody at the jail as possible and was reasonably safe.*** To the best of my knowledge, ***the SFPD never publicly disagreed with the obvious public health necessity requiring the new limits on whether and how long SFPD's arrestees should and could remain in jail during the worst parts of the pandemic.*** Doubling-down on this cynical misinformation, the SFPD's Director of Strategic Communications [tweeted](#) out to the public the misleading memo almost three months later allowing supporters of the attempted recall of the DA to excerpt and circulate widely the misleading graphic depiction of "time-in-custody" averages pre- and post-Boudin.

There is no non-political, appropriate, legitimate, institutional purpose in a law enforcement agency so fundamentally misrepresenting the impact of an elected official's tenure. Not when they're running for re-election. Not when they're seeking higher office. Not when they are facing a recall vote ***Not ever.*** Maybe political "hits" against opposing candidates are considered acceptable practice by communications consultants during election campaigns. They should never be designed and carried out like this by the communications staff for a police agency.

CONCLUSION

A police department that repeatedly fails to be candid and fully transparent with the public and other parts of City government... that repeatedly creates and uses communications products that contain falsehoods, misrepresentations, an apparently altered image, selective disclosures and wild exaggerations... that promotes propaganda to create the false impression that its reform efforts have had greater scope and impact and won greater acclaim than they actually have...is a police department that is not serious about reforming itself and not truly committed to engaging in more just and effective public safety strategies.

In turn, a City government that is aware that its police department is engaging in these deeply misleading and trust-destroying communication strategies that serve no legitimate public interest and yet allow them to continue and, in fact, subsidize them with significant public expenditures cannot be considered to be truly committed to either comprehensive police reform or to more racially-equitable policing.

Thank you for this important hearing and for carefully considering the implications of what you learn -- and then for taking the steps necessary to at least reduce if not prevent the SFPD's creating and promotion of propaganda.

John Crew
(415) 793-4146

cc. John Carroll, Assistant Clerk for the GAO Committee
Members, San Francisco Police Commission
William Scott, Chief of Police
Mr. Sam Sinyangwe

From: [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Nick Monti](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hernandez, Melissa G \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public comment on item 220307
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:30:12 AM

Good morning Nick Monti,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
Office of the Clerk of the Board | San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick Monti <nickmax123@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2022 9:52 AM
To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public comment on item 220307

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

Hello,

I live in District 17 and am commenting on agenda item 220307 - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety.

The community should NOT use taxpayer money to fund propaganda for cops.

There is a clear distrust of the SFPD within the community that cannot be fixed by brainwashing people into trusting the SFPD, who have continually proven to be disinterested in the safety of San Franciscans.

From illegally destroying property (tents) to murdering San Franciscans like Alex Nieto, the SFPD should not use taxpayer money to launder their sins with propaganda aimed primarily at gentrifiers.

Nick Monti - District 17

From: [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)
To: [anne richards](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hernandez, Melissa G \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:30:32 AM

Good morning Anne Richards,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
Office of the Clerk of the Board | San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: anne richards <drwrchrds@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2022 9:27 AM

To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>

Cc: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]

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

My name is Anne Richards and I live in Duboce Triangle. I do not want public funds to be used to whitewash the violent history and purpose of the San Francisco police force. The police are incentivized to manipulate narratives around “crime” to make themselves seem necessary, and justify the harm they perpetrate in our community every day. For an organization that purports to keep the community safe, we should be asking: why do they need a PR department to convince people of this? Thank you.

Best,

Anne (She/They)

From: [Andrew Richards](#)
To: [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hernandez, Melissa G \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:32:07 AM

thank you!

Best,

Anne (She/They)

From: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 10:30:31 AM
To: anne richards <drwrchrds@gmail.com>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: GAO_050522_220307 || RE: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]

Good morning Anne Richards,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
Office of the Clerk of the Board | San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: anne richards <drwrchrds@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2022 9:27 AM

To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>

Cc: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment for [Hearing - Taxpayer-Funded Communications Regarding Police and Public Safety]

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

My name is Anne Richards and I live in Duboce Triangle. I do not want public funds to be used to whitewash the violent history and purpose of the San Francisco police force. The police are incentivized to manipulate narratives around “crime” to make themselves seem necessary, and justify the harm they perpetrate in our community every day. For an organization that purports to keep the community safe, we should be asking: why do they need a PR department to convince people of this? Thank you.

Best,

Anne (She/They)

From: [Adkins, Joe \(BOS\)](#)
To: [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Clerk to Act/Letter of Inquiry 05/03/2022
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 12:22:00 PM
Attachments: [Safai CTA 050922.pdf](#)
[HomelessCA.pdf](#)

Dear Deputy City Attorney Pearson,

On May 3, 2022 Supervisor Safai issued the attached inquiry to the Office of the City Attorney. Please review the attached introduction form and letter of inquiry which provides the Supervisor's specific request.

Sincerely,

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

Phone: (415) 554-5184

Email: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org



May 9, 2022

Via Email: Anne.Pearson@sfcityattty.org

Anne Pearson, Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 234
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Deputy City Attorney Pearson,

At the May 2, 2022, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Safai issued the attached inquiry to the Office of the City Attorney. Please review the attached introduction form, which provides the Supervisor's specific request:

Bill Barnes, Chief of Staff to Supervisor Safai, has communicated to my office that Supervisor Safai has been in privileged correspondence with the Office of the City Attorney regarding the timeline for introducing the full Charter Amendment, pending City Attorney approval as to form.

Please contact Bill Barnes at Bill.Barnes@sfgov.org for response and/or questions related to this request, and copy BOS@sfgov.org on all non-privileged communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry no later than May 23, 2022, if possible.

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) 554-5158.

Very Truly Yours,

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

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
JA/WN

Attachment(s):

- Introduction Form

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- ☐ 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
- ☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- ☐ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- ☐ 4. Request for letter beginning : "Supervisor inquiries"
- ☒ 5. City Attorney Request.
- ☐ 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- ☐ 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- ☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- ☐ 9. Reactivate File No.
- ☐ 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- ☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission
- ☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

The text is listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:

For Clerk's Use Only

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Rose, Harvey \(BUD\)](#)
Cc: [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Campbell, Severin \(BOS\)](#); [Menard, Nicolas \(BUD\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [Imperial, Megan \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter of Inquiry: Sponsoring Women in Anti-Choice States to Travel to SF
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 5:48:19 PM
Attachments: [CTA - Ronen Chan Melgar Stefani 050322.pdf](#)

Hello BLA Rose,

Attached please find the Clerk of the Board's Letter of Inquiry forwarding a request from Supervisors Ronen, Chan, Melgar, and Stefani regarding a Fund and Program to sponsor women living in anti-choice States to travel to San Francisco to obtain an abortion . Response directions are provided in the letter.

Thank you.

Alisa Somera

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

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

~~~~~

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

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



**OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD**

Phone: (415) 554-5184

Email: [Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org)

May 6, 2022

Via Email: [Harvey.Rose@sfgov.org](mailto:Harvey.Rose@sfgov.org)

Harvey Rose, Budget and Legislative Analyst  
Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst  
1390 Market Street, Suite 1150  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Rose,

At the May 3, 2022, Board of Supervisors (Board) meeting, Supervisors Hillary Ronen, Connie Chan, Myrna Melgar, and Catherine Stefani issued the attached inquiry to the Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst. Please review the attached Introduction Form, which provides the Supervisors' specific request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests a report that calculates the cost of a program (Program) sponsoring out of State women to receive safe and free travel, accommodation, and an abortion in San Francisco in the most economical way. The Program would be run by the Commission on the Status of Women with support from the Department of Public Health. As a pilot endeavor that the Board and Mayor can fund in the 2022-23 Fiscal Year, assume the program would sponsor 1,000 women. Please also provide cost escalators for every 100 women served so that Supervisors can make funding decisions to serve as many women as possible. Finally, please detail any similar State programs or funding opportunities that could work in conjunction with a local program.

Please contact Supervisors Hillary Ronen, Connie Chan, Myrna Melgar, and Catherine Stefani's staff at [Ana.Herrera@sfgov.org](mailto:Ana.Herrera@sfgov.org), [Kelly.Groth@sfgov.org](mailto:Kelly.Groth@sfgov.org), [Megan.Imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:Megan.Imperial@sfgov.org) and [Lila.Carrillo@sfgov.org](mailto:Lila.Carrillo@sfgov.org), and [Dominica.Donovan@sfgov.org](mailto:Dominica.Donovan@sfgov.org), respectively, for response and/or questions related to this request and copy [BOS@sfgov.org](mailto:BOS@sfgov.org) on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than May 18, 2022.

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

JA/WN

Attachments:

- Introduction Form

# Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp  
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- ☐ 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
- ☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- ☐ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- ☐ 4. Request for letter beginning : "Supervisor  inquiries"
- ☐ 5. City Attorney Request.
- ☐ 6. Call File No.  from Committee.
- ☒ 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- ☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- ☐ 9. Reactivate File No.
- ☐ 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- ☐ Small Business Commission      ☐ Youth Commission      ☐ Ethics Commission
- ☐ Planning Commission      ☐ Building Inspection Commission

**Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.**

Sponsor(s):

Ronen; Chan; Melgar; Stefani

Subject:

Fund and program to sponsor women living in anti-choice States to travel to San Francisco to obtain an abortion

The text is listed:

A leaked draft opinion from the Supreme Court suggests that the highest Court of the land will overturn Roe v. Wade paving the way for anti-Choice States to outlaw abortions within their boundaries. As a staunchly pro-Choice City, San Francisco has a responsibility and opportunity to save lives by sponsoring women in anti-Choice States to travel to San Francisco, receive lodging, and gain access to a safe abortion in a City operated or funded health clinic.

Please prepare a report that calculates the cost of a Program sponsoring out of State women to receive safe and free travel, accommodation, and an abortion in San Francisco in the most economical way. The program would be run by the Commission on the Status of Women with support from the Department of Public Health. As a pilot endeavor that the Board and Mayor can fund in the 2022-23 Fiscal Year, assume the program would sponsor 1000 women. Please also provide cost escalators for every 100 women we can serve so we can make funding decisions to serve as many women as possible. Finally, please detail any similar State programs or funding opportunities that could work in conjunction with a local program.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: /s/Hillary Ronen

---

For Clerk's Use Only

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda item #1 for May 12, 2022 needs your approval  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:54:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Dennis Hong <dennisjames888@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 9, 2022 2:54 PM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; hello@THD.org  
**Subject:** Agenda item #1 for May 12, 2022 needs your approval

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

Dear Honorable San Francisco Planning Commissioners and everyone,

I'm sorry but I will be unable to attend your May 12, 2022 Commission Meeting. My name is Dennis Hong, A San Francisco Native and resident and property owner with seventy five plus years. Forty two plus years in district 3, right up on Bannan/m Place, its been called worse at Union Street. I miss District three, but now living in District seven. Because of this pandemic I do not get down there much. All too often when I visit both North Beach and Chinatown, its so sad to still see this blight.

Anything that the commissioners can do to help move this approval process along would be appreciated and with the expedited the process.

I'm not aware of why its taking so long for this blighted space to get the required permits. As I see it, it too is taking it's tool on the business. But I too would like your support with moving this on. Hint Coit Liquors has some wonderful wines.

If anyone has any questions to my rambling email here, please feel free to chime back to me here. Again, I hope you all agree with approving this item.

All the best,  
Dennis Hong

1. 2022-003219PCA (A. STARR: (628) 652-7533) FIRE-DAMAGED LIQUOR STORES IN NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT [BOARD FILE NO. 220342] – Planning Code Amendment – Ordinance, sponsored by Supervisor Peskin, amending the Planning Code to extend the time, from three to six years from the date of a fire, for a temporary closure of a liquor store in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) as a result of the fire to not result in an abandonment of such use, and for the relocation of such use to another location in the North Beach NCD to not require a new Conditional Use permit; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302 Preliminary Recommendation: Approv

end

**From:** [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Results of Sale of General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2022-R1  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:47:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 9, 2022 11:03 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** FW: Results of Sale of General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2022-R1

---

**From:** San Francisco Controller's Office of Public Finance <[vishal.trivedi@sfgov.org](mailto:vishal.trivedi@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 6, 2022 6:21 PM  
**To:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Results of Sale of General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2022-R1



## General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2022-R1

On Tuesday, April 26, 2022, the City priced \$327.3 million in aggregate principal amount of City and County of San Francisco General Obligation Refunding Bonds (the "Bonds"), Series 2022-R1. This was the third issuance of bonds under the \$1.48 billion refunding authorization approved in 2020.

The Bonds were issued to refinance four separate series of outstanding General Obligation Bonds (the "Prior Bonds"), which previously financed projects for San Francisco General Hospital as well as Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response bond authorizations, and to pay costs of issuance.

### REFUNDING SAVINGS

The issuance of the Series 2022-R1 Refunding Bonds resulted in a savings to the City of:

- Nominal debt service savings of \$30.6 million over 12 years.
- Net present value debt service savings of \$25.8 million or 7% of the refunded par amount of the Prior Bonds.



### SALE RESULTS

The Bonds were sold via a negotiated sale with an underwriting syndicate led by senior manager Wells Fargo Securities, co-senior manager Stifel, and co-managers Ramirez & Co., Raymond James, Siebert Williams Shank & Co., and TD Securities.

The Bonds had a strong reception despite a challenging set of overall municipal market conditions; receiving a total of \$1.9 billion in orders for the Bonds. Strong investor demand allowed the City to lock in a true interest cost (TIC) of 2.72% for the financing. The Bonds have a final maturity on June 15, 2034. We expect to close this transaction on May 18, 2022.

The Controller's Office of Public Finance would like to thank and congratulate everyone who put in the hard work to successfully bring this transaction to market.

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

Anna Van Degna, *Director* • [anna.vandegna@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.vandegna@sfgov.org)

Vishal Trivedi, *Financial Analyst* • [vishal.trivedi@sfgov.org](mailto:vishal.trivedi@sfgov.org)

**Share this email:**



[Manage](#) your preferences | [Opt out](#) using TrueRemove®

Got this as a forward? [Sign up](#) to receive our future emails.

View this email [online](#).

[1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place](#)  
[San Francisco, CA | 94102 US](#)

[This email was sent to bos.legislation@sfgov.org.](#)

[To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.](#)

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please Reinstate MUNI Mask Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:53:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Quynh Bui <[qttbui@gmail.com](mailto:qttbui@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2022 11:02 AM  
**To:** Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA) <[Jeffrey.Tumlin@sfmta.com](mailto:Jeffrey.Tumlin@sfmta.com)>; [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com)  
**Cc:** Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <[mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; DPH, Health Commission (DPH) <[HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org](mailto:HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org)>  
**Subject:** Please Reinstate MUNI Mask Mandate

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

Dear Director Tumlin & SFMTA Board Members,

I am writing to urge you to follow the lead of BART and reinstate the mask mandate on Muni, taxis, and SF Paratransit. The pandemic is not over and we need to take action immediately to protect disabled and immunocompromised people. There is no time to waste. Please do the right thing.

Thank you

Quynh Bui

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Latest "upgraded" SFFD Mandate Unreasonable  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:50:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Jay Elliott <jayelliott415@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 9, 2022 12:56 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Latest "upgraded" SFFD Mandate Unreasonable

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

What on earth is this latest SFFD apartment house mandate? In 2016 we were told to upgrade fire systems to 75 decibels by 2021. We are a family-run business, we follow the rules and take building safety and security very seriously. We implemented the change at significant expense and thought we were done with it. At no time were we notified that a job card/permit was required. And that's an extraordinarily expensive, time consuming and intrusive game changer.

Now I'm told we must do more to adhere to the regulation – additional measures have been added

to it! After all we've been through over the past two years, the city is going to make unreasonable demands for the illusion of more safety. According to the experts, the fire safety protocols we have in place are more than ample. Add into that the annual requirement to have the alarms serviced, reminders sent to tenants to check their smoke/carbon monoxide detectors (in each hall / bedroom) along with the spot checks SFFD makes to our buildings (which we must pay for), make the city's mandate ridiculous.

It will cost more than \$50K per building to get the required permits and install additional horns in the units. And out of the blue we are now required to have wireless monitoring installed, which have monthly fees attached. This is a significant cost and undertaking and will contribute to the ever-rising cost of living in the City.

When COVID hit, we lost nearly 50% of our tenants. We have worked hard to rent these units, often at discounted rates just to get them filled. This updated mandate – a true bait and switch for those of us that upgraded before 2021 – is unconscionable. And I will be seeking relief from the Rent Board to pass along these charges. I will also do whatever I can to inform the tenants that the City of San Francisco, it's Board of Supervisors are the reason we all must pay more money. This isn't about safety – our buildings and its tenants are well protected.

Since 95% of all fire alarm activations are false alarms (due to power outages, etc.), the horns in everyone's bedrooms will be frightening and mind-numbing. I will be sure to remind tenants when I get their angry phone calls to credit the BOS.

I would recommend the SFFD and BOS revisit this policy and the abusive "add-on's" they've snuck into it. While we are wholeheartedly behind safety measures, this is too much for everyone involved.

Regards,

Jay Elliott

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Budget & Finance Committee Mtg. May 11; Item 1, File No. 22-0199; Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment; SF Public Golf Alliance Supplemental Opposition  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:52:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2022 1:54 PM

**To:** Richard Harris Jr. <rharrisjr1@gmail.com>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Marstaff (BOS) <marstaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Haneystaff (BOS) <haneystaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Teahan, Kevin (REC) <kevin.teahan@sfgov.org>; Summers, Ashley (REC) <ashley.summers@sfgov.org>; 'Marc Connerly' <mconnerly@connerlyandassociates.com>; Andersen, Eric (REC) <eric.andersen@sfgov.org>; Jue, Tyrone (ENV) <tyrone.jue@sfgov.org>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>; [ashley.graffenberger@sfgov.org](mailto:ashley.graffenberger@sfgov.org)

**Subject:** RE: Budget & Finance Committee Mtg. May 11; Item 1, File No. 22-0199; Ban on Gas-

Powered Landscaping Equipment; SF Public Golf Alliance Supplemental Opposition

Good afternoon Richard Harris,

I am confirming that your message from Friday May 6, received by our office at 10:46 a.m. is part of the [Public Correspondence](#) attachment, and the [Committee Agenda Packet](#) (Page 55) for the Budget and Finance Committee's meeting on May 11 for [File No. 220199](#). If your message is still not viewable, I would suggest clearing your browser's cache or (depending on your browser) use CTRL-SHIFT-R to do a hard reload of the page to bypass cached material.

Best,

**Brent Jalipa**

**Assistant Clerk**

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

[brent.jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:brent.jalipa@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

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

*Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.*

---

**From:** Richard Harris Jr. <[rharrisjr1@gmail.com](mailto:rharrisjr1@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2022 12:56 PM

**To:** Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <[brent.jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:brent.jalipa@sfgov.org)>; RonenStaff (BOS) <[ronenstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ronenstaff@sfgov.org)>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>; Marstaff (BOS) <[marstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:marstaff@sfgov.org)>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <[myrna.melgar@sfgov.org](mailto:myrna.melgar@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** MelgarStaff (BOS) <[melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org)>; ChanStaff (BOS) <[chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <[catherine.stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stefani@sfgov.org)>; Haneystaff (BOS) <[haneystaff@sfgov.org](mailto:haneystaff@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <[phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org](mailto:phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org)>; Teahan, Kevin (REC) <[kevin.teahan@sfgov.org](mailto:kevin.teahan@sfgov.org)>; Summers, Ashley (REC) <[ashley.summers@sfgov.org](mailto:ashley.summers@sfgov.org)>; 'Marc Connerly' <[mconnerly@connerlyandassociates.com](mailto:mconnerly@connerlyandassociates.com)>; Andersen, Eric (REC) <[eric.andersen@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.andersen@sfgov.org)>; Jue, Tyrone (ENV) <[tyrone.jue@sfgov.org](mailto:tyrone.jue@sfgov.org)>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <[carmen.chu@sfgov.org](mailto:carmen.chu@sfgov.org)>; [ashley.graffenberger@sfgov.org](mailto:ashley.graffenberger@sfgov.org)

**Subject:** Budget & Finance Committee Mtg. May 11; Item 1, File No. 22-0199; Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment; SF Public Golf Alliance Supplemental Opposition

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

Budget & Finance Committee Mtg. May 11; Item 1, File No. 22-0199; Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment; SF Public Golf Alliance Supplemental Opposition

Dear Committee and All --

We reviewed the Committee's agenda packet for its May 11 meeting, and did not find in the Correspondence File a copy of our May 6, 2022 correspondence to the Committee (attached below), which encloses copy of a May 3 e-mail from Cal Air Resources Board staff, noting that "**riding mowers are not on the list of preempt equipment**". See below. This is to request that this correspondence be added to the Correspondence file – and considered by the Committee and the Departments of the Environment and Rec & Park. Please confirm receipt.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance  
1370 Masonic Ave., SF, CA. 94117  
415-290-5718

---

**From:** Richard Harris Jr. <[rharrisjr1@gmail.com](mailto:rharrisjr1@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, May 6, 2022 10:46 AM

**To:** 'Jalipa, Brent (BOS)' <[brent.jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:brent.jalipa@sfgov.org)>; [ronenstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ronenstaff@sfgov.org); 'Safai, Ahsha (BOS)' <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>; 'Marstaff (BOS)' <[marstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:marstaff@sfgov.org)>; 'Melgar, Myrna (BOS)' <[myrna.melgar@sfgov.org](mailto:myrna.melgar@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** 'MelgarStaff (BOS)' <[melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org)>; 'ChanStaff (BOS)' <[chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)>; 'Stefani, Catherine (BOS)' <[catherine.stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stefani@sfgov.org)>; 'Haneystaff (BOS)' <[haneystaff@sfgov.org](mailto:haneystaff@sfgov.org)>; 'Board of Supervisors, (BOS)' <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; 'Ginsburg, Phil (REC)' <[phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org](mailto:phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org)>; 'Teahan, Kevin (REC)' <[kevin.teahan@sfgov.org](mailto:kevin.teahan@sfgov.org)>; 'Summers, Ashley (REC)' <[ashley.summers@sfgov.org](mailto:ashley.summers@sfgov.org)>; 'Marc Connerly' <[mconnerly@connerlyandassociates.com](mailto:mconnerly@connerlyandassociates.com)>; 'Andersen, Eric (REC)' <[eric.andersen@sfgov.org](mailto:eric.andersen@sfgov.org)>; [tyrone.jue@sfgov.org](mailto:tyrone.jue@sfgov.org); 'Carmen Chu' <[carmen.chu@sfgov.org](mailto:carmen.chu@sfgov.org)>; [ashley.graffenberger@sfgov.org](mailto:ashley.graffenberger@sfgov.org)

**Subject:** Budget & Finance Committee Mtg. May 11; Item 1, File No. 22-0199; Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment; SF Public Golf Alliance Supplemental Opposition

Budget & Finance Committee Mtg. May 11; Item 1, File No. 22-0199; Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment; SF Public Golf Alliance Supplemental Opposition

Dear Budget & Finance Committee and Members

Supplementing our previously-filed Opposition and Supplemental Opposition letters on file with the Committee, **we submit, below, partial copy of a May 3 e-mail from California Air Resources Board** staff, with link to a CARB memo entitled "**SORE - List to Determine Preempt Off-Road Applications**". **As noted by CARB Staff, "riding mowers are not on the list of preempt equipment."**

**From:** Fibiger, Dorothy@ARB <[dorothy.fibiger@arb.ca.gov](mailto:dorothy.fibiger@arb.ca.gov)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 3:06 PM

**Subject:** RE: Riding mowers - 25hp & under

**Riding mowers are not on the list of preempt equipment, which can be found here:**

<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sore-list-determine-preempt-road-applications>. Please let me

know if you have further questions.

Best,

Dorothy

Please confirm receipt of this note, include this note in the Public Record of the Budget Committee's May 11 public hearing, and circulate to the Committee members in advance of the meeting.

Thank you, and

Best Regards

***Richard Harris***

***San Francisco Public Golf Alliance***

*1370 Masonic Avenue*

*San Francisco, CA 94117-4012*

*Phone: (415) 290-5718*

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [McHugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Perkinson, Jessica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: GAO050522\_210198 || RE: May 5 GAO, Item 7. 210198 [Hearing - Status of the City's Electric Vehicle Fleet and Current,Infrastructure Plans to Charge Future Fleet],Sponsor: Melgar  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:41:00 AM

---

Arthur Khoo  
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) 554-7708 | (415) 554-5163  
[arthur.khoo@sfgov.org](mailto:arthur.khoo@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <[jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org](mailto:jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org)>  
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 9:37 AM  
To: [paul@pw-sc.com](mailto:paul@pw-sc.com); Preston, Dean (BOS) <[dean.preston@sfgov.org](mailto:dean.preston@sfgov.org)>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <[rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org)>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <[connie.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <[myrna.melgar@sfgov.org](mailto:myrna.melgar@sfgov.org)>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <[megan.imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:megan.imperial@sfgov.org)>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <[jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org](mailto:jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org)>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <[catherine.stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stefani@sfgov.org)>; Mullan, Andrew (BOS) <[andrew.mullan@sfgov.org](mailto:andrew.mullan@sfgov.org)>; Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <[melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org](mailto:melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org)>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <[frances.hsieh@sfgov.org](mailto:frances.hsieh@sfgov.org)>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <[jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org](mailto:jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: GAO050522\_210198 || RE: May 5 GAO, Item 7. 210198 [Hearing - Status of the City's Electric Vehicle Fleet and Current,Infrastructure Plans to Charge Future Fleet],Sponsor: Melgar

Good morning Paul Werner,

Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Perkinson  
Pronouns: she/her/hers  
Assistant Clerk  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors | Office of the Clerk of the Board  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102 [Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org](mailto:Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org) | (415) 554-7722

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

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Werner <[paul@pw-sc.com](mailto:paul@pw-sc.com)>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 6:58 PM  
To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <[jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org](mailto:jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org)>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <[dean.preston@sfgov.org](mailto:dean.preston@sfgov.org)>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <[rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org)>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <[connie.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <[myrna.melgar@sfgov.org](mailto:myrna.melgar@sfgov.org)>; Imperial, Megan (BOS) <[megan.imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:megan.imperial@sfgov.org)>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <[jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org](mailto:jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org)>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <[catherine.stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stefani@sfgov.org)>; Mullan, Andrew (BOS) <[andrew.mullan@sfgov.org](mailto:andrew.mullan@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: May 5 GAO, Item 7. 210198 [Hearing - Status of the City's Electric Vehicle Fleet and Current,Infrastructure Plans to Charge Future Fleet],Sponsor: Melgar

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

Dear Supervisors:

I would like to thank Supervisor Melgar and the Government Audit and Oversight Committee for holding this hearing on San Francisco's progress on Fleet Electrification.

Converting the vehicle fleet away from carbon based fuels - be they gasoline, diesel, or methane - is essential if San Francisco is going meet the urgent schedule for reducing GHG emissions. And it essential for public health, as the air quality impacts are significant cause of premature deaths, childhood asthma and damaged child development. It is important to recognize that the so-called renewable fuels are not clean nor are they carbon neutral nor are they sustainable at scale. They are not a safe bridge fuel, but a fuelish equivalent of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge.

In addition to the excellent questions Supervisor Melgar submitted, I believe that there needs to be some additional questions about what San Francisco City departments and enterprise agencies are doing by way of collaboration to:

- 1) reduce costs and implementation time.
- 2) for emergency services vehicles ensuring a level of interoperability required to support the mutual aid expectations, as well as strategies to provide energy to vehicles in the field.

With respect to item 1: A recent NY Times article highlights some challenges that New York City is facing, especially with respect to emergency vehicles.  
(<https://url.avanan.click/v/2/>\_\_\_\_<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/05/nyregion/ny-city-electric-vehicle-emergency.html>\_\_\_\_YXAzOnNmZHQyOml6b3o1MzRlMTQyYWRlMG50GU4N2VlZGMwYTlmYzAxMDgzZTo2OjU1OGYyYTY5OGYyZmZmZWY1NjgwYjNjMWI2YmQ0ZGNIjYlZGQyODJlMWQ0MDpwOkY).

This is an area where collaboration between cities could help manufacturers better understand requirements, reducing wasted engineering efforts, reducing development time and reducing costs. If there was agreement on performance standards for the various EVs it would help send clear signals to manufacturers. These EVs must reliably and cost effectively meet a city's performance needs. This is not the case with the private car. This strategy of collaborating in defining performance requirements was pioneered in the Semiconductor industry over 30 years ago with the formation of SEMI Sematech. It helped manage costs and speed development cycles.

As we electrify, it is important to recognize that we are changing systems - and that offers opportunities to redesign existing systems for better performance. Each agency independently replicating what they did with internal combustion vehicles ignores these opportunities - and we cannot afford to do so.

Sincerely,  
Paul Werner

--  
Paul Werner  
2309 California St  
San Francisco, CA 94115

[paul@pw-sc.com](mailto:paul@pw-sc.com)

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#); [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public comment- May 3 item 29  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:42:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Adri Almaguer <[adri.alma214@gmail.com](mailto:adri.alma214@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 4:13 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Public comment- May 3 item 29

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

Hello my name is Adri Almaguer.

I stand in support of the American Indian Truth & Healing Reparations Advisory Committee. I hope that you also will stand in support to bring resources to one of the city's most underserved populations.

thank you

--

Adri Almaguer

(559)349-9759

[adri.alma214@gmail.com](mailto:adri.alma214@gmail.com)

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Caritas CMC HAS NO LICENSE, CHECK  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 8:46:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Screenshot\\_20220506-220312.png](#)  
[H12415SF\\_200114\\_P \(1\).pdf](#)  
[H12415SF\\_201105\\_P.pdf](#)  
[Public License Lookup - DRE \(1\)](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Donald Staley <dride1963@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Friday, May 6, 2022 10:11 PM

**To:** David Kim <dkim@ecs-sf.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>; CON, PublicIntegrity (CON) <PublicIntegrity@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>; Brian Dinsmore <newsdesk@kpix.com>; Mary Hennessy <mkhennessy@gmail.com>; news@kcra.com; Reed, Ousha (HOM) <ousha.reed@sfgov.org>; Donald Staley <dride1963@gmail.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Rosenfield, Ben (CON) <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>; PROCAK, BORYS (CAT) <Borys.Procak@sfcityatty.org>; newsroom@epochtimes.com; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Mission Local <info@missionlocal.com>; mgotai@ecs-sf.org; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Barnett, Monica (BOS) <monica.barnett@sfgov.org>; SFDA-Victim Services <victimservices@sfgov.org>; whistleblower,

CON (CON) <whistleblower@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Law <apourhamzeh@bvlawsf.com>; assignmentdesk@kron.com; Sewlal, Alyssa (CON) <alyssa.sewlal@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Ude, Adaku (DPH) <Adaku.Ude@sfdph.org>; attorneyregulation@calbar.ca.gov; Jordan, Contact Any Celebrity <support@contactanycelebrity.com>; admin@fbi.gov; Sucre, Richard (CPC) <richard.sucre@sfgov.org>; stephen.gregory@epochtimes.com; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Wohlers, Robert (DBI) <robert.wohlers@sfgov.org>; Dana Huffstutler <danah@evictiondefense.org>; Communications, DBI (DBI) <dbi.communications@sfgov.org>; SFhousingInfo <sfhousinginfo@sfgov.org>; CMS, SFDPA (DPA) <sfdpa@sfgov.org>; Francisco G. Torres <FTorres@ztalaw.com>; FireAdministration, FIR (FIR) <fireadministration@sfgov.org>; Chuquipul, Gretel (DAT) <gretel.chuquipul@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Zumwalt, Jeffrey (ETH) <jeffrey.zumwalt@sfgov.org>; Hannan, Patrick (DBI) <patrick.j.hannan@sfgov.org>; Wong, Jocelyn (BOS) <jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org>; MALAMUT, JOHN (CAT) <John.Malamut@sfcityatty.org>; kronon@kron4.com; Lew, Lisa (BOS) <lisa.lew@sfgov.org>; Barahona, Luis (DBI) <luis.barahona@sfgov.org>; Lui, Raymond (DPW) <Raymond.Lui@sfdpw.org>; Xiao, Xiao-Ling (HSA) <Xiao-Ling.Xiao@sfgov.org>; O'Riordan, Patrick (DBI) <patrick.oriordan@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stroud, Pierre (MYR) <pierre.stroud@sfgov.org>; Cope, Tyler (POL) <tyler.cope@sfgov.org>; Ordonez, Corey (ETH) <corey.ordonez@sfgov.org>; info@edringtonandassociates.com; info@kva-law.com; info@sfcityattorney.org; IRS.online.services@irs.gov; Yau, Willy (DBI) <willy.yau@sfgov.org>; yenci@bornsteinlaw.com; yolanda.delatorre@mncsf.org; yujie@missionlocal.com; Rydstrom, Todd (CON) <Todd.Rydstrom@sfgov.org>; tpurtell@thomaswjpurcell-law.com; tips@sfrist.com; KGO-TV.Programming@abc.com; Board, Rent (RNT) <rentboard@sfgov.org>; Wu, Darren (DBI) <darren.wu@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Strawn, William (DBI) <william.strawn@sfgov.org>; MayorSunshineRequests, MYR (MYR) <mayorsunshinerequests@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Caritas CMC HAS NO LICENSE, CHECK

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

They have been illegally evicting tenants and wait till the next article in the Chronicle comes out. Can you get who's name and title comes up next ?

FILED

JAN 14 2020

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

By       H. dew      

MEGAN LEE OLSEN, Counsel, (SBN 272554)

Department of Real Estate

P. O. Box 137007

Sacramento, CA 95813-7007

Telephone: (916) 576-8700

(916) 263-3767 (Fax)

(916) 576-7846 (Direct)

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

\* \* \*

In the Matter of the Accusation of

CARITAS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION  
and RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD,

Respondents.

No. H-12415 SF

ACCUSATION

The Complainant, ROBIN S. TANNER, acting in her official capacity as a  
Supervising Special Investigator of the State of California, for cause of Accusation against  
Respondents CARITAS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION (CMC) and RICHARD  
MALCOLM HIPPARD (HIPPARD), sometimes collectively referred to as Respondents, is  
informed and alleges as follows:

1

Respondents are presently licensed and/or have license rights under the Real  
Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code (Code).

2

At all times mentioned, CMC was and is licensed by the State of California  
Department of Real Estate (Department) as a real estate broker corporation.

///

At all times mentioned herein, HIPPARD was and is licensed by the Department individually as a real estate broker, and as the designated broker officer of CMC. As the designated broker officer, HIPPARD was responsible, pursuant to Section 10159.2 of the Code, for the supervision of the activities of officers, agents, real estate licensees and employees of CMC for which a real estate license is required to ensure the compliance of the corporation with the Real Estate Law and Regulations.

Whenever reference is made to an allegation in this Accusation to an act or omission of CMC, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that the officers, directors, employees, agents and real estate licensees employed by or associated with CMC committed such acts or omissions while engaged in furtherance of the business or operation of CMC and while acting within the course and scope of their corporate authority and employment.

At all times herein mentioned, Respondents engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, advertised, or assumed to act as real estate brokers within the State of California within the meaning of Section 10131(b) of the Code, including the operation and conduct of a property management business with the public wherein, on behalf of others, for compensation or in expectation of compensation, Respondents leased or rented or offered to lease or rent, or placed for rent, or solicited listings of places for rent, or solicited for prospective tenants, or negotiated the sale, purchase or exchanges of leases on real property, or on a business opportunity, or collected rents from real property, or improvements thereon, or from business opportunities.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 5, inclusive, is incorporated by this reference as if fully set forth herein.

On or about January 17, 2019, through January 22, 2019, an audit was conducted of the records of CMC. The auditor examined records for the period of January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018 (the audit period).

While acting as real estate brokers as described in Paragraph 5, above, and within the audit period, Respondents accepted or received funds in trust (trust funds) from or on behalf of property owners, lessees and others in connection with property management activities, and deposited or caused to be deposited those funds into bank accounts maintained by Respondents, at the following financial institutions, including but not limited to the following:

| BANK ACCOUNT #1 |                                                                   |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Bank:           | Wells Fargo Bank, 3027 16 <sup>th</sup> Street, San Francisco, CA |
| Account No.:    | XXXXXX2611                                                        |
| Entitled:       | REALITY HOUSE WEST – Cadillac Hotel                               |

| BANK ACCOUNT #2 |                                                      |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Bank:           | Fremont Bank, 200 Townsend Street, San Francisco, CA |
| Account No.:    | XXXX3687                                             |
| Entitled:       | EPISOCOPAL COMMUNITY SERVICES OF SAN FRANCISCO       |

| BANK ACCOUNT #3 |                                                       |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Bank:           | Bank of America, 501 Castro Street, San Francisco, CA |
| Account No.:    | XXXXXXXXXX1302                                        |
| Entitled:       | MISSION BAY AFFORDABLE HOUSING                        |

| BANK ACCOUNT #4 |                                                       |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Bank:           | Bank of America, 501 Castro Street, San Francisco, CA |
| Account No.:    | XXXXXXXXX0401                                         |
| Entitled:       | CANON KIP ASSOCIATES II, LP                           |

and thereafter from time-to-time made disbursement of said trust funds.

9

In the course of the activities described in Paragraph 5, in connection with the collection and disbursement of trust funds, it was determined that:

- (a) Respondents failed to disclose its license number on the corporation website as required by Section 10140.6 of the Code and Section 2773 of Chapter 6, Title 10, California Code of Regulations (Regulations);
- (b) Respondents failed to designate Bank Account #1, Bank Account #2, Bank Account #3, and Bank Account #4 as a trust fund account and in the name of the broker as trustee as required by Section 10145 of the Code and Section 2832 of the Regulations;
- (c) Respondents failed to place trust funds, in the form of rent checks collected, into the hands of the principal, into a neutral escrow depository, or into a trust fund account within three days of receipt, in violation of Section 10145 of the Code and Section 2832 of the Regulations;
- (d) Respondents allowed unlicensed persons not employed by CMC, to be a signatory on Bank Account #1, Bank Account #2 and Bank Account #4, in violation of Section 10145 and Section 2834 of the Regulations;
- (e) Respondents caused, suffered or permitted funds of others which were received and held by Respondents to be commingled with broker funds which had not been disbursed within 25 days of earning them in Bank Account # 4, in violation of Section 10176 (e) of the Code;
- (f) Respondent failed to properly and accurately maintain an accurate columnar record in chronological sequence of all trust funds received and disbursed (Control Record), containing all required information, for Bank Account #1, Bank Account #2, Bank Account #3 and Bank Account #4, in violation of Section 2831 of the Regulations; and

1 (g) HIPPARD was not an authorized signer on Bank Account #1, Bank Account  
2 #2 and Bank Account #4, in violation of Section 2725 of the Regulations.

3 10

4 The acts and/or omissions described above constitute violations of Sections 2725  
5 (Broker Supervision), 2773 (Disclosure of License Identification Number), 2831 (Control  
6 Records), 2832 (Bank Account Not Properly Designated as Trust Account), and 2834 (Trust  
7 Fund Signatory) of the Regulations and of Sections 10140.6 (Disclosure of License  
8 Identification in Advertising), 10145 (Trust Fund Handling), 10176 (e) (Commingling) of the  
9 Code, and are grounds for discipline under Sections 10176 (e), 10177(d) (Willful Disregard of  
10 Real Estate Laws) and/or 10177(g) (Negligence/Incompetence Licensee) of the Code.

11 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

12 11

13 Each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 10, inclusive, is incorporated  
14 by this reference as if fully set forth herein.

15 12

16 On or about September 7, 2016, CMC employed Devesh Patel (PATEL), a  
17 licensed real estate salesperson, to perform property management activities, as described in  
18 Paragraph 5.

19 13

20 The Department did not receive information that PATEL was employed by CMC  
21 within 5 days of employment.

22 14

23 The acts and/or omissions of described above, constitute violations of Section  
24 10161.8 (a) (Salesperson Employment) of the Code, and are grounds for discipline under  
25 Sections 10177(d) and/or 10177(g) of the Code.

26 ///

27 ///

///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27

Each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 14, inclusive, is incorporated by this reference as if fully set forth herein.

During the audit period, PATEL performed property management activities for compensation on behalf of CMC, as described in Paragraph 5, and while still employed and affiliated with another broker, California Standards Inc.

The acts and/or omissions described above constitutes grounds for discipline under Sections 10137 (Unlawful Employment/Retention and Compensation), 10177 (d) and/ or 10177 (g) of the Code.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

Each and every allegation in Paragraphs 1 through 17, inclusive, is incorporated by this reference as if fully set forth herein.

Respondent HIPPARD failed to exercise reasonable supervision and control over the property management activities of CMC. In particular, HIPPARD permitted, ratified and/or caused the conduct described above to occur, and failed to take reasonable steps, including but not limited to, the handling of trust funds, supervision of employees, and the implementation of policies, rules and systems to ensure the compliance of the business with the Real Estate Law and the Regulations.

The above acts and/or omissions of HIPPARD violate Section 2725 of the Regulations and Section 10159.2 (Responsibility/Designated Officer) of the Code and constitute

///

1 grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions of Sections 10177(d), 10177(g) and/or  
2 10177(h) (Broker Supervision) of the Code.

3 COST RECOVERY

4 21

5 Audit Costs

6 The acts and/or omissions of Respondents, as alleged above, entitle the  
7 Department to reimbursement of the costs of its audits pursuant to Section 10148(b) (Audit Costs  
8 for Trust Fund Handling Violations) of the Code.

9 22

10 Costs of Investigation and Enforcement

11 Section 10106 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that in any order issued in  
12 resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the Department, the commissioner may request the  
13 administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this part to  
14 pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

15 WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted on the  
16 allegations of this Accusation and that upon proof thereof a decision be rendered imposing  
17 disciplinary action against all licenses and license rights of Respondents under the Real Estate  
18 Law, for the cost of the investigation and enforcement as permitted by law, for the cost of the  
19 audit as permitted by law, and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other  
20 provisions of law.

21 

22 ROBIN S. TANNER  
23 Supervising Special Investigator

24  
25 Dated at Oakland, California,  
26 this 12<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2019.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27

- 8 -

1 Department of Real Estate  
2 P.O. Box 137007  
3 Sacramento, CA 95818-7007  
4 Telephone: (916) 576-8700  
5  
6  
7

**FILED**

OCT 14 2020

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE  
By B. dew

8 BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE  
9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
10

\*\*\*

11 In the Matter of the Accusation of

12 CARITAS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION  
13 and RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD,

14 Respondents.

No. H-12415 SF

STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT  
IN SETTLEMENT AND ORDER

15 It is hereby stipulated by and between CARITAS MANAGEMENT  
16 CORPORATION (CMC) and RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD (HIPPARD), collectively  
17 Respondents, represented by Robert F. Hahn, and the Complainant, acting by and through  
18 Megan Lee Olsen, Counsel for the Department of Real Estate (Department), as follows for the  
19 purpose of settling and disposing of the Accusation filed on January 14, 2020, in this matter:

20 1. All issues which were to be contested and all evidence which was to be  
21 presented by Complainant and Respondents at a formal hearing on the Accusation, which  
22 hearing was to be held in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act  
23 (APA), shall instead and in place thereof be submitted solely on the basis of the provisions of  
24 this Stipulation and Agreement In Settlement and Order (Stipulation).

25 2. Respondents have received, read, and understand the Statement to  
26 Respondent, the Discovery Provisions of the APA and the Accusation filed by the Department in  
27 this proceeding.

1                   3.       Respondents filed a Notice of Defense pursuant to Section 11505 of the  
2 Government Code for the purpose of requesting a hearing on the allegations in the Accusation.  
3 Respondents hereby freely and voluntarily withdraw said Notice of Defense. Respondents  
4 acknowledge and understand that by withdrawing said Notice of Defense they will thereby waive  
5 their right to require the Real Estate Commissioner (Commissioner) to prove the allegations in  
6 the Accusation at a contested hearing held in accordance with the provisions of the APA and that  
7 they will waive other rights afforded to them in connection with the hearing such as the right to  
8 present evidence in defense of the allegations in the Accusation and the right to cross-examine  
9 witnesses.

10                   4.       This Stipulation is based on the factual allegations contained in the  
11 Accusation. In the interest of expediency and economy, Respondents choose not to contest these  
12 factual allegations, but to remain silent and understand that, as a result thereof, these factual  
13 statements will serve as a prima facie basis for the "Determination of Issues" and "Order" set  
14 forth below. The Commissioner shall not be required to provide further evidence to prove such  
15 allegations.

16                   5.       It is understood by the parties that the Commissioner may adopt the  
17 Stipulation as his Decision and Order in this matter thereby imposing the penalty and sanctions  
18 on Respondents' real estate licenses and license rights as set forth in the below "Order." In the  
19 event that the Commissioner in his discretion does not adopt the Stipulation, it shall be void and  
20 of no effect, and Respondents shall retain the right to a hearing and proceeding on the  
21 Accusation under all the provisions of the APA and shall not be bound by any admission or  
22 waiver made herein.

23                   6.       This Decision and Order or any subsequent Order of the Commissioner  
24 made pursuant to this Stipulation shall not constitute an estoppel, merger or bar to any further  
25 administrative or civil proceedings by the Department with respect to any matters which were  
26 not specifically alleged to be causes for accusation in this proceeding.

27 ///

1                   7.       Respondents understand that by agreeing to this Stipulation, Respondents  
2 agree to pay, pursuant to Section 10148 of the Business and Professions Code (Code), the cost of  
3 the audit which resulted in the violations found in the Determination of Issues. The amount of  
4 such costs is \$8,574.60.

5                   8.       Respondents further understand that by agreeing to this Stipulation, the  
6 findings set forth below in the "Determination of Issues" become final, and that the  
7 Commissioner may charge said Respondents for the costs of any audit conducted pursuant to  
8 Section 10148 of the Code to determine if the violations have been corrected. The maximum  
9 cost of said audit shall not exceed \$10,718.25.

10                                   DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

11                   CARITAS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION and RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD

12                   By reason of the foregoing stipulations, admissions and waivers, and solely for  
13 the purpose of settlement of the pending Accusation without a hearing, it is stipulated and agreed  
14 that the acts and/or omissions of Respondents, as described in the Accusation, constitute grounds  
15 for the suspension or revocation of the licenses and license rights of Respondents under the  
16 provisions of Sections 10137, 10176 (e), 10177(d) and 10177 (g) of the Code, in conjunction  
17 with Sections 10161.8 (a), 10140.6, 10145 and 10176 (g) of the Code, and Sections 2725, 2773,  
18 2831, 2832, and 2834 of Title 10 of the California Code of Regulations.

19                                   RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD

20                   By reason of the foregoing stipulations, admissions and waivers, and solely for  
21 the purpose of settlement of the pending Accusation without a hearing, it is stipulated and agreed  
22 that the acts and/or omissions of Respondent HIPPARD, as described in the Accusation,  
23 constitute grounds for the suspension or revocation of the licenses and license rights of  
24 Respondent HIPPARD under the provisions of Sections 10177 (d), 10177 (g) and 10177 (h) of  
25 the Code, in conjunction with Section 10159.2 of the Code, and Section 2725 of Title 10 of the  
26 California Code of Regulations.

27       ///

1

## 2

3

1

**Abstract**

1

1                   3.     The restricted broker license issued to HIPPARD may be suspended prior  
2 to hearing by Order of the Commissioner in the event of HIPPARD's conviction or plea of nolo  
3 contendere to a crime which is substantially related to HIPPARD's fitness or capacity as a real  
4 estate licensee.

5                   4.     The restricted broker license issued to HIPPARD may be suspended prior  
6 to hearing by Order of the Commissioner on evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that  
7 HIPPARD has violated provisions of the California Real Estate Law, the Subdivided Lands Law,  
8 Regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner or conditions attaching to the restricted license.

9                   5.     HIPPARD shall not be eligible to apply for the issuance of an unrestricted  
10 real estate broker license nor for removal of any of the conditions, limitations or restrictions of a  
11 restricted license broker license until two (2) years have elapsed from the effective date of this  
12 Decision and Order. HIPPARD shall not be eligible to apply for any unrestricted licenses until  
13 all restrictions attaching to the license have been removed.

14                  6.     HIPPARD shall, within nine (9) months from the effective date of this  
15 Decision and Order, present evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that HIPPARD has, since  
16 the most recent issuance of an original or renewal real estate license, taken and successfully  
17 completed the continuing education requirements of Article 2.5 of Chapter 3 of the Real Estate  
18 Law for renewal of a real estate license. If HIPPARD fails to satisfy this condition, HIPPARD's  
19 real estate license shall automatically be suspended until HIPPARD presents evidence  
20 satisfactory to the Commissioner of having taken and successfully completed the continuing  
21 education requirement. Proof of completion of the continuing education courses must be  
22 delivered to the Department of Real Estate, Flag Section, at P.O. Box 137013, Sacramento, CA  
23 95813-7013.

24                  7.     All licenses and licensing rights HIPPARD are indefinitely suspended  
25 unless or until HIPPARD provides proof satisfactory to the Commissioner, of having taken and  
26 successfully completed the continuing education course on trust fund accounting and handling  
27 specified in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 10170.5 of the Code. Proof of

1 satisfaction of these requirements includes evidence that HIPPARD has successfully completed  
2 the trust fund account and handling continuing education courses, no earlier than 120 days prior  
3 to the effective date of the Decision and Order in this matter. Proof of completion of the trust  
4 fund accounting and handling course must be delivered to the Department of Real Estate, Flag  
5 Section at P.O. Box 137013, Sacramento, CA 95813-7013, prior to the effective date of this  
6 Decision and Order.

7 CARITAS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION and RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD

8 8. Pursuant to Section 10148 of the Code, Respondents shall, jointly and  
9 severally, pay the sum of \$8,574.60 for the Commissioner's cost of the audit which led to this  
10 disciplinary action. Respondents shall pay such cost within sixty (60) days of receiving an  
11 invoice therefore from the Commissioner. Payment of audit costs should not be made until  
12 Respondents receives the invoice. If Respondents fail to satisfy this condition in a timely  
13 manner as provided for herein, Respondents' real estate licenses shall automatically be  
14 suspended until payment is made in full, or until a decision providing otherwise is adopted  
15 following a hearing held pursuant to this condition.

16 9. Pursuant to Section 10148 of the Code, Respondents shall pay the  
17 Commissioner's reasonable cost, not to exceed \$10,718.25 for an audit to determine if  
18 Respondents have corrected the violations found in the "Determination of Issues". In calculating  
19 the amount of the Commissioner's reasonable cost, the Commissioner may use the estimated  
20 average hourly salary for all persons performing audits of real estate brokers, and shall include  
21 an allocation for travel time to and from the auditor's place of work. Respondents shall pay such  
22 cost within sixty (60) days of receiving an invoice therefore from the Commissioner. Payment of  
23 the audit costs should not be made until Respondents receives the invoice. If Respondents fail to  
24 satisfy this condition in a timely manner as provided for herein, Respondents' real estate licenses  
25 shall automatically be suspended until payment is made in full, or until a decision providing  
26 otherwise is adopted following a hearing held pursuant to this condition.

27 10. All licenses and licensing rights of Respondents are indefinitely suspended

1 unless or until Respondents, jointly and severally, pay the sum of \$3,525.75 for the  
2 Commissioner's reasonable cost of the investigation which led to this disciplinary action. Said  
3 payment shall be in the form of a cashier's check made payable to the Department of Real Estate,  
4 Flag Section at P.O. Box 137013, Sacramento, CA 95813-7013, prior to the effective date of this  
5 Stipulation.

6  
7 8/13/20

8 DATED

9 

MEGAN LEE OLSEN, Counsel  
DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

10 \* \* \*

11 I have read the Stipulation and Agreement In Settlement and Order, discussed it  
12 with my counsel, and its terms are understood by me and are agreeable and acceptable to me. I  
13 understand that I am waiving rights given to me by the California Administrative Procedure  
14 Act (including but not limited to Sections 11506, 11508, 11509 and 11513 of the Government  
15 Code), and I willingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waive those rights, including the right of  
16 requiring the Commissioner to prove the allegations in the Accusation at a hearing at which I  
17 would have the right to cross-examine witnesses against me and to present evidence in defense  
18 and mitigation of the charges.


19 Respondents and Respondents attorney further agree to send the original signed  
20 Stipulation by mail to the following address no later than one (1) week from the date the  
21 Stipulation is signed by Respondents and Respondents' attorney: *Department of Real Estate,*  
22 *Legal Section, P.O. Box 137007, Sacramento, California 95813-7007.* Respondents and  
23 Respondents' attorney understand and agree that if they fail to return the original signed  
24 Stipulation by the due date, Complainant retains the right to set this matter for hearing.

25 ///


26 ///

27 ///

1 7-29-20  
2 DATED

  
CARITAS MANAGEMENT  
CORPORATION, Respondent  
By: RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD  
Designated Officer

6 7-29-20  
7 DATED

  
RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD,  
Respondent

10 \* \* \*

11 *I have reviewed the Stipulation and Agreement as to form and content and have advised my*  
12 *clients accordingly.*

14 7-29-20  
15 DATED

  
ROBERT F. HAHN, Attorney for  
Respondent

17 \* \* \*


18 The foregoing Stipulation and Agreement In Settlement and Order is hereby  
19 adopted by the Real Estate Commissioner as his Decision and Order and shall become effective  
20 at 12 o'clock noon on

21 **NOV 05 2020**

22 IT IS SO ORDERED

10.1.20

23 DOUGLAS R. McCAULEY  
24 Real Estate Commissioner

25   
26  
27

**FILED**

**JAN 14 2020**

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

By                     

MEGAN LEE OLSEN, Counsel, (SBN 272554)

Department of Real Estate

P. O. Box 137007

Sacramento, CA 95813-7007

Telephone: (916) 576-8700

(916) 263-3767 (Fax)

(916) 576-7846 (Direct)

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

\*\*\*

In the Matter of the Accusation of

CARITAS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION  
and RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD,

Respondents.

No. H-12415 SF

ACCUSATION

The Complainant, ROBIN S. TANNER, acting in her official capacity as a Supervising Special Investigator of the State of California, for cause of Accusation against Respondents CARITAS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION (CMC) and RICHARD MALCOLM HIPPARD (HIPPARD), sometimes collectively referred to as Respondents, is informed and alleges as follows:

1

Respondents are presently licensed and/or have license rights under the Real Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code (Code).

2

At all times mentioned, CMC was and is licensed by the State of California Department of Real Estate (Department) as a real estate broker corporation.

///

- 1 -

3

At all times mentioned herein, HIPPARD was and is licensed by the Department individually as a real estate broker, and as the designated broker officer of CMC. As the designated broker officer, HIPPARD was responsible, pursuant to Section 10159.2 of the Code, for the supervision of the activities of officers, agents, real estate licensees and employees of CMC for which a real estate license is required to ensure the compliance of the corporation with the Real Estate Law and Regulations.

4

Whenever reference is made to an allegation in this Accusation to an act or omission of CMC, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that the officers, directors, employees, agents and real estate licensees employed by or associated with CMC committed such acts or omissions while engaged in furtherance of the business or operation of CMC and while acting within the course and scope of their corporate authority and employment.

5

At all times herein mentioned, Respondents engaged in the business of, acted in

file:///C:/Users/AKhoo/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/INetCache/Content.Outlook/8... 5/11/2022

**From:** [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Arntz, John \(REG\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [SHEN, ANDREW \(CAT\)](#); [Lynch, Andy \(MYR\)](#); [Paulino, Tom \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Melissa \(ADM\)](#)  
**Bcc:** [Townsend, Arnold \(REG\)](#); [Reiner, Ditka \(REG - Contractor\)](#); ["Ditka Reiner"; revtword@hotmail.com](#); [Lee, Chasel \(REG - Contractor\)](#); [Lee, Jeremy \(REG - Contractor\)](#); [J.Michelle Pierce1](#); [Hernandez Gil, Chema \(REG - Contractor\)](#); [Ho, Lily \(REG - Contractor\)](#); [Castillon, Matthew \(REG - Contractor\)](#); [Cooper, Raynell \(REG\)](#)  
**Subject:** 2021-2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force - Draft Final Report  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 5:49:29 PM  
**Attachments:** [Draft Final Report.docx](#)  
[Draft Final Report.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached Redistricting Task Force DRAFT Report submitted by Chasel Lee. Translated versions will be made available as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh

Executive Assistant

Office of the Clerk of the Board

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Lee, Chasel (REG - Contractor) <[chasel.lee@sfgov.org](mailto:chasel.lee@sfgov.org)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 4:56 PM

**To:** REG - Redistricting Taskforce <[rdtf@sfgov.org](mailto:rdtf@sfgov.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** Carroll, John (BOS) <[john.carroll@sfgov.org](mailto:john.carroll@sfgov.org)>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <[wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org](mailto:wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>; SHEN, ANDREW (CAT) <[Andrew.Shen@sfcityatty.org](mailto:Andrew.Shen@sfcityatty.org)>; FLORES, ANA (CAT) <[Ana.Flores@sfcityatty.org](mailto:Ana.Flores@sfcityatty.org)>; GUIBERT, GUS (CAT) <[Gus.Guibert@sfcityatty.org](mailto:Gus.Guibert@sfcityatty.org)>

**Subject:** 2021-2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force - Draft Final Report

Dear Clerk Calvillo,

Please see the attached Draft Final Report of the 2021-2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force in both Word and PDF format. Please let me know if you have any questions or if I should submit other materials to you.

Sincerely,

**Chasel Lee**

*Pronouns: he/him/his*

Member | San Francisco Redistricting Task Force

[chasel.lee@sfgov.org](mailto:chasel.lee@sfgov.org) | <https://sfelections.org/rdtf>

**2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force  
Draft Final Report**

**Table of Contents**

|       |                                                                  |    |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I.    | Introduction.....                                                | 1  |
| II.   | Provisions of the City Charter.....                              | 1  |
| III.  | Task Force and Staff.....                                        | 2  |
| IV.   | Redistricting Criteria.....                                      | 2  |
| V.    | 2020 Census and Population Numbers .....                         | 3  |
| VI.   | Work of the Task Force .....                                     | 4  |
| VII.  | Supervisory District Considerations .....                        | 6  |
| VIII. | Supervisory District Deviations in Excess of 1% of the Mean..... | 9  |
| IX.   | Lessons Learned and Recommendations .....                        | 11 |
| X.    | Closing Remarks.....                                             | 14 |

**Appendices**

Final Map and Supervisory District Statistics

Supervisory District Descriptions

Statements from Task Force Members

Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors – Report

Civic Edge Consulting – Outreach and Support Final Report

## **2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force Draft Final Report**

### **I. Introduction**

The San Francisco Redistricting Task Force (“Task Force”) is the governmental body empowered by the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco (“Charter”) to redraw the supervisorial district boundaries. The Task Force is convened every ten years after each decennial census and is responsible for redrawing district boundaries to be compliant with all redistricting criteria.

The Final Map containing the revised supervisorial district boundaries was adopted by the Task Force on April 28, 2022. This Final Report of the 2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force sets forth the Final Map and the work of the Task Force leading to its adoption.

### **II. Provisions of the City Charter**

Section 13.110(d) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco sets forth the powers of the Task Force and the requirements and procedures for redrawing the City’s eleven supervisorial districts.

The Charter requires that within 60 days following publication of the decennial federal census, the Director of Elections shall report to the Board of Supervisors on whether the existing districts continue to meet the relevant legal requirements. If it is determined that any of the districts is not in compliance, the Board of Supervisors by ordinance shall convene and fund a nine-person elections task force, with three members appointed by the Board of Supervisors, three members appointed by the Mayor, and three members appointed by the Elections Commission.

The Charter provides that population variations between the supervisorial districts should be limited to one percent from the statistical mean unless additional variations, limited to five percent of the statistical mean, are necessary to prevent dividing or diluting the voting power of minorities and/or to keep recognized neighborhoods intact. The Charter also requires the districts to conform to the rule of one person, one vote, and to reflect communities of interest in San Francisco.

The Charter requires that census data, at the census block level, as released by the United States Census Bureau be used in any analysis of population requirements and application of the rule of one person, one vote.

The Charter requires the Task Force to complete redrawing district lines before April 15 in the year in which the first election using the redrawn lines will be conducted. The Board of Supervisors may not revise the district boundaries established by the Task Force. The Charter provides that the City Attorney shall cause the description of the redrawn district lines to be published in an appendix to the Charter.

### III. Task Force and Staff

Due to delays in the publication of 2020 Census redistricting data by the United States Census Bureau, the 2021–2022 Task Force was convened by Ordinance 94-21 in July 2021 before receiving the population data and in anticipation of the need to redistrict at least one of San Francisco’s eleven supervisorial districts following the 2020 census. Appointments to the Task Force were made in June and July of 2021 by the three appointing authorities set forth by the Charter: the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Elections Commission.

The members of the Task Force appointed by the Board of Supervisors were Jeremy Lee, Jose Maria (Chema) Hernández Gil, and J. Michelle Pierce. The members appointed by the Mayor were Matthew Castillon, Lily Ho, and the Rev. Arnold Townsend. The members appointed by the Elections Commission were Raynell Cooper, Chasel Lee, and Ditka Reiner. At its first meeting on September 17, 2021, the Redistricting Task Force elected the Rev. Arnold Townsend as its Chair and Ditka Reiner as its Vice Chair.

The Task Force was supported by Angela Calvillo, John Carroll, Wilson Ng, John Tse, Joe Adkins, Alicia Somera, Eileen McHugh and many more staff members from the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors (“Clerk’s Office”); Andrew Shen, Ana Flores, and Gus Guibert from the Office of the City Attorney; and Agnes Li, Arturo Castenza, and Raymond Borres from the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs. Staff from the Department of Elections and the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs supported their teams. The Task Force was also supported by the Sheriff’s Department and their officers. Q2 Data and Research LLC (“Q2”) was selected by the Department of Elections to assist with mapping, and Civic Edge Consulting were selected to do outreach by the Clerk’s Office prior to the seating and the first meeting of the Task Force.

### IV. Redistricting Criteria

In accordance with federal, state, and local legal requirements and with the advice from the Office of the City Attorney, the Task Force performed its work with the following criteria:

- **Equal population:** The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, United States Supreme Court rulings in *Avery v. Midland County*, 390 U.S. 474 (1968) and subsequent cases, and Section 13.110(d) of the San Francisco City Charter require supervisorial districts to substantially comply with the rule of one person, one vote.
- **Federal Voting Rights Act (VRA):** The VRA protects the voting power of racial and language minorities. A violation of the VRA can occur if there is dilution of the voting power of a racial or language minority by cracking the minority group into several districts to prevent them from concentrating their strength or by packing the minority group into as few districts as possible.

- **Contiguity:** Districts should be contiguous, with all parts of a district being adjacent to another part of the district. Areas separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not considered contiguous.
- **Recognized neighborhoods:** Recognized neighborhoods are based on data and geography collected from official sources, such as those defined by the Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services. The Charter permits deviations beyond one percent of the statistical mean to keep recognized neighborhoods intact.
- **Communities of interest:** Communities of interest are a population of residents that share common social, cultural, and economic interests. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.
- **Compactness:** Districts should be compact. Article XXI, Section 2 of the California Constitution defines compactness as “nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant population.”

## V. 2020 Census and Population Numbers

According to the 2020 United States Census, San Francisco’s population was 873,965 as of April 1, 2020, an increase of 68,730 people (8.53%) from the 2010 Census count of 805,235 people. In compliance with the Fair And Inclusive Redistricting for Municipalities And Political Subdivisions Act (FAIR MAPS Act) and California Elections Code Section 21500, the adjusted 2020 total population for redistricting is 874,933 people, or 79,545 people per supervisorial district.

Population growth in the past ten years was unevenly distributed, with the greatest growth occurring in the eastern parts of the city. This led to population deviations in a majority of supervisorial districts that exceeded 5% of the statistical mean of 79,545 people.

| District<br>(2012–2022) | Population<br>(2020) | Population Deviation<br>from the Mean |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1                       | 72,848               | –8.31%                                |
| 2                       | 76,363               | –3.89%                                |
| 3                       | 72,474               | –8.78%                                |
| 4                       | 72,784               | –8.39%                                |
| 5                       | 80,667               | +1.53%                                |
| 6                       | 103,564              | +30.35%                               |
| 7                       | 75,436               | –5.05%                                |
| 8                       | 82,418               | +3.73%                                |
| 9                       | 75,829               | –4.56%                                |
| 10                      | 86,323               | +8.65%                                |
| 11                      | 76,287               | –3.98%                                |

District 6 saw the greatest amount of growth, adding 29,655 people over ten years and ending with a deviation of 30.35% above the mean. Growth in District 10 also outpaced many other

areas in the city, with its population growing to above 8% of the mean. Meanwhile, Districts 1, 3, 4, and 7 had population numbers that deviated to below 5% of the mean, and Districts 9 and 11 actually saw fewer people counted in 2020 than in 2010.

| District<br>(2012–2022) | Population<br>(2010) | Population<br>(2020) |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1                       | 69,703               | 72,848               |
| 2                       | 69,544               | 76,363               |
| 3                       | 70,394               | 72,474               |
| 4                       | 72,498               | 72,784               |
| 5                       | 74,600               | 80,667               |
| 6                       | 73,909               | 103,564              |
| 7                       | 72,737               | 75,436               |
| 8                       | 75,746               | 82,418               |
| 9                       | 76,720               | 75,829               |
| 10                      | 72,566               | 86,323               |
| 11                      | 76,818               | 76,287               |

## **VI. Work of the Task Force**

The Task Force held its first meeting on September 17, 2021, one day after the delayed release of the 2020 Census data by the United States Census Bureau and using remote meeting software due to the global COVID-19 pandemic and the Mayor’s public health orders. During its initial meetings, the Task Force elected officers, adopted bylaws, and set a schedule for future meetings. The Task Force received briefings on its duties and powers from the Department of Elections, Office of the City Attorney, Clerk’s Office, Q2 Data and Research LLC (“Q2”), and Civic Edge Consulting. The Task Force also received various data sets including socioeconomic demographics, neighborhood maps, cultural district information, and community benefit district boundaries.

To accomplish the voluminous number of tasks needed to complete its work, the Task Force assigned individual members to lead on particular matters. Members were assigned to the following areas: community outreach and engagement, social media and website, data and mapping, budgeting, community input management, and messaging coordination. The Chair and Vice Chair assisted the members in their assignments alongside their duties to lead and represent the Task Force as a whole.

Outreach was a high priority for the Task Force. The Task Force relied on its outreach consultant Civic Edge Consulting to develop marketing materials, identifying community organizations for engagement, and digital outreach efforts such as email and social media. These efforts were supplemented by the Clerk’s Office, which included window signs, flyers, and other printed materials. Details of the tasks undertaken by Civic Edge Consulting and the Clerk’s Office are included in their respective reports in this Final Report’s appendices.

Individual Task Force members also participated in outreach activities: speaking with San Francisco residents, making presentations to community-based organizations, and attending

events to engage the public in the redistricting process. Interested organizations and members of the public also participated in informing their fellow neighbors and community members regarding the Task Force's work.

In addition to outreach, the Task Force also emphasized language access. Printed materials were available in English, Chinese, Spanish, Filipino, and other languages as needed, and translation services for district-specific Task Force meetings were provided for Cantonese Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino speakers. Several district-specific meetings also had translation services for Mandarin Chinese, Taishanese Chinese, Vietnamese, and Russian speakers. In April 2022, funding was secured for simultaneous interpretation of the Task Force meetings into Cantonese Chinese and Spanish.

The Task Force directed its mapping consultant Q2 Data and Research LLC to provide mapping and community of interest submission tools for the public to create district maps and submit their proposals to the Task Force. In accordance with this direction, Q2 released the San Francisco Redistricting Tool, a free-to-use online mapping tool that allowed the public to work with the same geographies and data available to the Task Force to create their district maps, and a Community of Interest Public Input Form using Airtable. There was also a training video created to assist users in map drawing. Using these tools, members of the public submitted 99 district maps and 162 community of interest entries to the Task Force for consideration.

The Task Force also received public testimony in other ways. Members of the public were able to give oral public comment at Task Force meetings, submit handwritten letters and hand-drawn maps by mail and or in person, and send emails to a dedicated email inbox for the Task Force. Unlike previous iterations of the Task Force, this Task Force declined to set a deadline for map and community of interest submissions and continued to receive public comments, maps, and communities of interest until the end of the redistricting process. By the end of April 2022, the Task Force received over 2,500 written and oral public comments.

The Task Force sought to hear from each district and their residents first before creating draft maps, emphasizing the importance of the public's ability to testify regarding their neighborhoods and communities of interest. The Task Force also decided to have two district-specific meetings for every supervisorial district, the first time a Task Force has done so.

As the mapping process got underway in February 2022, the Task Force agreed to an iterative process to create draft maps. The Task Force would give specific directions regarding the district boundaries to Q2, who would create multiple draft maps based on the directions for the next mapping meeting. The Task Force would advance one or more maps, give additional directions regarding the district boundaries, and request Q2 to create a next set of maps for the next mapping meeting. This process would repeat itself until the Task Force adopted a map as the Draft Final Map. In addition to these directions, the Task Force held multiple live line-drawing sessions, including all meetings during the final few weeks, allowing the public to watch the work, understand the movement of district boundaries, and witness their impact on other districts in real time. Throughout this process, the Task Force continued to receive public testimony.

Using this process, several working maps were advanced and adjusted by the Task Force. A Draft Final Map was advanced on April 10, 2022, but was not adopted as the Final Map. The Task Force therefore continued its work and advanced a new Draft Final Map on April 21, 2022, which was adopted as the Final Map of the 2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force on April 28, 2022.

## **VII. Supervisorial District Considerations**

For each supervisorial district, the Redistricting Task Force considered the geographic issues listed below.

### **• District 1**

- Anza Vista: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
- Jordan Park: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Lone Mountain: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- North of Lake Street: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Panhandle: whether to include the area west of Masonic in D1 or D5
- Presidio Terrace: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Seacliff: whether to include in D1 or D2

### **• District 2**

- Anza Vista: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Aquatic Park: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Cathedral Hill / Jefferson Square Park / Margaret Haywood Playground: whether to include in D2 or D5 or to split between districts
- Fishermans Wharf: whether to include the area west of Leavenworth and Columbus in D2 or D3
- Japantown / Western Addition: where to establish the border between D2 and D5, especially with respect to the Booker T. Washington Community Service Center, the Hamilton Recreation Center, Housing Authority projects, Japantown's culturally significant sites, Rosa Parks Elementary School, the Sequoias senior living facility, the Western Addition Branch Library, and Westside Courts
- Jordan Park: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Lone Mountain: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- North of Lake Street: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Panhandle: whether to include the area east of Masonic in D2 or D5
- Polk Gulch: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Presidio Terrace: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Russian Hill: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Seacliff: whether to include in D1 or D2

### **• District 3**

- Aquatic Park: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- East Cut / Rincon Hill: whether to include in D3 or D6

- Financial District: whether to include in D3 or D6 or to split between districts
  - Fishermans Wharf: whether to include the area west of Leavenworth and Columbus in D2 or D3
  - Lower Nob Hill: whether to establish the border between D3 and D6 on Post, Geary, or O'Farrell
  - Polk Gulch: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
  - Lower Polk Street Corridor: whether to include in D3 or D6
  - Russian Hill: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
  - South of Market: whether to include the area northeast of 2nd Street in D3 or D6
  - Tenderloin: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
  - Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island: whether to include in D3 or D6
- **District 4**
    - Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
    - Inner Sunset: whether to include in D4, D5, or D7 or to split between districts
    - Lakeshore / Merced Manor: whether to include in D4 or D7
- **District 5**
    - Ashbury Heights / Cole Valley: whether to include in D5 or D8
    - Cathedral Hill / Jefferson Square Park / Margaret Haywood Playground: whether to include in D2 or D5 or to split between districts
    - Central SoMa: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
    - Civic Center: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
    - Golden Gate Park / Kezar Stadium: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
    - Haight-Ashbury: whether to include in D5 or D8
    - Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
    - Japantown / Western Addition: where to establish the border between D2 and D5, especially with respect to the Booker T. Washington Community Service Center, the Hamilton Recreation Center, Housing Authority projects, Japantown's culturally significant sites, Rosa Parks Elementary School, the Sequoias senior living facility, the Western Addition Branch Library, and Westside Courts
    - Lower Haight: whether to include in D5 or D8 or to split between districts
    - Mid-Market: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
    - Mint Hill: whether to include in D5 or D8 or split between districts
    - Panhandle: whether to include in D1, D2, or D5 or to split between districts
    - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
    - Tenderloin: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
- **District 6**
    - Chase Center: whether to include in D6 or D10
    - Civic Center: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
    - Dogpatch / Central Waterfront: whether to include in D6 or D10

- East Cut / Rincon Hill: whether to include in D3 or D6
- Financial District: whether to include in D3 or D6 or to split between districts
- Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
- Mission Bay: whether to include various areas in D6 or D10
- Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
- Showplace Square: whether to include in D6 or D10 or to split between districts
- South of Market: whether to include various parts in D3, D5, or D6
- Tenderloin / Transgender Cultural District: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
- Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island: whether to include in D3 or D6
- **District 7**
  - Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
  - Inner Sunset: whether to include in D4, D5, or D7 or to split between districts
  - Lakeshore / Merced Manor: whether to include in D4 or D7
  - Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or split between D7 and D11
  - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
  - Upper Market: whether to include in D7 or D8
- **District 8**
  - Ashbury Heights / Cole Valley: whether to include in D5 or D8
  - Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
  - Kezar Stadium: whether to include in D5 or D8
  - Guerrero / Valencia: where to establish the border between D8 and D9
  - Mint Hill: whether to include in D5 or D8 or to split between districts
  - Mission Dolores: whether to include in D8 or D9 or to split between districts
  - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
  - Upper Market: whether to include in D7 or D8
- **District 9**
  - Guerrero / Valencia: where to establish the border between D8 and D9
  - Mission Dolores: whether to include in D8 or D9 or to split between districts
  - McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
  - Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or to split between D7 and D11
  - Portola: whether to include in D9 or D10
  - Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
  - University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

- **District 10**

- Chase Center: whether to include in D6 or D10
- Dogpatch / Central Waterfront: whether to include in D6 or D10
- McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
- Mission Bay: whether to include various areas in D6 or D10
- Portola: whether to include in D9 or D10
- Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
- Showplace Square: whether to include in D6 or D10 or to split between districts
- University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

- **District 11**

- Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or split between D7 and D11
- McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
- University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

## **VIII. Supervisorial District Deviations in Excess of 1% of the Mean**

Ten supervisorial districts (all except District 3\*) have population deviations between one percent and five percent of the statistical mean of 79,545 people. The deviations were necessary to keep recognized neighborhoods intact. The recognized neighborhoods are listed below.

- **District 1 (–4.80%)**

- Inner Richmond
- Lake Street
- Lincoln Park / Fort Miley
- Presidio Terrace
- Outer Richmond
- Seacliff
- Sutro Heights

- **District 2 (–4.52%)**

- Aquatic Park / Fort Mason
- Cow Hollow
- Laurel Heights / Jordan Park
- Marina
- Presidio Heights
- Presidio National Park
- Union Street

---

\* District 3 has a population deviation of –0.31%. The recognized neighborhoods wholly in District 3 are Chinatown, Lower Nob Hill, Nob Hill, Northern Waterfront, Polk Gulch, and Telegraph Hill.

- **District 4 (–4.46%)**
  - Outer Sunset
  - Parkside
- **District 5 (+4.98%)**
  - Alamo Square
  - Haight-Ashbury
  - Hayes Valley
  - Lower Haight
  - Panhandle
- **District 6 (–4.45%)**
  - Mission Bay
  - Rincon Hill
  - Showplace Square
  - South Beach
  - Treasure Island
  - Yerba Buena Island
- **District 7 (–1.08%)**
  - Balboa Terrace
  - Forest Hill
  - Forest Knolls
  - Golden Gate Heights
  - Laguna Honda
  - Ingleside Terraces
  - Inner Sunset
  - Miraloma Park
  - Monterey Heights
  - Mt. Davidson Manor
  - Parkmerced
  - Sherwood Forest
  - St. Francis Wood
  - West Portal
  - Westwood Highlands
  - Westwood Park
- **District 8 (+4.87%)**
  - Ashbury Heights
  - Castro
  - Cole Valley
  - Corona Heights
  - Diamond Heights
  - Eureka Valley
  - Fairmount
  - Glen Park

- Upper Market
- **District 9 (+2.54%)**
  - Bernal Heights
  - Peralta Heights
- **District 10 (+3.27%)**
  - Apparel City
  - Bayview
  - Bret Harte
  - Candlestick Point SRA
  - Central Waterfront
  - Dogpatch
  - Hunters Point
  - India Basin
  - Produce Market
  - Silver Terrace
  - Sunnydale
  - Visitacion Valley
- **District 11 (+3.95%)**
  - Cayuga
  - Crocker Amazon
  - Excelsior
  - Ingleside
  - Mission Terrace
  - Oceanview
  - Outer Mission

## **IX. Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

The Task Force was heavily impacted by the global COVID-19 pandemic, which forced it to work in unprecedented ways that may not affect future iterations of the Task Force. For example, the delay of the census data also delayed the ability for the Task Force to convene for several months compared to previous iterations, only holding its first meeting in September 2021. All Task Force meetings before March 7, 2022, were held remotely due to the Mayor's public health orders. This, along with successive pandemic waves, hindered the ability for Task Force members to hold meetings in San Francisco's diverse districts and communities, many of which were already struggling with the pandemic.

Despite the pandemic, the Task Force exerted its best efforts to perform its duties under trying circumstances. Through the benefit of experience and hindsight, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for future iterations of the Task Force.

- **Starting early:** The Task Force should start as early as the calendar and Charter allows, and definitely before receiving Census data. There are many tasks such as adopting

bylaws; finalizing district meetings and the schedule; getting trained in mapping; being apprised on legal duties and requirements; formulating outreach strategies; and setting in district meetings that are not dependent on census data. Importantly, starting early gives the Task Force the ability to begin working on its substantive duties earlier, such as holding community meetings and discussing draft maps.

- **Early planning:** The Task Force's early meetings saw protracted discussions regarding the creation of bylaws and the meeting schedule. Each new iteration of the Task Force benefits from the institutional knowledge of the Clerk's Office, the City Attorney's Office, and other City agencies and departments that have supported previous Task Forces. Rather than having newly empaneled Task Force members grapple with issues such as bylaws and the schedule without the important context, draft bylaws, tentative schedules, and proposed timelines should be presented to the next iteration of the Task Force for consideration in the first meeting.

As previously mentioned, the Task Force should also receive training in mapping early in the redistricting process rather than waiting until mapping meetings begin. San Francisco is a diverse city with many neighborhoods, communities of interest, and viewpoints, and Task Force members will benefit from experience with working on mapping tools, reviewing district iterations, and understanding the line-drawing process by the time mapping meetings are fully underway.

- **Direct support:** While the Task Force is immensely grateful for the support it received from the Clerk's Office and other City agencies, staffing availability and resources were constant concerns. Vice Chair Ditka Reiner spent endless hours handling the Task Force's many operational needs and coordinating with the Clerk's Office. The Clerk's Office also spent much of its own resources supporting the work of the Task Force, which increased greatly as the redistricting process progressed, and all involved found themselves stretched thin. With ever-increasing public access to government proceedings, the next Task Force should be able to work with all sufficient resources to accomplish its duties to the public.

The Task Force echoes the recommendation of the Clerk's office that, upon convening the next iteration of the Task Force, the City should establish a temporary department or division to support the Task Force and its needs. Such a department or division will require a paid chief of staff, dedicated administrative support, a media coordinator, and a Sunshine Ordinance expert to manage the myriad requests that may be directed at the Task Force at their busiest time. The Board of Supervisors should also allocate more funding from the outset rather than having the Task Force draw on limited funds from the Clerk's Office and the Department of Elections to meet public participation needs, as has occurred in this and previous iterations of the Task Force.

- **Clerks:** The Task Force thanks its clerk John Carroll for his efforts and dedication to help the Task Force fulfill its duties. However, the time and energy needed to support the Task Force is too much for one person and calls for the need of more staffing and support. The 2011–2012 Task Force was supported by two clerks. If the City does not accept the establish a more robust support framework for future iterations of the Task

Force (see above), then the Task Force should be staffed by at least two clerks to sufficiently assist in its work, with one person assigned to document issues, agreements, and the Meeting Minutes.

- **Meetings:** Most meetings were held in the evening. While starting meetings later in the day allows Task Force members to attend meetings and for more members of the public to participate, starting late in the day also means ending late into the night. Future iterations of the Task Force should strongly consider beginning their meetings in the morning, as starting earlier allows everyone involved to be better engaged in the process.

The length of meetings should also be managed. Several meetings exceeded ten hours, with the longest one being almost twenty hours long, which is inappropriate under any measure. Future iterations of the Task Force should consider various methods of running meetings more efficiently while allowing for robust participation, including more focused public comment, better facilitation of discussion and action, and even recessing until the next day if necessary.

- **Outreach:** The COVID-19 pandemic adversely impacted the abilities for the Task Force, its consultant Civic Edge Consulting, and interested parties to conduct important community outreach. However, engagement with the public is a fundamental component of the redistricting process and is important to perform regardless of the challenges. The next iteration of the Task Force should engage in vigorous outreach with the diverse communities of San Francisco, including participating as many events, meetings, and presentations as possible.

The 2021–2022 Task Force was the first Task Force to retain an outreach consultant. This was done in light of advice from the 2011–2012 Task Force, which recommended having an outreach consultant for the purposes of community engagement. However, several Task Force meetings were spent understanding the role of this outreach consultant and to resolve differences between the contracted scope of work for the consultant and the expectations of Task Force members. With the benefit of experience, the Task Force recommends that for future iterations of the Task Force, relevant City bodies should set forth clearer expectations for outreach that more closely align with the needs of the redistricting process.

- **Independence of the Task Force:** As a governmental body, the Task Force makes considerations and decisions that generate passionate discussion and fervent debate. The Task Force welcomes the extraordinary amount of public interest and scrutiny of its work. However, it also witnessed unprecedented assaults on its independence by political actors invested in a specific outcome. These actions, including an effort to remove the three appointees of the Elections Commission, highlight the need for mechanisms to shield the Task Force from undue and inappropriate influence. Stronger measures should be considered to protect future iterations of the Task Force from experiencing these attacks ever again.

Likewise, future iterations of the Task Force should not have to endure racist, prejudiced, vitriolic, and other personal attacks and threats as this Task Force did for performing its

duties for the people of San Francisco. These inappropriate attempts to intimidate the Task Force have no place in public discourse. Better methods should be developed to cut off inappropriate comments and to protect all public servants who volunteer for this difficult job.

- **Composition of the Task Force:** To affirm and protect the independence of the Task Force from inappropriate political influence, a review should be conducted regarding the composition of the Task Force, including the member selection process and ways to reduce potential conflicts of interest. The review should examine whether implementing appointment procedures like that used for the California Citizens Redistricting Commission, but without any involvement of elected officials, are appropriate and will reinforce the independence of the Task Force.

There are currently no guidelines on who may be a member of the Task Force, leaving the Task Force vulnerable to potential conflicts of interest. Therefore, minimum qualifications and restrictions such as those imposed on the California Citizens Redistricting Commission should be considered. To further reduce potential conflicts of interest, such a review should consider restrictions on persons directly receiving or connected to for-profit or nonprofit entities receiving discretionary grants or funding from the City.

- **Alternate members:** Future iterations of the Task Force should consider including alternate members that can take the place of a voting Task Force member who can no longer continue serving. These alternate members should meet the same requirements as that of voting members and should be selected before the first meeting of the Task Force.

## **X. Closing Remarks**

The Task Force was convened to perform a civic duty set forth in the Charter. Amidst a global pandemic and through unprecedented circumstances, the Task Force fulfilled its responsibility to the people of San Francisco by considering the data, engaging communities, and adopting the Final Map setting forth the supervisorial district boundaries for the next ten years. The Task Force thanks the people of the City and County of San Francisco for the great honor of serving them in this capacity and for their participation in this important process.

**From:** [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Hickey, Jacqueline \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS-IT](#); [BOS-Legislative Services](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Paulino, Tom \(MYR\)](#); [Rose, Harvey \(BUD\)](#); [Campbell, Severin \(BOS\)](#); [Goncher, Dan \(BUD\)](#); [Menard, Nicolas \(BUD\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Presidential Memo: 2022 Board Committee Assignments  
**Date:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 12:27:55 PM  
**Attachments:** [2022 Committee Assignments Memo.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see the attached memo from the President of the Board of Supervisors regarding new Board Committee assignments. They will be effective on Thursday, May 26, 2022.

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](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Gee, Natalie (BOS) <[natalie.gee@sfgov.org](mailto:natalie.gee@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 8:23 AM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <[bos-supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <[Anne.Pearson@sfcityattty.org](mailto:Anne.Pearson@sfcityattty.org)>; BOS-Legislative Aides <[bos-legislative\\_aides@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org)>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <[tom.paulino@sfgov.org](mailto:tom.paulino@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Presidential Memo: 2022 Board Committee Assignments

Good morning Supervisors,

Attached is President Walton's memorandum on 2022 Board Committee Assignments. These assignments will be effective on Thursday, May 26, 2022.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,  
Natalie

**Natalie Gee 朱凱勤**, Chief of Staff

**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**

**President, Board of Supervisors**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282

**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670



SHAMANN WALTON

---

## MEMORANDUM

---

DATE: May 12, 2022

TO: Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: President Shamann Walton

CC: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
Anne Pearson, Office of the City Attorney  
Board Legislative Aides

SUBJECT: **2022 Board Committee Assignments**

---

Dear Supervisors,

I am pleased to present the updated Board Committee assignments for the remainder of 2022. These appointments will be effective on Thursday, May 26, 2022. Thank you to all of you for your continued leadership and collaboration.

**Budget & Finance Committee**

Supervisor Hillary Ronen, Chair  
Supervisor Ahsha Safai, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Gordon Mar, Member

**Land Use & Transportation Committee**

Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair  
Supervisor Dean Preston, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Member

**Budget & Appropriations Committee\***

Supervisor Hillary Ronen, Chair  
Supervisor Ahsha Safai, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Gordon Mar, Member  
Supervisor Connie Chan, Member  
Supervisor Shamann Walton, Member

**Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee**

Supervisor Gordon Mar, Chair  
Supervisor Catherine Stefani, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Member

**Government Audit & Oversight Committee**

Supervisor Dean Preston, Chair  
Supervisor Connie Chan, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, Member

**Rules Committee**

Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Chair  
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Connie Chan, Member

**Youth, Young Adults, and Families Committee**

Supervisor Hillary Ronen, Chair  
Supervisor Ahsha Safai, Vice Chair  
Supervisor Matt Dorsey, Member

*\* Pursuant to Section 3.25.1 of the Board of Supervisors' Rules of Order, the Budget & Appropriations Committee shall convene year-round on an as needed basis determined by the President of the Board.*

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SF ACC FY23 Waiver Requests  
**Date:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 1:45:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [FY23\\_Waiver\\_PattersonVeterinarySupply-signed - send to BOS.pdf](#)  
[FY23\\_Waiver\\_CampbellPetCompany-signed - send to BOS.pdf](#)  
[FY23\\_Waiver\\_IdexxDistributionInc-signed - send to BOS.pdf](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Alberto, Justine Eileen (ADM) <[justine.alberto@sfgov.org](mailto:justine.alberto@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 3:23 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Protz, Anita (ADM) <[anita.protz@sfgov.org](mailto:anita.protz@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** SF ACC FY23 Waiver Requests

Hello Board of Supervisors,

Attached are SFACC's FY23 waiver requests.

- Campbell Pet Company
- Idexx Distribution Inc.
- Patterson Veterinary Supply

Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,  
Justine



**Justine Alberto, PMP**  
Principal Administrative Analyst  
(628) 652-8810  
*In shelter Sun – Thu, off Fri & Sat*

**Connect with [SFACC](#)**  
1419 Bryant Street | San Francisco CA 94103  
Main: (415) 554-6364 | Emergencies: (415) 554-9400





VIRGINIA DONOHUE  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

May 10, 2022

**Contract Monitoring Division**  
**ATTN: Tamra Winchester**  
**1155 Market street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor**  
**San Francisco CA 94103**

Ms. Winchester,

San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC) is requesting a waiver for **Patterson Veterinary Supply Inc.** Patterson carries diagnostic tests, treatments, and shelter sanitation supplies. SF ACC has looked into contracting with other animal health care distributors, but none are 12B compliant.

Please grant this vendor a waiver for up to \$20,000. We will work with the Contract Monitoring Division and follow up on the vendor's compliance status.

Sincerely,



Virginia Donohue  
Executive Director

1419 Bryant Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 554-6364  
FAX (415) 557-9950  
TDD (415) 554-9704  
acc@sfgov.org  
[www.sfanimalcare.org](http://www.sfanimalcare.org)



# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CONTRACT MONITORING DIVISION

## S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (CMD-201)

Send completed waiver requests to:  
CMD, 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 200, San Francisco, CA 94102 or  
cmd.waiverrequest@sfgov.org

FOR CMD USE ONLY

Request Number:

### ► Section 1. CCSF Department Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Department Head Signature: *Justine Alberto*  
Name of Department: San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC)  
Department Address: 1419 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Contact Person: Justine Alberto, Principal Administrative Analyst  
Phone Number: (628) 652-8810 E-mail: justine.alberto@sfgov.org

### ► Section 2. Contractor Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Contractor Name: Patterson Veterinary Supply Inc  
Bidder/Supplier No.: 0000013422 Contractor Tax ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contractor Address: 28905 Network Place, Chicago, IL 60673  
Contact Person: Christine Glendenning Contact Phone No.: (970) 347-1085

### ► Section 3. Transaction Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 05/10/2022 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$ 20,000  
Contract/Transaction Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Contract Name: Diagnostic Tests, Treatments, Sanitation Supplies  
Contract/Transaction Start Date: 07/01/2022 Contract/Transaction End Date: 06/30/2023

### ► Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (*please check all that apply*)

☒ Chapter 12B  
☐ Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements will still be in force even when a 14B Waiver Type A or B is granted.*

### ► Section 5. Waiver Type (*a justification must be attached; see Check List on the other side of this form for instructions*)

☐ A. Sole Source  
☐ B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or §21.15)  
☐ C. Public Entity  
☒ D. No Potential Contractors Comply ..... (*Required*) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 05/10/2022  
☐ E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement..... (*Required*) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ F. Sham/Shell Entity ..... (*Required*) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ G. Subcontracting Goals  
☐ H. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) *Note: For contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7(J)(2)*

### CMD ACTION – For CMD/HRC Use Only

12B Waiver Granted: \_\_\_\_\_  
12B Waiver Denied: \_\_\_\_\_

14B Waiver Granted: \_\_\_\_\_  
14B Waiver Denied: \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for Action: \_\_\_\_\_

CMD or HRC Staff: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

CMD or HRC Director: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



VIRGINIA DONOHUE  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

May 10, 2022


**Contract Monitoring Division  
ATTN: Tamra Winchester  
1155 Market street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco CA 94103**

Ms. Winchester,

San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC) is requesting a waiver for **Campbell Pet Company**. Campbell is a supplier of specific slip leads, leashes, muzzles, and collars for SF ACC. Campbell supplies SF ACC with styles necessary for shelter animals (e.g. front-clipping harnesses/collars).

Please grant this vendor a waiver for up to \$10,000. We will work with the Contract Monitoring Division and follow up on the vendor's compliance status.

Sincerely,



Virginia Donohue  
Executive Director

1419 Bryant Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 554-6364  
FAX (415) 557-9950  
TDD (415) 554-9704  
acc@sfgov.org  
www.sfanimalcare.org



# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CONTRACT MONITORING DIVISION

## S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (CMD-201)

Send completed waiver requests to:  
CMD, 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 200, San Francisco, CA 94102 or  
cmd.waiverrequest@sfgov.org

FOR CMD USE ONLY

Request Number:

### ► Section 1. CCSF Department Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Department Head Signature: *Justine Alberto*  
Name of Department: San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC)  
Department Address: 1419 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Contact Person: Justine Alberto, Principal Administrative Analyst  
Phone Number: (628) 652-8810 E-mail: justine.alberto@sfgov.org

### ► Section 2. Contractor Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Contractor Name: Campbell Pet Company  
Bidder/Supplier No.: 0000023446 Contractor Tax ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contractor Address: PO Box 122, Brush Prairie, WA 98606  
Contact Person: Kelly Elliott Contact Phone No.: (360) 892-9786

### ► Section 3. Transaction Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 05/10/2022 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$ 10,000  
Contract/Transaction Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Contract Name: Specialty Leads, Leashes, Muzzles, Collars  
Contract/Transaction Start Date: 07/01/2022 Contract/Transaction End Date: 06/30/2023

### ► Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (*please check all that apply*)

☒ Chapter 12B  
☐ Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements will still be in force even when a 14B Waiver Type A or B is granted.*

### ► Section 5. Waiver Type (*a justification must be attached; see Check List on the other side of this form for instructions*)

☐ A. Sole Source  
☐ B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or §21.15)  
☐ C. Public Entity  
☒ D. No Potential Contractors Comply ..... (Required) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 05/10/2022  
☐ E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement..... (Required) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ F. Sham/Shell Entity ..... (Required) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ G. Subcontracting Goals  
☐ H. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) *Note: For contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7(J)(2)*

### CMD ACTION – For CMD/HRC Use Only

12B Waiver Granted: \_\_\_\_\_ 14B Waiver Granted: \_\_\_\_\_  
12B Waiver Denied: \_\_\_\_\_ 14B Waiver Denied: \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for Action: \_\_\_\_\_

CMD or HRC Staff: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

CMD or HRC Director: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



VIRGINIA DONOHUE  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

May 10, 2022

**Contract Monitoring Division**  
**ATTN: Tamra Winchester**  
**1155 Market street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor**  
**San Francisco CA 94103**

Ms. Winchester,

San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC) is requesting a waiver for **Idexx Distribution Inc.** Idexx is the supplier of veterinary testing products and lab services for SF ACC.

Please grant this vendor a waiver for up to \$30,000. We will work with the Contract Monitoring Division and follow up on the vendor's compliance status.

Sincerely,

Virginia Donohue  
Executive Director

1419 Bryant Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 554-6364  
FAX (415) 557-9950  
TDD (415) 554-9704  
acc@sfgov.org  
www.sfanimalcare.org



# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CONTRACT MONITORING DIVISION

## S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (CMD-201)

Send completed waiver requests to:  
CMD, 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 200, San Francisco, CA 94102 or  
cmd.waiverrequest@sfgov.org

FOR CMD USE ONLY

Request Number: \_\_\_\_\_

### ► Section 1. CCSF Department Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Department Head Signature: [Signature]  
Name of Department: San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC)  
Department Address: 1419 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Contact Person: Justine Alberto, Principal Administrative Analyst  
Phone Number: (628) 652-8810 E-mail: justine.alberto@sfgov.org

### ► Section 2. Contractor Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Contractor Name: Idexx Distribution Inc.  
Bidder/Supplier No.: 0000018516 Contractor Tax ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contractor Address: 1 Idexx Drive, Westbrook, ME 04092  
Contact Person: Cheryl Zimmerman Contact Phone No.: (845) 430-9453

### ► Section 3. Transaction Information (*all fields must be completed*)

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 05/10/2022 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$ 30,000  
Contract/Transaction Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Contract Name: Veterinary Testing Products / Lab Services  
Contract/Transaction Start Date: 07/01/2022 Contract/Transaction End Date: 06/30/2023

### ► Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (*please check all that apply*)

☒ Chapter 12B  
☐ Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements will still be in force even when a 14B Waiver Type A or B is granted.*

### ► Section 5. Waiver Type (*a justification must be attached; see Check List on the other side of this form for instructions*)

☐ A. Sole Source  
☐ B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or §21.15)  
☐ C. Public Entity  
☒ D. No Potential Contractors Comply ..... (*Required*) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 05/10/2022  
☐ E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement..... (*Required*) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ F. Sham/Shell Entity ..... (*Required*) Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ G. Subcontracting Goals  
☐ H. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) *Note: For contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7(J)(2)*

### CMD ACTION – For CMD/HRC Use Only

12B Waiver Granted: \_\_\_\_\_ 14B Waiver Granted: \_\_\_\_\_  
12B Waiver Denied: \_\_\_\_\_ 14B Waiver Denied: \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for Action: \_\_\_\_\_

CMD or HRC Staff: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

CMD or HRC Director: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Departmental Racial Equity Action Plan Progress Reports (Ordinance No 188-19)  
**Date:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 1:46:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

---

**From:** Davis, Sheryl (HRC) <[sheryl.davis@sfgov.org](mailto:sheryl.davis@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 10:21 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Legislative Aides <[bos-legislative\\_aides@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Tseng, Sarah (HRC) <[sarah.tseng@sfgov.org](mailto:sarah.tseng@sfgov.org)>; Campos, Jessica (HRC) <[jessica.campos1@sfgov.org](mailto:jessica.campos1@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Departmental Racial Equity Action Plan Progress Reports (Ordinance No 188-19)

To Members of the Board of Supervisors:

We respectfully submit to you the departmental progress reports on their Phase One Racial Equity Action Plans for 2021. The Office of Racial Equity has compiled the [progress reports](#) for your convenience, along with its [evaluations](#) of the original

## Phase One Racial Equity Action Plans.

Per [Ordinance No 188-19](#), each City department shall report annually on progress on its Racial Equity Action Plan in alignment with the [ORE Citywide Racial Equity Framework](#). The legislation notes that in connection with the budget process, the Board of Supervisors will consider each department's compliance with its mandated Racial Equity Action Plan and progress in addressing key racial equity disparities. The legislation also requires that each City department post its Racial Equity Action Plan and annual progress report on its individual website.

The Racial Equity Action Plans and annual departmental progress reports are an invaluable part of the City's workforce transformation. They bring more accountability and transparency to department change, uplift what is working, and highlight challenges and areas for continued focus on this Citywide journey.

Over the next few weeks, I will be working with the small number of departments who are still finalizing their progress reports due to extenuating circumstances during the COVID-19 pandemic. The staff in the Office of Racial Equity are also collaborating closely with Racial Equity Leaders across the City to review the departmental progress reports and identify issues, themes, and strategic priorities for elevating and sustaining this work.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss these further, please do not hesitate to reach out. Thank you for your continued partnership.

Sincerely,

Sheryl Evans Davis, EdD  
Executive Director  
San Francisco Human Rights Commission  
25 Van Ness Avenue #800  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Urgent - Crime at 240 Dolores Street  
**Date:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 1:47:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image71e5fa.PNG](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

## Arthur Khoo

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 | (415) 554-5163  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.


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

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

---

**From:** Matthew Binczek <Matthew.Binczek@trinitysf.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2022 4:19 PM  
**To:** Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; McEachern, Michael (POL) <M.Gavin.McEachern@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; SFPD Central Station, (POL) <sfpdcentralstation@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Crime Task Force <CrimeTaskForce@trinitysf.com>; Loren Atienza <Loren.Atienza@trinitysf.com>; Michael Huang <Michael.Huang@trinitysf.com>; Sean Halladay <Sean.Halladay@trinitysf.com>; Leanne Morford <Leanne.Morford@trinitysf.com>  
**Subject:** Urgent - Crime at 240 Dolores Street

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



Dear Supervisor Mandelman and Captain McEachern,

Unfortunately, I'm writing this email to report another crime at the 240 Dolores Street Apartments. On Monday, May 9<sup>th</sup>, criminals attempted to pry open the door to our leasing office using hand tools, causing much damage to the door. Below is a link to a folder containing videos and pictures of the incident and a copy of the "reportee follow-up" tag and case number provided to us by officer Butland.

<https://trinitysf.box.com/s/4dg40v8bmbn1lm6e175zwm31karir41b>

As residential and commercial property owners, employers, and residents of the Mission Dolores neighborhood in District 8, we write to express our profound concern about the current rising crime levels. We live every day with unacceptable and dangerous behavior in our communities.

This vandalism and theft is by no means an isolated incident. Unfortunately, we have seen this type of crime repeated many times. The safety of our residents and employees is of utmost importance to us, so we ask you for your immediate attention to this matter.

We have fortified this property in every feasible way, but we still cannot curb this constant criminal activity. We have even created an internal Crime Task Force and partnered with SF Safe to promote awareness and crime prevention in our communities. We need your help to provide the other necessary resources to deter and combat the overwhelming amount of criminal enterprise we are experiencing at 240 Dolores Street and across the city.

We appreciate all your officers' do to impact the city, and we offer ourselves to work with your team in any way we can to help find a path forward to a safer neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Matthew Binczek  
General Manager  
(415) 575-3355



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

[trinitysf.com](http://trinitysf.com)

[Email Disclaimer](#)

Matthew Binczek  
General Manager  
(415) 575-3355



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

[trinitysf.com](http://trinitysf.com)

[Email Disclaimer](#)