From:	Dave Rhody
To:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Imperial, Megan (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Fund SFE in Current Budget
Date:	Friday, May 27, 2022 8:32:36 AM
Attachments:	MayorBreedClimateRealityProject.docx
Importance:	High

Mayor Breed -

Please find attached (below) a letter from San Francisco members of the Climate Reality Project urging you to provide funding for the SF Department of the Environment in the new city budget.

Funding SFE is urgent and necessary for the future of San Francisco.

-Dave Rhody
Climate Reality Project
San Francisco

The Climate Reality Project
BAY AREA CHAPTER

Date: May 27, 2022

From: SF Policy Team of the Bay Area Climate Reality Project

To: Mayor London Breed
City & County of San Francisco

c.c.: SF Board of Supervisors

Re: Funding for SF Department of the Environment

Mayor Breed:

We have been intently watching the budget process and see a significant omission: funding for the city's Department of the Environment.

This small department is staffed with highly qualified experts who are ready to go to work to help our city agencies meet our State mandated Climate Action Plan. However, they require a budget to work with and a strong director. Without oversight from the Dept. of the Environment our agencies are already missing their targets.

For example, 2017 city legislation mandated our city light fleets to be electrified by 2022. 2022 is here and agencies in total have only met 13% of their requirements, punting the ball to the next year because no one has been monitoring them.

The SF Department of the Environment (SFE) has requested a modest $3.2 million in this year's fiscal budget and only $4.1M for next year. These monies are absolutely critical if we are to be anywhere close to reaching our climate goals. Funding for 2022-23 will provide necessary staff to direct plans for green buildings, electric vehicles and healthy eco-systems we all depend on:

- Building sector decarbonization - $2.4 million
- Transportation sector electric mobility - $488 thousand
- Biodiversity and healthy ecosystems - $316 thousand

Without these funds SFEnvironment's Climate Action Plan will remain just that – a plan. To be effective, the plan needs to be implemented, the work guided by knowledgeable staff and corrections made as needed along the way. This is the only way to reach our goals. $3.2M funding this year allows the Department of the Environment to initiate these critical, State mandated plans; next year's $4.1 funding will enable it to follow the work through implementation and assessment.

Waiting leads to added costs, not less. Meanwhile, it's the low-income communities which bear the brunt of poor air quality and climate change. Please adequately fund the Department of the Environment so it can do its job.

Respectfully,

Dave Rhody, Kimberlee Stryker & Paul Wermer

San Francisco Climate Reality Project

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: File 220491 At Budget And Appropriations (DBI Budget conflict of interest concerns)
Date:	Wednesday, May 18, 2022 2:05:43 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Christopher Mika <mika.christopher@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 1:17 PM
To: Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Saini, Nikita (BOS) <nikita.saini@sfgov.org>; Lerma, Santiago (BOS) <santiago.lerma@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana herrera@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Chan, Karen (REC) <karen.chan@sfgov.org>; Lovett, Li (BOS) <li.lovett@sfgov.org>; Wright, Edward (BOS) <edward.w.wright@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong1@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Evans, Abe (BOS) <abe.evans@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Parsons, Winston (BOS) <Winston.Parsons@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances hsieh@sfgov.org>; Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; fred@hrcsf.org
Subject: File 220491 At Budget And Appropriations (DBI Budget conflict of interest concerns)

Hello

My Name is Christopher Mika. I'm a SRO supportive housing Tenant in The Tenderloin, now District 5.
I'm writing the Budget and Appropriations committee because I want to express my concern about conflicts of interest regarding the local SRO Collaboratives which, by my understanding, are overseen by the Department of Building Inspection. These entities include, but may not be limited to:

- The Central City SRO Collaborative
- The Mission SRO Collaborative
- The Chinatown SRO Collaborative
- TNDC

What we have with the SRO Collaboratives are organizations which claim to represent formerly homeless supportive housing - SRO tenants. In practice what they are, to greater and lesser degrees, are organizations owned and directed by SH-SRO landlords. In many cases the landlords that run the Collaboratives use tenants to lobby for their personal and political aims. The most egregious organization is probably CCSRO, which is run by Tenderloin Housing Clinic, and owned by Randy Shaw.

I am a THC SRO tenant, and I can share a few examples of this:

- Randy Shaw, through CCSRO staff (and publicly through interviews in The Examiner) opposed the '30 Right Now' legislation which was created and driven by SRO tenants. The legislation sought to bring rent for SRO tenants in line with the national standard for rent subsidy, which was 30% of income. Shaw used the existence of CCSRO approved and paid for fake "Tenant Organizers" to lobby against the legislation and make the claim that tenants

didn’t want it because tenants themselves were worried that they would use drugs with “extra money”. This was undeniably false. SRO tenants were overwhelmingly supportive of “30 Right Now”

- Late in 2020 I was alarmed that the staff of my THC SH-SRO building was still not adhering to COVID protocols. I had reached out to the manager of my building, but her response was dismissive. At the time, a San Francisco supervisor reaeased a statement re: where to go if SRO tenants need help with COVID compliance, and other issues. The recommendation listed the Collaboratives, including CCSRO. I was struck at the futility of this and that an SRO tenant having problems with their landlord was recommended to go to their landlord.

- CSROC recently demanded an amendment to legislation by Sup Aaron Peskin to give San Francisco tenants power to form tenants’ unions. The amendment was to deny SRO supportive housing residents the same powers and rights.

It is apparent that the SRO collaboratives, being owned and managed by landlords, are working at cross purposes with their tenants. It is a flagrant conflict of interest.

Assuming that the Collaboratives have utility outside of being lobbying organizations for SRO landlords, I would like to see them completely severed from the non-profit landlord complex, and made public entities that truly serve tenants. If that is not an option, I think they should be defunded and put to pasture immediately due to the complex harm that they are causing SRO tenants.

Sincerely,

Christopher Mika.